ABSTRACT

O’MALLEY, DEIRDRE MAUREEN. Internationalization of Higher Education: A Case Study of Trinity College Dublin. (Under the direction of Dr. Alyssa Rockenbach).

Due to globalization, the world is becoming increasingly interconnected (Hudzik, 2011; Jackson, 2008). In response, institutions of higher education are reassessing their mission and being relied upon to determine how they can best prepare their graduates to become global citizens and successful in today’s diverse world. The response of many is internationalization (Jackson, 2008). The purpose of this study was to describe the process of internationalization at Trinity College Dublin. This study also sought to understand in what ways Rumbley’s (2007) Delta Cycle for Internationalization was an applicable conceptual framework for the internationalization process at Trinity College Dublin.

This study employed a descriptive, qualitative case study to understand how and why the internationalization phenomenon developed at the institutional level at Ireland’s leading tertiary institution. Data was collected through 12 in-person, in-depth interviews with Trinity administrators, academics, and staff, on-site observations, and document analysis. Themes that emerged from the findings revealed Trinity College Dublin was largely influenced and driven to internationalize by the Irish government’s national mandate to internationalize the country’s institutions. The large impact environmental factors played in shaping Trinity’s internationalization process pointed to the importance in monitoring that impact. Trinity’s corporate approach to internationalization demonstrated the potential benefits of applying business practices to academic processes while, at the same time, highlighted potential problems and risks that can result from an academic pursuit with economic goals. Trinity’s dedication to and strong focus on partnering with faculty in their internationalization initiatives were noted to be integral to the process.
The application of the Delta Cycle for Internationalization (2010) to the Trinity case study indicated the theoretical model most directly aligned with the implementation stages of internationalization at Trinity and was determined to be a highly serviceable theoretical framework for understanding internationalization at the institutional level. At the same time, this study revealed that as internationalization rapidly expands in breadth and depth and into various university departments across campus, future theoretical frameworks dedicated to understanding internationalization at the institutional level will need to assume a more multidimensional approach in order to consider the various internationalization cycles taking place within those units.

This research study addressed growing concerns in the literature over internationalization trends that are shifting in more economically-driven directions (de Wit, 2010). This study determined that consistent monitoring of internationalization is required in order to balance the growing economic pressures to internationalize with academic objectives so that internationalization aligns with its pure and real objective - to educate students to be global graduates and contributing members of the global workforce.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Over the last two decades, the concept of the internationalization of higher education has moved from the periphery of institutional interest to the very core (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011). As a rapidly growing phenomenon, internationalization is progressively impacting all aspects of the higher education arena and is increasingly being approached in broad and pervasive terms. No longer considered a luxury as it once was, internationalization is commonly understood to be an essential part of all university reforms (Egron-Polak, 2011), also referred to as “the mainstreaming of internationalization” (de Wit, 2011). At an increasing number of institutions worldwide, internationalization is “firmly embedded in institutional mission statements, policies, strategies, as well as national policy frameworks” (Knight, 2011, p.1). An examination of this rapidly growing phenomenon is at the heart of the current study that focused on understanding the process of internationalization at Trinity College Dublin.

Internationalization is defined “at the national, sector, and institutional levels as the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education” (Knight, 2004, p. 11). The national/sector level has an important influence on the international dimension of higher education through policy, funding, and regulatory frameworks. It is at the institutional level, however, that the actual process of internationalization is taking place. The internationalization phenomenon at the institutional level manifests in a variety of ways, including academic programs (e.g., student exchange programs, foreign language study, international curricula); research and
scholarly collaboration (e.g., international joint research projects, international conferences and seminars, internationally published articles and papers, researcher and graduate student exchange programs); extra-curricular activities (for example, international and intercultural campus events, liaison with community-based cultural groups, and social, cultural, and academic support systems); and external relations and services (domestic and international) (for example, community service and international project work, international teaching sites and distance education, and participation in international networks) (Altbach & Knight, 2007; de Wit, 2002, 2010; Knight, 2004). Taken together, the internationalization phenomenon is all-encompassing and is increasingly being integrated into all aspects of academia (Egron-Polak, 2012; Hudzik, 2011; Qiang, 2003).

Internationalization is driven, on the one hand, by the pursuit of the lofty academic, political, and social/cultural goals and ideals that include increasing international understanding, strengthening liberal education, avoiding parochialism in scholarship and research, stimulating critical thinking, and enhancing the quality of teaching and research (Childress, 2010; de Wit, 2002; Green, 2003; Knight, 1999; Lim, 2003; Reichard, 1983). On the other hand, internationalization is increasingly driven and used as a central lever of economic competitiveness in the knowledge economy and as a source of revenue for institutions worldwide (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Egron-Polak, 2012; Knight, 2012). Criticisms of the internationalization process are growing and appear to stem from the need to balance these two sets of divergent drivers, that is the drive to internationalize based on the more altruistic and academic goals with the economically driven rationales that are
increasingly motivating institutions to internationalize (Egron-Polak, 2012). Thus, alongside the often-cited benefits of internationalization, the multiple interests, approaches, and practices that are progressively commercial in focus have provoked some negative reactions and led many to engage in a more critical analysis of internationalization (de Wit, 2010, 2011; Egron-Polak, 2012; Hawawini, 2011; Knight, 2009, 2011). In light of these developments, some "rethinking" is needed in order to identify ways to address this growing unease and to strike a better balance between the academic rationales and benefits of internationalization and the more economic and self-interested motivations (Altbach, Reisburg, & Rumbley, 2009; de Wit, 2011; Egron-Polak, 2012; Hawawini, 2011; Knight, 2011).

The last decade or so has seen an acceleration of notable shifts in internationalization that add to the increasing need to rethink, monitor, and understand the phenomenon (Egron-Polak, 2012). For example, internationalization trends are increasingly shifting from the pursuit of international higher education collaboration for the purpose of soft diplomacy to a pursuit more focused on economic competitiveness. Also recognized is the shift from the pursuit of internationalization for the purpose of institutional partnerships that enhance diversity of perspectives and worldviews to a search for partnerships in terms of prestige and status in rankings and institutions that can boost institutional status (de Wit, 2011; Knight, 2004). Likely the most frequently referenced shift in internationalization is from offering international students access to programs locally unavailable to them, to a race for access to increasingly large numbers of international fee-paying student and the best brains worldwide.
Such shifts are at the heart of the unease and concerns with current internationalization trends (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011). These shifts and the overall expansion of internationalization, particularly in terms of the depth of institutional engagement in the process, increases potential benefits as well as risks and the subsequent concerns over the future of internationalization (de Wit, 2011; Egron-Polak, 2012; Knight, 2007).

As stakes get higher and institutions worldwide increasingly embed internationalization into all aspects of their functions and purpose, higher education leaders must be mindful that pursuing goals that are more commercial than academic will, in the long run, come at a cost (Altbach & Welch, 2011; Egron-Polak, 2012). The pursuit of internationalization for economic and commercial goals, for improved ranking, and for levels of prestige will not likely achieve the original goal of internationalization, notably the improvement in the quality of higher education and an enriched learning environment (de Wit, 2011). It will also not lead institutions to focus research on solving some of the most pressing global problems or issues. Yet, these are among the important stated objectives of internationalization of higher education that are included in many institutional approaches to internationalization (Egron-Polak, 2012; Hawawini, 2011).

The notable shift in the pursuit of internationalization for economic objectives are increasingly reflected in the rationales, approaches, and strategies adopted by institutions in their efforts to internationalize (Egron-Polak, 2012; Knight, 2004; Qiang, 2003). As a result, research dedicated to describing how and why internationalization unfolds at the institutional
level is increasingly important. Such research can add to the literature an understanding of how these trends may be impacting institutional rationales, approaches, and strategies for internationalization and the challenges and risks involved in the process, all of which are objectives of the current study on the internationalization of higher education at Trinity College Dublin.

An examination of the internationalization process at an Irish higher education institution is of particular importance and interest for Ireland, as a small, open European economy, relies fundamentally on international engagement. An internationalized higher education system in Ireland has a crucial role to play in sustaining Ireland’s international profile and attractiveness by educating the next leaders, entrepreneurs, and decision-makers in Ireland’s partner countries and by giving Irish students the intercultural competence that is necessary in today’s global economy (High Level Group, 2010). The environment in which Ireland currently operates relies heavily on the internationalization of the country’s higher education institutions. Indeed, international higher education has been highlighted as “a key underpinning” (Hennessy, 2012) to Ireland’s recovery from the current economic recession that has greatly diminished funding for Irish higher education. Particularly in light of international education being a 1 billion euro market in the Irish economy, the Irish government has made international education a key priority area for development (Strategy Group, 2011).

So great is the call for Irish institutions to internationalize, that the country’s national government has taken far-reaching steps towards developing the internationalization of Irish
higher education. Examples of such efforts include the creation of the *High Level Group on International Engagement*, assigned to coordinate and implement a national approach to internationalization and to develop a strategy for Ireland to become internationally recognized and ranked as a world leader in the delivery of high-quality international education (High Level Group, 2010). Ireland’s national mandate for Irish institutions to internationalize was outlined in *Investing in Global Relationships (2010)* (High Level Group, 2010). Since its publication, Irish institutions have responded to the call to internationalize based on various rationales and through different approaches and strategies. Although great efforts have been made by the Irish government to internationalize higher education and, in turn, an immense amount of responsibility has been placed on Irish institutions to internationalize, to date, no other qualitative study has been conducted on an Irish institution’s experience with internationalization. This study aimed to fill that significant void in the literature through the description of the internationalization process at an Irish case study institution. From this study, the Irish government can gain a greater understanding how and why one of Ireland’s institutions has responded to the call to internationalize. Understanding the current international context and direction the case study institution is headed can inform future national policies and practice in the field in order to ensure the main goals and objectives of internationalization are met. Other Irish higher education institutions, issued with the same national mandate to internationalize, can learn from the steps taken and challenges faced along the way in Trinity’s efforts to internationalize in order to inform their own choices and approaches and to avoid possible pitfalls experienced at Trinity.
Given the increasing concern that the internationalization of higher education is becoming an end in itself, rather than a means to end (with the end being the improvement of the quality of education) (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; Hudzik, 2011; Knight, 1999), a study dedicated to detailing the process of internationalization at an Irish institution can provide insight into how the phenomenon may be veering in a direction that is less pure in academic focus and nature and instead, more economically motivated. Researchers in the field argue for a return to understanding and viewing internationalization in its pure and real meaning - not as the goal, but, rather, as part of the process that helps to achieve the goal (de Wit, 2011; IAU, 2012). Pure and real internationalization efforts focus on the core role of universities: to help prepare students to live and work in a global community (de Wit, 2011). In this way, the literature signals the need for the continuous examination and a deeper understanding of the internationalization process at the institutional level in order to ensure the pure and real academic goals of internationalization are not lost in the process, but rather are at the center of all internationalization efforts.

**Problem Statement**

The current international higher education literature focuses on the tremendous growth, rapid pace, and potential benefits as well as the growing risks associated with the global internationalization phenomenon. As internationalization is less driven by academic, social and cultural rationales and increasingly driven by economic competitiveness and revenue generation needs, international higher education scholars and practitioners are increasingly expressing concerns over these developments and are focusing scholarly
discussions on the need for reflecting upon, monitoring, and understanding the current context of internationalization. In order to ensure internationalization remains focused on its intended end goal – to enhance the quality of education and research – research dedicated to understanding the current state of internationalization at the institutional level can help to ensure this noted objective is met and does not veer off in a more commercial and revenue-focused direction. While research is often dedicated to understanding the quantitative aspects of internationalization (for example, the increasing number of international students and institutional links), less attention has been paid in the literature to in-depth qualitative studies focused on learning how and why internationalization is taking place, which is the objective of the current study.

The literature highlights the Irish government’s large and concerted national policies and efforts to internationalize Irish higher education and the subsequent and considerable responsibility that has been placed on Irish institutions to internationalize. Missing from the literature, however, is an in-depth examination that describes how internationalization actually unfolds at an Irish institution. With internationalization happening at a rapid pace and being encouraged at the national level in Ireland, this study addresses the importance for leaders and scholars to fully understand the internationalization process at the institutional level in order to ensure it advances in a way that enhances educational quality and, subsequently, avoids the potential long-term consequences that could develop without such awareness and understanding. In this way, this study serves to fill the important void in the literature on an Irish institutions’ experience with internationalization.
Finally, the current state of the theoretical literature based on the process of internationalization at the institutional level has not considered how the Delta Cycle for Internationalization (2010) is applicable to an institution outside of the Spanish context, where the model was originally designed. Theoretical frameworks for internationalization at the institutional level are limited, with relatively little attention to being paid to examining the applicability of those models that do exist in the international education literature. Application of the Delta Cycle (2010) to an Irish institution’s experience with internationalization informs the field of international education on the applicability of the model to the Irish context and in this way, can determine its serviceability to institutions in other contexts.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to describe the experience of Trinity College Dublin in its efforts to become a more international university. A qualitative study of this type allowed for an in-depth and descriptive examination of the internationalization developments taking place at the case study institution. This study attempted to portray the process of internationalization through a descriptive case study design using semi-structured interviews with key university actors who played an integral role in the internationalization process at the case study institution.

A second objective of this study was to assess the applicability of Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle for Internationalization, a theoretical framework for understanding and analyzing internationalization at the institutional level, in the Irish context. Such an analysis was
insightful, as the theoretical application of Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle to Trinity College Dublin both tested the model and in the process, determined those components that were most applicable and those that were less dynamic in illustrating the case study’s experience with internationalization. The analysis of a theoretical model on the internationalization process at the institutional level is of great value to the field of internationalization of higher education, a field currently lacking in relevant theoretical models.

**Research Questions**

The research questions for this study are outlined as follows:

1. What is the process of internationalization at Trinity College Dublin (TCD) for the last 20 years?

2. In what ways is Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle for Internationalization applicable conceptual framework for the internationalization process at TCD?

The first question served as the primary research question for this study, followed by the applicability of Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle for Internationalization (2010) to Trinity College Dublin, as the theoretical framework that guided the study. A review of the theoretical framework that guided this study on research on the internationalization of higher education at the institutional level follows.

**Guiding Theoretical Framework**

During this time of increased attention to and investment in the internationalization of higher education, qualitative studies on various aspects of the internationalization of higher
education have been conducted on an institutional level (Rumbley, 2007). In her formative research on the internationalization of Canadian universities, Jane Knight (1994) created a working conceptual framework for institutional internationalization (see Appendix A).

Knight’s (1994) Internationalization Cycle considered the internationalization process as a continuous and sequential cycle. The Internationalization Cycle (1994) identified six steps or phases, (a) awareness, (b) commitment, (c) planning, (d) operationalization, (e) review, and (f) reinforcement (Knight, 1994), which an institution moves through to integrate an international dimension into the university culture. Although Knight’s (1994) Internationalization Cycle (see Appendix A) captured valuable aspects of the internationalization process in a straightforward illustration, Knight’s (1994) model failed to recognize environmental factors (i.e., resources and the economic environment) and the critical role they play in shaping institutions’ experience with internationalization. Such factors were considered essential to the current analysis of Trinity College Dublin. As a result, Knight’s (1994) Internationalization Cycle would not be the most appropriate theoretical framework to ground this study. Knight’s (1994) model does continue, however, to be a highly seminal framework in the field of international higher education, particularly given the relatively limited number of practical models in the field.

Laura Rumbley’s (2007, 2010) research on the internationalization of Spain’s universities also examined the utility of Knight’s (1994) Internationalization Cycle by applying Knight’s (1994) model to four Spanish universities’ experience with internationalization. In doing so, Rumbley (2010) highlighted elements missing in Knight’s
Knight’s (1994) model and created the Delta Cycle for Internationalization (see Appendix B), a revised and expanded graphic representation of Knight’s (1994) Internationalization Cycle and the most appropriate theoretical framework for the current analysis. This study built on the work begun by Knight (1994) and later revised and expanded upon by Rumbley (2010), as this study focused on the application of Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle to the process of internationalization at Trinity College Dublin.

Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle for Internationalization served as the conceptual framework for this study. The Delta Cycle (2010) originated from Rumbley’s (2010) examination of four Spanish universities’ experiences with internationalization, as understood principally by the conceptual model of Jane Knight’s (1994) Internationalization Cycle. Rumbley’s (2010) findings revealed that while Knight’s (1994) model was applicable to the Spanish context on a number of different levels, the model was missing some critical features. The Delta Cycle, therefore, represented a revised and expanded graphic representation of Knight’s (1994) original interpretation of the internationalization process, and attempted to address those missing features.

The Delta Cycle for Internationalization (2010) (See Appendix B) is an enhanced framework for understanding and analyzing internationalization at the institutional level. Similar to Knight’s (1994) model, the Delta Cycle (2010) considered the internationalization process as a continuous cycle and identified six steps or phases that an institution proceeds through to develop and implement an internationalization strategy ((a) awareness, (b) commitment, (c) planning, (d) operationalization, (e) review, and (f) reinforcement) (Knight,
The Delta Cycle (2010) considered elements of the internationalization process that Rumbley (2010) determined were missing from Knight’s (1994) framework. Specifically, Rumbley’s (2010) model acknowledged that four key environmental factors - opportunities, imperatives, obstacles, and resources - define the boundaries of the internationalization cycle. Furthermore, the Delta Cycle (2010) asserted that rationales, strategies, and outcomes must be incorporated into any analysis of internationalization, and that change - both in terms of the continuously fluid nature of the external environment and the transformational impact of the change on institutions - is a defining feature of internationalization (Rumbley, 2010).

Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle was relevant to the study of an Irish institution’s experience with internationalization for a variety of reasons. Unlike Knight’s (1994) model, Rumbley’s (2010) model considered a wider range of factors that were highly relevant and significant to the Irish context. Particularly given the current challenging economic climate in Ireland, factors such as rationales, strategies, and environmental factors were important to a study dedicated to an Irish institution’s internationalization process. From a contextual perspective, Ireland and Spain were ideally matched for comparative studies. Ireland and Spain were communal members of the European Union and were actively pursuing the shared goal to promote and enhance their institutional internationalization efforts in the midst of what was a financially-constrained European climate. Meanwhile, Rumbley (2010) created the Delta model from an institutional level context and perspective with in-depth descriptive analysis being a primary aim of the study, both of which are shared objectives with this study.
Significance of the Study

Theoretical and Empirical Significance

This study built on the empirical work of Knight’s (1994) and later Rumbley’s (2010) in its focus on one institution’s experience with the internationalization of higher education. The scholarly work also built on the existing literature in the field of internationalization of higher education in general and internationalization in European and Irish higher education more specifically. Based on the current internationalization developments taking place at Trinity, the current study highlighted the various ways the model was and was not (yet) applicable to the Trinity case study. The implications from these findings indicated the Delta Cycle (2010) as a highly serviceable theoretical model in many ways and a valuable contribution to the field of international higher education as a worthy model to reference and apply to future research studies of internationalization at the institutional level. At the same time, however, consideration was also given for expanding the Delta Cycle to reflect factors that were apparent in the Trinity case study but were missing from the Delta Cycle (2010).

The theoretical and empirical implications from these findings will be discussed in this section.

First, integral to Trinity’s internationalization process was the institutional focus on building internal and external relationships and in the process maintaining an internal and external frame of reference. More specifically, the Trinity case study demonstrated the importance of developing a strong institutional foundation that is receptive and engaged in internationalization and suggested this can be achieved through internal relationship building
with key stakeholder, such as faculty. At the same time, the Trinity case study highlighted that institutions must have a global reach that extends outward in order to incorporate a more international dimension into the teaching, research, and services functions. A global reach was demonstrated to be achieved through external relationship building. A strong internationally-focused campus foundation and global reach are important dimensions to factors to consider in theoretical approaches to internationalization.

A second theoretical contribution points to the highly significant role environmental factors played in the internationalization process at Trinity College Dublin. Particularly given the ever-changing global economic climate and the increasing impact that social and political forces can have on higher education institutions, a great deal can be learned from understanding how environmental factors impact the internationalization process at the institutional level. To date, the literature generally does not speak directly to this impact. The Delta Cycle’s (2010) four key environmental factors - opportunities, imperatives, obstacles, and resources - largely shaped and impacted Trinity’s internationalization pursuits. By considering and monitoring how environmental factors can influence internationalization processes, institutions can remain aware and active in steering internationalization initiatives in a direction that meets the intended and ultimate objective of internationalization, namely to help prepare students to successfully contribute to the increasingly globalized world.

A third and final theoretical implication stemming from this study considers future theoretical directions for Trinity and other institutions pursuing internationalization. The findings for this study indicated that the Delta Cycle (2010) was applicable to the current
state of Trinity’s experience with internationalization. However, as internationalization rapidly expands in breadth and depth at the institutional level (as it currently is doing at Trinity), the phenomenon is no longer contained to a unit within academia that is specifically focused on international initiatives, such as an international office. Rather, internationalization efforts at Trinity and institutions worldwide are taking place across campus within diverse university units, each at their own pace and at their own stage in the process. In this way, future theoretical frameworks for internationalization will need to take a more multidimensional approach to consider the various internationalization cycles taking place across campus. As a result of the increasingly comprehensive approaches to internationalization, future theoretical considerations for internationalization will need to move in a direction that is no longer one-dimensional in nature and will no longer be easily captured in sequential steps or phases, as the Delta Cycle (2010) illustrated. The Trinity case study contributed to the literature valuable foundational points to reference in future considerations for theoretical models and comprehensive approaches to institutional internationalization.

**Practical Significance**

Institutional leaders, academics, and staff can all acquire a deeper level of understanding on the internationalization process by learning from the multiple levels and viewpoints represented in this study and the resulting rich, thick description of Trinity’s experience with internationalization. The various viewpoints represented in this study could
be enlightening to university representatives, from the top to the bottom of the institutional hierarchy. For instance, senior leaders of institutions can gain rare insight into the perspective of Trinity staff and their experience with internationalization at the institution in terms of how it impacts them and the students they directly work with. In this way, senior leaders at Trinity can gain a unique insight into understanding the internationalization process from a different lens, one that is more in tune with how university internationalization policies impact those at the opposite end of the institutional hierarchy. For example, this study may awaken university leaders to the need for more consideration for the design and structure of Trinity’s international student support services. Such awareness and knowledge could impact decisions made and resource allocations dedicated to the issue. Conversely, by representing the viewpoints of high-level university academics and administrators, this study can help to inform those working at the lower levels of the institutional hierarchy on details such as how and why institutional decisions were made and larger initiatives are implemented at Trinity. Such insight, in turn, could help to clarify possible points of confusion and increase awareness in the process.

Given the national mandate issued by the Irish government for Irish institutions to internationalize, this study can be helpful to other, small European countries seeking to learn more about how a national mandate to internationalize can play out at the institutional level. At the same time, this study can provide practical insight so that other institutions can learn from and potentially work to prevent the challenges Trinity faced in the implementation of its strategy. Additionally, Trinity’s challenge to balance the academic rationales to
internationalize with the growing economic and more commercial motivations can provide insight into the various ways the divergent motivations can have an impact at the institutional level. As institutions worldwide are progressively faced with this same challenge, understanding more about the various ways it unfolds and is addressed at the institutional level will be increasingly helpful and important.

From an Irish perspective, Ireland’s international education sector has been highlighted by Irish government and institutional leaders alike as one of the keys to the country’s economic recovery (Bruton & Quinn, 2011; Hennessy, 2002; High Level Group, 2010; O’Keeffe, 2009). The international developments of Ireland’s higher education institutions “represent a very valuable national resource and it is imperative for Ireland’s economic and social development that their full potential be realized” (O’Keeffe, 2009, p.1). The sector currently contributes 1 billion euros to the Irish economy each year and supports thousands of jobs (O’Keeffe, 2009). Strategic plans by the Irish government set the goal of doubling the number of international students studying in Ireland and the resulting international education sector’s worth by some 300 million euro to 1.2 billion euro by 2015 (High Level Group, 2010). Hence, from an economic perspective, the Irish government has placed a large responsibility on Irish institutions to internationalize. In order to reach such lofty financial goals, a greater understanding of the internationalization developments taking place at an Irish university is of immense importance to Irish institutions and to the Irish government alike.

From an American higher education perspective, the United States sent more students
to study abroad in Irish higher education institutions than any other country of origin, with 4,415 U.S. students studying in Ireland during the 2010-2011 academic year (ICOS, 2012). Figures from the Institute of International Education (IIE) indicate that Ireland is consistently ranked in the top ten destination countries for U.S. study abroad students (IIE, 2012). Additional data highlights that after China, Ireland is the fastest growing destination for U.S. study abroad students (Enterprise Ireland, 2010). Given the growing demand for Ireland as a study abroad destination for U.S. students, U.S. institutions’ and international education administrators should be interested in the international developments taking place at institutions in such a highly sought-after study abroad location.

**Overview of Methodological Approach**

The purpose of this descriptive qualitative case study was to describe one Irish university’s efforts to become a more international institution. By drawing principally from 12 key university actors, this study focused on the process of internationalization at Trinity College Dublin. A qualitative case study was most appropriate for this type of study, as it provided a “comprehensive understanding of the groups under study” (Becker, 1968, p. 233) through an “intensive, holistic description and analysis…of a single phenomenon” (Merriam, 1988, p.21) that was bound within the context of a university setting (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009).

Trinity College Dublin (TCD) served as the case study institution and provided an ideal context for this study. As Ireland’s oldest university, TCD was recognized internationally as Ireland’s leading university, often as a result of being at the forefront of
research, technology, and innovation. Since its foundation in 1592, Trinity has been regarded as an international university attracting faculty, students, and staff from every continent. TCD’s strategic plans aim to become “Ireland’s university on the world stage” by embedding internationalization into Trinity’s culture and by creating an inclusive, integrated, and global Trinity community (TCD, 2014). TCD was also an ideal case study institution given its recent concerted efforts to implement a strategic and comprehensive internationalization strategy. Finally, TCD provided a useful context for examining the relevance of Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle for Internationalization; because internationalization is currently so salient at Trinity, the context served as a rich example of the process.

The 12 university actors selected for this research played an integral role in the decision-making and implementation of internationalization strategies at TCD. Data were collected through interviews, observations, and document analysis, providing appropriate triangulation for this case study. Interviews gathered information on the motivations, strategies, challenges, and outcomes of internationalization at the case study institution and observations were conducted to support and enhance the findings for this study. Individual case analysis and cross-case synthesis was used to analyze the data collected for this study. Open and axial coding was then employed to generate codes, themes, and ultimately, findings. Appropriate methods of trustworthiness such as triangulating data and researcher reflexivity were employed to address credibility, dependability, transferability, and confirmability.
Limitations and Delimitations

Despite efforts to ensure a high level of credibility, it is important to recognize limitations that affected the outcomes of this study. Contrary to Rumbley’s (2010) examination of four Spanish institutions, the research for this study was limited in its examination to a single case study institution. As a result, any comparison of the applicability of the theoretical framework used in the two studies or the outcomes produced was limited in scope to the one institution examined in this analysis.

The methodological approach itself can be a limitation, as the case study method is known to limit broad generalizations, with findings that are not likely to extend beyond the case study institution (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 2009). I did, however, attempt to diminish these effects with my use of “thick description” (Merriam, 1988, Yin, 2009) that served to enhance the transferability of this study. As a result, readers will be able to determine how the findings from this study apply to their context through the use of these descriptions. The findings from this study could serve as a helpful source of information and research framework for institutions that pursue similar internationalization goals and would like to conduct a comparable study at their respective institutions.

This study was limited in its description of issues related to the internationalization process at Trinity College Dublin at the general level. The more focused elements of internationalization (i.e., the examination of an individual university department’s experience with internationalization, the impact of internationalization on faculty workloads, and so
forth) would be an ideal topic for further studies on how internationalization is being executed by specific parts of the university.

I interviewed administrators, faculty, and staff from a variety of divisions and academic units at TCD; at the same time, I had to be realistic about time limitations in my research. It was not possible to interview representatives from every department. This study reflected the perspectives of those individuals most instrumental in the internationalization process at Trinity. In an effort to represent comprehensively examine Trinity’s internationalization process, I consulted with key informants prior to my research in Ireland to determine those participants who were most involved in Trinity’s internationalization process.

My position as a cultural outsider, researching an institution in a country outside of my country of origin, related to the final limitation in this study, because data gathered in qualitative studies by a researcher from a different cultural group can carry limitations (Cherry, 2000). Although Ireland is not my country of origin, I had a dual lens, as an outsider and insider, as I hold dual citizenship in both Ireland and the United States, and I have visited the country often and lived in Ireland as a graduate student. I am aware that the US / Irish lens through which I viewed and wrote this study potentially impacted the way I interpreted the internationalization context and experiences at TCD. I attempted to mitigate possible flaws due to potential cross-cultural misunderstandings by tapping into the expertise of my dissertation committee members, by practicing my interview questions, and by continuously consulting Irish cultural-informants for feedback. The unique, dual lens was,
arguably, beneficial in the end, due to the unique, fresh outsider/insider perspective that I brought to this research study.

Chapter Summary

This research study examined the internationalization process at Trinity College Dublin. This chapter began with a discussion on internationalization as a widespread phenomenon, one that is rapidly growing and is increasingly prevalent in all aspects of academia. The problem and purpose of this study were discussed, as were the two guiding research questions for this study. Research on internationalization of higher education conducted at the institutional level was discussed in order to establish an understanding on research already conducted on the subject and how the current study extends that work. A brief overview of Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle for Internationalization was provided and justified as a suitable theoretical model for this research study. The significance of this study and the theoretical, empirical, and practical implications for conducting this research study were discussed, followed by an overview of the methodology that was employed in this study. Limitations and delimitations were explained, followed by the various steps that were taken to address those limitations.

The subsequent chapters review the literature and the theory informing the topic (Chapter 2), provide further description and definition of the methodological approach that was taken to gather and analyze data (Chapter 3), and present the study’s findings (Chapter 4) and their implications (Chapter 5).
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter begins with the various ways in which internationalization has been defined and includes the definition that has been determined to be most fitting for the current study. A discussion on the rationales that lead institutions to internationalize is followed by an analysis of the various ways of measuring the phenomenon. A review of the current context of internationalization precedes a discussion on the barriers and risks involved in internationalization. Relevant theoretical models on the internationalization of higher education are included next to explain how the models have evolved and why Rumbley’s (2010) has been chosen as the most appropriate for this study. In order to understand the broader European context in which Ireland is situated, a review of European integration and the subsequent amalgamation of European higher education follows. Finally, an analysis of the issues raised in the literature that chronicle the Irish educational context within both Irish higher education generally and internationalization efforts more specifically establish the setting for this study. These broad patterns or trends in the literature provide an understanding of the larger context for this analysis and the environment in which the case study institution exists. Collectively, this literature review highlights those topics most germane to the objective of this study - to describe the internationalization process at Trinity College Dublin over the last 20 years.
Current Context of the Internationalization of Higher Education

The internationalization of higher education has been highly recognized as a phenomenon that has grown in importance since the university’s medieval beginnings and has taken on new and diverse approaches in the contemporary era (Altbach, 2002; Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; Egron-Polak, 2011; Knight, 2011; Quiang, 2003; Rumbley, 2007). The internationalization of higher education is certainly not a new concept. There seemed to be widespread consensus in the literature that the university has always been regarded as an inherently international institution (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Altbach & Teichler, 2001; de Wit, 2002; Harari, 1989; Hudzik, 2011; Knight, 2003; Scott, 1998; Taylor, 2004; van der Wende, 2001). A core reality that distinguishes current discussion and action from that of the past is the sheer scale and scope of what internationalization encompasses in the present era: “the breath of clientele served, the outcomes intended, and a reshaping of institutional ethos” (Hudzik, 2011, p. 7).

Despite the inherent complexities to the institutional transformation entailed in the internationalization process, the results from 745 questionnaires that were completed by universities worldwide in the Global Survey of Internationalization (Egron-Polak, 2011) confirmed that many institutions have gone through a process of institutional transformation and consequently, internationalization was generally considered to be mainstreamed and rooted in institutional strategic plans. Internationalization was recognized in the same survey as no longer being a luxury but rather is understood to be an essential part of all university reforms (Egron-Polak, 2011), also referred to as “the mainstreaming of internationalization”
(De Wit, 2011). Internationalization is, undoubtedly, past the “new flavor of the month stage” and is “firmly embedded in institutional mission statements, policies, strategies, as well as national policy frameworks” (Knight, 2011, p.1). Taken together, the literature signaled that internationalization has come of age as an area of policy, practice, and research in the field of higher education (Knight, 2011).

As this literature review indicates, internationalization is a rapidly growing phenomenon that is progressively impacting all aspects of the higher education arena. A term that is increasingly being used to describe the permeating nature of internationalization is “comprehensive internationalization” (CI) (Hudzik, 2011). As internationalization grows, CI is a term and approach to internationalization that is growing in acceptance and use in higher education. CI is defined as “a commitment, confirmed through action, to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education” (Hudzik, 2011). CI is an approach to internationalization that crosses the silos of an institution, both horizontal and vertical, by shaping institutional ethos and values, and by touching the entire higher education enterprise. In the process, CI is to be embraced by institutional leadership, governance, faculty, students, and all academic service and support units. Particularly unique to comprehensive internationalization is that it not only impacts all of campus life internally, but the institution’s external frames of reference, partnerships, and relations as well. CI is a relatively new approach to internationalization but one that merited review in this study, as it served as an example of the deep level that internationalization can be integrated into the fabric of higher education intuitions.
Institutions worldwide are increasingly adopting CI as their institutional approach to internationalization (Henard, Diamond, & Roseveare, 2012). Finally, CI indicates that internationalization is a growing phenomenon at universities worldwide that is increasingly being approached in broad and pervasive terms.

**Globalization: Defining the Foundational Phenomenon**

A discussion dedicated to the internationalization of higher education necessitates a review of the globalization phenomenon that shapes it. Globalization, or “the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas…across borders” (Knight, 2003, p. 3), is growing as the world’s economies and cultures become increasingly interconnected. Higher education institutions are responding to globalization and to their subsequent role to prepare students to become global citizens in today’s diverse world through the process of internationalization. In this way, internationalization is affecting the world of education, and globalization is changing the world of internationalization (Knight, 2003).

**Definitions for Internationalization of Higher Education**

As internationalization has advanced in importance at the institutional level over the last 30 years, many scholars have developed noteworthy definitions for internationalization (Altbach, 2002; Knight, 1994, 2004; van der Wende, 1997). A critical analysis of the different meanings and definitions of internationalization put forth by scholars in the field of international higher education reflected an interesting distinction between them. Those definitions provided by U.S. scholars appear to place emphasis on more programmatic elements and “activities relevant to the American study abroad tradition” (de Wit, 2002, p.
whereas, non-U.S. scholars focused their definitions on internationalization as a *process*. This distinction reflected the broader shift in definitional terms from internationalization being regarded principally as a set of programs and activities in the 1980s to the phenomenon being understood as a *process* in the 1990s (Knight, 2004).

**Internationalization as an Institutional Level Process (Knight, 1994)**

In the mid-1990s, Knight (1994) introduced a definition that illustrates internationalization as a process at the institutional level (Knight, 1994, 2004). Knight’s (1994) definition highlighted internationalization as, “the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution” (p.7). Two concerns were expressed in the literature over Knight’s (1994) definition. The first concern was also a topic of increasing debate between researchers in the field of international higher education. Notably, Knight’s (1994) definition suggested that internationalization is an aim in itself and lacks a wider goal (van der Wende, 1997). Researchers increasingly posited that internationalization is not a goal in itself, but rather a means to an end, with the end goal ultimately being to upgrade the quality of education and research (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; de Wit, 2011; Qiang, 2003; van der Wende, 1997). The second concern was that Knight’s (1994) definition limited the focus to institutional strategies and polices and excluded the national policy level (van der Wende, 1997).

In response to these concerns, van der Wende (1997) suggested a broader definition, notably, “any systematic effort aimed at making higher education responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy and labour
markets” (p.18). Knight (2004) commended van der Wen’s (1997) definition for including the important national policy level viewpoint, but noted it was limited in that it does not include the institutional perspective.

**Internationalization at National, Sector, and Institutional Levels (Knight, 2004)**

Taking these concerns into account, Knight (2004) revised her definition, which was ideally suited for this research study: “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” (p. 11). Knight’s (2004) definition was fitting for the context of this research study, as it was generic enough to apply to many different countries, cultures, and educational systems yet it did not specify the rationales, benefits, outcomes, actors, activities, and stakeholders of internationalization, as they can vary enormously across nations and from institution to institution. The definition was also appropriate for use in a broad range of contexts and for comparative purposes across countries and regions of the world. As a result, Knight’s (2004) definition appropriately covered the most essential elements for the context and objectives of this research study.

**Internationalization in Practice**

Researchers in the field of international higher education have explored how the internationalization of higher education has manifested itself on university campuses. They generally classified the most significant components into two categories of academic activities and programs and organizational strategies (Aigner et al., 1992; Altbach, 2008;

**Academic Activities and Programs**

The literature noted that the most significant elements in the *academic activities and programs* category include integrating an international and intercultural context into curriculum; offering study abroad, international internships, and faculty and student exchange programs; recruiting international students; providing foreign language options; supporting community involvement and global awareness; and developing external partnerships (Aigner et al., 1992; Altbach, 2008; Audas, 1991; de Wit, 2002; Francis, 1993; Harari, 1989; Knight, 1994; Mestenhauser, 2002; Norfleet & Wilcox, 1992; Paige, 2005; Scott, 1992).

Researchers in the field of international higher education noted that, irrespective of contextual differences within and between countries, nearly all higher education institutions worldwide are engaged in international activities and are seeking to expand them. The same researchers asserted that engaging with the world is considered part of the very definition of quality in education and research, and that many enduring academic benefits of internationalization activities are widely recognized as fundamental (Aigner et al., 1992; Altbach, 2008; Audas, 1991; de Wit, 2002; Francis, 1993; Harari, 1989; IAU, 2012; Knight, 1994; Mestenhauser, 2002; Norfleet & Wilcox, 1992; Paige, 2005; Scott, 1992; Sutton & Rubin, 2004; Van de Berg & Paige, 2009). Noteworthy academic benefits that stem from internationalization include the preparation of students as national and global citizens and as productive members of the workforce and opportunities to study outside their home.
countries, particularly in programs that would not otherwise be available to them in their home countries. Faculty also benefit academically from internationalization, as they benefit from the expertise and perspectives of researchers collaborating from many parts of the world (IAU, 2012; Jaschik, 2012; Knight, 2007). Internationalization can provide faculty with enhanced opportunities to participate in international networks to conduct research on pressing issues at home and abroad, and in the process, decrease the risk of academic ‘inbreeding’ (IAU, 2012; Sutton & Rubin, 2004; Van de Berg & Paige, 2009). Finally, institutions can benefit academically from internationalization, through the improved quality of teaching, learning, and research that, as research noted, develops from internationalization (IAU, 2012; Sutton & Rubin, 2004; Van de Berg & Paige, 2009). Additionally, through the sharing of experiences across national borders with universities abroad, institutions can improve elements such as institutional policy-making, governance, student services, outreach, and quality assurance. Internationalization was also noted in the literature as an opportunity to enhance prestige, global competitiveness, and revenue (IAU, 2012; Sutton & Rubin, 2004; Van de Berg & Paige, 2009). Taken together, the literature highlighted the various ways students, faculty, and institutions can benefit from internationalization.

**Measuring the benefits of academic activities and programs.** While scant amounts of research studies focused on the benefits or impact of internationalization as a whole, scholars are increasingly analyzing demonstrative and measurable outcomes on specific internationalization activities. Study abroad, for instance, is increasingly being held accountable to produce measurable students learning outcomes. Studies have been
conducted that generally focus on the research question, do college students who study abroad achieve learning outcomes that are significantly better than those who do not study abroad? (Hadis, 2005; Pedersen, 2010; Sutton & Rubin, 2004; Van de Berg & Paige, 2009; Williams, 2005). Two recent comprehensive research studies conducted by Sutton and Rubin (2004) and Van de Berg and Paige (2009) evaluated study abroad programs not in terms of those institutional indicators most often cited as an indication of overall institutional quality within internationalization definitions (i.e., the number of students who studied abroad; the number of visiting international students on campus, and so forth). Rather, the research (Sutton & Rubin, 2004; Van de Berg & Paige, 2009) went beyond corollary data to determine direct measures of knowledge gained through study abroad. The results of Van de Berg and Paige’s (2009) and Sutton and Rubin’s (2004) research indicated that studying abroad did add value to a student’s academic achievements. Several dimensions of learning outcomes were determined to increase as a result of a students studying abroad (i.e., functional knowledge; knowledge of world geography; knowledge of cultural relativism; knowledge of global interdependence; and knowledge of oral proficiency in their target language) (Sutton & Rubin, 2004; Van de Berg & Paige, 2009). The positive results in support of the benefits of study abroad, in turn, provide support for the benefits of internationalization at higher education institutions (Salisbury, 2011).

As study abroad and other components of internationalization are increasingly asked to produce evidence of their value, studies such as those discussed by Sutton and Rubin (2004) and Van de Berg and Paige (2009) will likely increase. The same studies provided
insight into the importance of being vigilantly attentive to the actual data the studies are seeking (or claiming) to produce. For example, the outcomes measured in the two studies discussed above quantified personal attributes and attitudes that may be attainable by any number of cross-cultural life experiences, and therefore, differed from the more empirically-focused outcomes that can be gained through study abroad (notably, self-efficacy, world-mindedness, and the like). A key point and cautionary lesson to draw from these studies is that the application of learning outcomes assessments to study abroad requires questions to be asked that are specifically focused on how cognitive understandings and content knowledge from the curriculum have improved (Salisbury, 2011). In doing so, the benefits of study abroad may be more accurately demonstrated.

Organizational Strategies

In addition to academic activities and programs, the literature highlighted organizational strategies as another way internationalization has manifested on campus. Researchers in the field of international higher education (Aigner et al., 1992; Altbach, 2008; Audas, 1991; de Wit, 2002; Francis, 1993; Harari, 1989; Knight, 1994; Mestenhauser, 2002; Norfleet & Wilcox, 1992; Paige, 2005; Scott, 1992) listed as the most significant organizational strategies commitment and leadership from administration in support of internationalization (including mission statements, systematic review and long term, integrated, strategic planning, institutional commitment and ethos, and written policies, among others); faculty development and involvement; and support (including funding and resource allocation to sustain internationalization).
Organizational strategies to internationalization help to ensure an international dimension is institutionalized into the university fabric (Knight, 1997). Knight (1994, 1997) further stressed the importance of organizational strategies as “even if there are an increasing number of academic activities taking place, if they are not underpinned by a permanent organizational commitment and structure, they may die…” (Knight, 1994, p.5). Table 1 presents Knight’s (2004) examples of organizational strategies. The strategies have been grouped into four generic categories: governance, operations, support systems, and human resource development (Knight, 1997). Table 1 does not present a comprehensive list of organizational strategies, but serves as a list of suggestions. The strategies are, however, generic enough to merit serious consideration as to how appropriate they are to achieve an institution’s stated purpose and goals for internationalization.

Table 1.

*Institutional Level Organization Strategies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Level</th>
<th>Organization Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Governance          | Expressed commitment by senior leaders  
|                     | Active involvement of faculty and staff  
|                     | Articulated rationale and goals for internationalization  
|                     | Recognition of an international dimension in institutional mission statements, planning, and policy documents |
| Operations          | Integrated into institution-wide and department/college-level planning, budgeting and quality review systems  
|                     | Appropriate organizational structures  
<p>|                     | Systems (formal and informal) for communication, liaison, and coordination |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. (continued)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance between centralized and decentralized promotion and management of internationalization</strong></td>
<td>Adequate financial support and resource allocation systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td>Support from institution-wide service units, i.e., student housing, registrar, fund-raising, alumni, information technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement of academic support units, i.e., library, teaching and learning, curriculum development, faculty and staff training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student support services for incoming and outgoing students, i.e., orientation programs, counseling, cross-cultural training, visa advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resources</strong></td>
<td>Recruitment and selection procedures that recognize international expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reward and promotion policies to reinforce faculty and staff contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty and staff professional development activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support for international assignments and sabbaticals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Measuring the benefits of organizational strategies.** While research on the most successful strategies (or those that yield the most significant outcomes in terms of increasing educational quality) would be helpful, the lack of such research is likely due to each institution having its own organizational culture, context, resources, and governance/operating systems which affect the choice and success of the different strategies (Knight, 1997). Such a point serves to highlight the value of the current study and its importance in the literature. More specifically, a research study that is dedicated to describing individual institutional strategies to internationalization based on its own
organizational culture, context, resources, and governance/operating systems can provide insight into those approaches that were most appropriate and effective (Knight, 1997). Institutional leaders and internationalization scholars seeking to understanding more about topics such as why institutions chose certain strategies above others or how they are implemented would be well informed by referring to a qualitative study focused on such topics, which was a focus of the current study. This study extended the existing literature on decisions made at the institutional level on internationalization strategies. The research for this study also provided a depth of perspectives from those most directly involved in the internationalization process at Trinity: Trinity administrators, faculty, and staff. In the process, the research provided a rare insight into the various decisions included in implementing internationalization strategies and their implications. Knowledge gained from this study will be most useful for those at Trinity seeking to have such a depth of perspective, particularly in the early stages of the implementation of internationalization at Trinity. Higher education constituents outside of Trinity will also find this study helpful as they seek to learn more about strategies to employ at their own institutions.

Taken together, the elements included in academic activities and programs and organizational strategies help to identify and describe the most significant components included in the internationalization of higher education institutions. The current study provided an ideal context for examining the various internationalization activities and strategies employed at the institutional level at Trinity College Dublin. In doing so, this study can provide valuable insight for institutional leaders and those most directly involved
in the internationalization process at the institutional level. This section reviewed how the internationalization of higher education has manifested itself on university campuses. Also discussed were the ways in which academic programs and organizational strategies were measured. With this understanding, the following section will examine how scholars have attempted to measure internationalization as a whole, in more comprehensive terms.

**Measuring Internationalization in Comprehensive Terms**

Despite the relative improvement of its standing within higher education over the past two decades, internationalization remains subject to increasing scrutiny from many quarters. As the field matures and increasingly grows in prominence, it will progressively bear the responsibility to provide data, facts, and analyses that document the value of its endeavors to those both within and outside the international and higher education (Sutton & Rubin, 2004). Particularly in light of the ascendant trend in higher education accountability, questions are increasingly being asked by governing boards and higher education leaders for internationalization performance measurements to help inform their decisions, long-term strategic planning, and resource allocations.

**Quantitative Internationalization Indexes**

Because of these trends, a limited number of recent quantitative research studies that build on one other were conducted to measure the internationalization practices at higher education institutions. The studies specifically focused on the development of international indexes that measure and rank universities based on their internationalization practices, and in the process, determined key indicators for successful internationalization.
Afonso (1990) and Krane’s (1994) quantitative studies defined and measured internationalization by developing international development indexes, and in the process, determined indicators most highly correlated with successful internationalization (notably, foreign languages, study abroad, international studies, and foreign students). Research conducted by Petronis (2000) continued Afonso (1990) and Krane’s (1994) quantitative pursuits to determine elements most critical to successful internationalization. Petronis’ (2000) research focused specifically on the internationalization of business schools. Based on an extensive literature review (Afonso, 1991; Ellingboe, 1999; English, 1999; Krane, 1994; Leibold, 1994), Petronis (2000) delineated the ten most important elements for successful internationalization, including:

1) the number of foreign students as a percentage of institutional enrollment
2) the number of foreign languages offered in the institution
3) the number of foreign language requirements with the business component
4) the number of faculty fluent in one or more foreign languages
5) the number of international degree options available to business students
6) the number of specific international business courses offered
7) the number of international instructional methods utilized in non-international courses
8) the number of student foreign study experiences available within the last year
9) the number of faculty foreign exchange experiences within the last year
10) the number of international development opportunities available to faculty.
The 10 elements were then analyzed by frequency analyses and helped to create an Internationalization of Business Component Index (IBCI) for each institution. The IBCI can be a useful tool for business schools seeking to assess their internationalization process through quantitative measures.

Similar to the quantitative research studies reviewed above, factors such as the number of students participating in study abroad programs and the number of foreign students studying on campus have often been noted as indicators of successful internationalization and overall institutional quality. On their university websites and promotional brochures, higher education institutions worldwide often list the number of study abroad programs offered and the large percentage of their students who study abroad as an indication of institutional excellence. Although the numerical indicators can be useful factors in looking at the productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness of education, they miss the ultimate goal of internationalization; notably, to help graduates to live and work in a global community. While increasing participation in study abroad continues to be a laudable educational goal, simply knowing how many students studied abroad is arguably not equivalent to understanding credible learning outcomes such as knowledge students attain (or failed to attain) as a result of their study abroad experience (Sutton & Rubin, 2004), nor does the number necessarily indicate successful internationalization.

**Advocacy for Process-based Evaluation**

Scant amounts of research existed that focus on the internationalization phenomenon that moves beyond measuring the capacity for a given internationalization activity as an
indicator of success (i.e., the number of students who enroll and complete internationalization programs). As noted in the quantitative studies highlighted above, internationalization research often focused on indicators for successful internationalization that consider the phenomenon as the goal in itself, rather than as means to an end, with the ultimate goal being to upgrade the quality of education and research (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; de Wit, 2011; Qiang, 2003; van der Wende, 1997). This is arguably why researchers in the field increasingly argue for a return to understanding and viewing internationalization in its pure and real meaning - not as the goal, but rather, as part of the process that helps to achieve the goal (de Wit, 2011; IAU, 2012). Pure and real internationalization efforts are recognized in the literature as not being preoccupied with evidentiary-based data such as increasing the number of international students on campus and the number of students studying abroad and similar topics (Altbach, 2008; Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; Hudzik, 2011; Knight, 2004, 2008, 2009). Rather, pure and real internationalization efforts focus on the core role of universities: to help prepare students to live and work in a global community. In demonstrating numbers and hard data, quantitative studies often missed the immeasurable components and descriptions of how the internationalization process unfolds and contributes to helping students prepare to live and work in a global community.

The limitations highlighted in measuring internationalization through quantitative means provided a useful counterpoint to the current qualitative study that provided a rich, thick description of the internationalization process. More specifically, a qualitative lens provided insight and description to highlight those aspects of internationalization that often
cannot be measured in quantitative terms. The current qualitative study provided insight into understanding internationalization from a more holistic and comprehensive perceptive. In the process, details that would otherwise be lost in quantitative studies (factors such as why and how institutions internationalize and faculty attitudes and beliefs towards internationalization) can be accounted for in a descriptive and holistic process that takes into account how and why such developments occur. While the field of internationalization is moving forward to confront the challenges of a data-driven, evidentiary-based articulation of what is gained from the process, limitations clearly exist that provide a cautionary tale of not limiting the measurement of internationalization to purely quantitative methods.

This section was helpful in understanding the various ways the literature approached the measurement of internationalization, and in the process, determined the most influential elements that lead to successful internationalization, such as study abroad, foreign language, international students, and internationalized curriculum. Also discussed were the limitations in attempting to measure internationalization through purely quantitative methods. Rather, internationalization was determined to be better understood through the rich, thick description and depth provided with a qualitative research approach, which is what the current research study provided in its focus on the process of internationalization.

**Research Gap and Empirical Challenges**

Beyond student-focused research, such as the examples above from the study abroad field, there was a significant lack of internationalization research studies focused on hard evidence that demonstrated the benefits of internationalization. Indeed, there were dubious
observers who questioned whether internationalization could be measured purely through qualitative means (Green, 2012). Measuring education and its most prized learning outcomes (such as advanced critical thinking, oral communication, and written expression) tended to be the most difficult to measure empirically. Consequently, internationalization, a phenomenon intended to enhance the quality of education and research, is also difficult to measure empirically. Research that seeks to enhance the understanding of processes such internationalization or that seeks to demonstrate meaningful qualitative improvements developments from the phenomenon were arguably best addressed through qualitative processes.

The limitations of previous quantitative research studies can serve to highlight the value of the current study. More specifically, through an in-depth, qualitative, comprehensive review of the process of internationalization at an individual higher education institution, the current study extended the literature on the various activities included in the phenomenon. By describing those activities included in Trinity’s internationalization process and their role (and potential benefit to Trinity) the current research enhanced the literature on internationalization activities in a way that quantifiable numbers would otherwise not be able to demonstrate. The current study was not limited to those processes or outcomes that can be quantified, or to rigidly defined variables. Rather, the current study asked and explored value-laden questions that get at the heart of the internationalization process and examined complex questions that can be impossible to address through quantitative methods.
This section focused on how the internationalization of higher education has manifested itself on university campuses through academic activities and programs. Also reviewed were the beneficial outcomes of internationalization activities and a discussion on research attempts to assess those benefits. The following section will focus on how the internationalization of higher education has manifested itself on university campuses through organizational strategies.

**Motivations to Internationalize**

Included in the variety of ways used to describe and define internationalization were the rationales that motivate higher education institutions to integrate an international dimension into their teaching, research, and service (Knight, 1999). This section will examine what motivates higher education institutions to internationalize by exploring answers to the simple question: “Why internationalize?” The categorization of rationales into four groups (political, economic, social/cultural, and academic) was the most common classification of rationales found in the literature (Callan, 2000; Childress, 2010; de Wit, 1995, 2002; Knight & de Wit, 1997, 1999; Knight, 1999, 2004; Ollikainen, 1996, 1998; van der Wende, 1996, 1998) and was a useful framework for understanding institutional motivations for internationalization. The motivations driving institutions to internationalize were not mutually exclusive, but rather, the four rationales were interrelated (de Wit, 2002; Knight, 2004, 1999) and shifted in emphasis over time (Knight, 1999).
**Political Rationale**

Twentieth century events such as World Wars I and II increased individual interest and national importance in acquiring knowledge of other cultures, languages, and systems (Hayward, 2000). These significant world events and newfound interests became instrumental motivators for political and higher education leaders alike to pursue internationalization efforts in tertiary education. As a result, a new link between education and foreign policy formed, with education increasingly being seen as an influential dimension of foreign policy. Education became an avenue for both improving the image of a country and for casting a country’s policies in a favorable light (Alladin, 1992; Knight & de Wit, 1995).

The political motivation to internationalize was also exemplified through educational cooperation in the form of diplomatic investment in future political relations. The literature pointed to many countries who, as a form of diplomacy, allocated scholarships to international students on track to becoming future world leaders in their respective countries. The knowledge these students attained of the host country and the sympathy they likely acquired while abroad for the host country’s political system, culture, values, and people (de Wit, 2002, p.85) were anticipated to form important long-term political ties between the student and the host country.

Internationalization was also promoted for ideological reasons, principally as a means for peace and mutual understanding. Examples of this peace-driven rationale were in abundance, particularly in literature emanated from American studies, documents, and
political statements (de Wit, 2002; Harari, 1989; IAUP, 1995; Kallen, 1991; Knight, 1999, 2004; UNESCO, 1998). Indeed, the optimistic view of international education as a peacemaking force that leads to mutual understanding between nations has been dominant in United States politics and higher education for more than 50 years (de Wit, 2002).

Although the political rationale continues to be a large consideration in the United States and in increasingly diverse parts of the world, many scholars in the international education field argued that the political motivation to internationalize higher education does not hold the importance it once did (de Wit, 1999, 2002; Knight, 1999, 2004; Knight & de Wit, 1995). Rather, they argued that after the Cold War, an emphasis change from a political to an economic rationale became the dominant motivating force to internationalize higher education (de Wit, 1999, 2002; Knight, 1999, 2004; Knight & de Wit, 1995).

Conversely, other researchers contended that, while many individuals and institutions turned inward after the Cold War (Alliance for International Educational Cultural Exchange & NAFSA: Association for International Educators, 2006), the September 11, 2001 attack on the United States underscored the continuing political importance of international education. In response to September 11, the internationalization of higher education was noted to have gained prominence. September 11 has been referred to as a wake-up call, with students becoming aware of the need for understanding world cultures and acquiring skills that are necessary to address national security and foreign policy needs (Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange & NAFSA: Association of International Educators, 2006;
Both arguments are credible. While the political rationale to internationalize is certainly prominent, there is no denying the increased attention and importance placed on the economic incentive to internationalize higher education institutions. The literature predominately pointed in the direction of economic rationale having a greater implication.

**Economic Rationale**

There is a growing trend to view education in terms of an export commodity rather than a politically advantageous and benevolent endeavor (O’Carroll, 2012). A series of coinciding events marked a discernible shift from the political to the economic rationale becoming increasingly important and relevant (Childress, 2010; de Wit, 1999, 2002; Knight, 1999, 2004; Knight & de Wit, 1995). With the end of the Cold War, the advent of globalization, a growing interdependence between nations, and the information revolution, countries have become heavily focused on their economic, scientific, and technological competitiveness (Childress, 2010; de Wit, 1999, 2002; Knight, 1999, 2004; Knight & de Wit, 1995). The internationalization of the higher education sector was viewed as the main vehicle for becoming (and remaining) competitive in the newly globalized world. Indeed, the literature was replete with studies that highlighted internationalization as a critical component to preparing new graduates to function in an international work environment and to contribute to national economic development and competitiveness in the process (Childress, 2010). The reframing of internationalization rationales from Cold War foreign
policy to a globally competitive knowledge economy is clear (Groennings, 1997): “Today, the dominant argument for internationalizing higher education is that it will ensure the nation’s economic competitiveness” (Johnston & Edelstein, 1993).

From an institutional level, the economic motivation to internationalize is becoming more prevalent as well. Deep cuts in higher education budgets worldwide have forced institutions to be innovative in their efforts to find alternative funding sources. International activities such as the recruitment of foreign students, the establishment of branch campuses abroad, and the growth of online courses were initiated by many institutions worldwide to generate income (Altbach, 2008; Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; de Wit, 2011; Hudzik, 2011; Knight, 2011). Of particular monetary interest to institutional leaders were foreign students, who pay full-fee costs for their education abroad and generally do not receive financial support from colleges or universities (IIE, 2005, 2006). Many institutions indicated that the primary component of their internationalization strategy was the recruitment of international students (Hayward, 2001). The new market approach to everyday functioning has many institutions following the simple logic: “the more foreign students there are paying high tuition fees, the higher the economic return” (de Wit, 2002, p.91). Consequently, numerous institutions worldwide have adopted a full-fee policy (i.e., requiring students from outside the country pay a tuition fee equivalent to the ‘real cost’ of their education) (de Wit, 2002, p.91).

The “big business” (Pratt & Poole, 1998) of foreign student recruitment has become a highly competitive and lucrative enterprise worldwide, with foreign students contributing, for example, more than $22.81 billion to the U.S. economy in 2011-2012 (Education in Ireland,
2012), $16.3 billion to the Australian economy, and 1 billion euros to the Irish economy in 2011-2012 (Education in Ireland, 2012). While the full-fee policy was resisted at first by some institutions and national governments, in a climate of increasingly severe restraints on public expenditure for higher education, the profitable income source of student recruitment has become a financial lifeline for many institutions worldwide (Callan, 1993).

In addition to money collected from international students, evident in the last 20 or more years is the dramatic movement of internationalization rationales toward income production for other reasons. The incentive to internationalize in order to prepare students to work in an increasingly global workforce and to contribute to national economic development continues to grow. Likewise, university entrepreneurialism (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997) is more dominant because of increased pressure to secure alternative forms of income in the face of heavily reduced higher education budgets. In summary, the economic incentive to internationalize is strong and growing at the national and institutional level.

**Socio-cultural Rationale**

While the economic rationale to internationalize higher education is growing in strength, the cultural and social rationale appears to be of diminished importance and is taking on a different orientation than in the past (Childress, 2009; de Wit, 1999; Knight, 1999, 2004). Among the more traditional social/cultural motivating forces was the development of student and faculty knowledge and skill bases in intercultural relations and communications which, ultimately, affected their ability to live in an increasingly
multicultural environment (Childress, 2010; de Wit, 2002; Goodwin & Nacht, 1988; Green, 2003; Knight, 1999; Merkx, 2003).

While the traditional socio-cultural forces persist, more recent motivating forces stemmed from a different source. Specifically, recent socio-cultural forces stemmed from the perceived homogenizing effect of globalization that is the result of the intermingling of cultural norms, practices, and values. Because of this homogenizing effect, nations are increasingly cognizant of the subsequent loss of their national and cultural identity (Childress, 2010). Consequently, the preservation and promotion of national culture are becoming a strong motivation for countries, with internationalization increasingly being considered as a way to respect cultural diversity. Hence, the acknowledgement of cultural and ethnic diversity within and between countries is considered a powerful rationale for the internalization of a nation’s education system (Knight, 1999).

As a final note, the relative lack of focus on cultural and social rationales in the literature could, arguably, be attributed to their intangible benefits, as the attainment of intercultural competence is difficult to measure (Childress, 2010; Deardorff, 2006). What is clear is that many institutions continue to emphasize social and cultural rationales as reasons to internationalize, as the enhancement of students’ and faculty’s cross-cultural knowledge and skills are fundamental to internationalization efforts (Childress, 2010).

**Academic Rationale**

The internationalization of education is often noted in the literature as an inevitable phenomenon given that the advancement and dissemination of knowledge is a global
enterprise that has no borders (Altbach, 2008; de Wit, 2002). Internationalization is an intrinsic component of the academic mission of universities. Universities are, by their very nature international (de Wit, 2002) by way of their mission and name, with the concept “universe” embedded in the concept university (Knight, 1999). Although the internationalization of education is regarded as inevitable by nature, what is still important is a thoughtful review of how and why higher education institutions are placing importance on integrating an international dimension to the teaching, learning, research, and service mandates of the university (de Wit, 2002).

Scholars in the field of international education repeatedly highlighted the academic importance of the internationalization of higher education by noting that the process seeks to strengthen liberal education, avoid parochialism in scholarship and research, stimulate critical thinking, and enhance the quality of teaching and research (Childress, 2010; de Wit, 2002; Green, 2003; Knight, 1999; Lim, 2003; Reichard, 1983). In order to provide opportunities for students to develop such skills, institutional leaders have called for the internationalization of the curriculum (Bremer & van der Wende, 1995; Childress, 2010; de Wit, 2002; Engberg & Green, 2002; Green & Shoenberg, 2006; Harari, 1989, 1992; Knight, 2011; Robson, 2011), the presence and participation of international students on university campuses (de Wit, 2002, 2010; Green & Kock, 2010; Knight, 2011; Robson, 2011), and increased financial and institutional support for study abroad programs (Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, 2005).
What has been rigorously debated in the literature is whether the academic goals for the internationalization of higher education have been lost. Internationalization of higher education is argued to have become an end in itself, rather than a means to end (with the end being the improvement of the quality of education) (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; Hudzik, 2011; Knight, 1999). Researchers in the field argued for a return to understanding and viewing internationalization in its pure and real meaning - not as the goal, but, rather, as part of the process that helps to achieve the goal. More specifically, pure and real internationalization efforts were not motivated by internationalization activities (i.e., preoccupation with increasing the number of international students on campus and students studying abroad; the development of transnational education; the founding of branch campuses, etc.) (Altbach, 2008; Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; de Wit, 2011; Hudzik, 2011; Knight, 2011). Pure and real internationalization efforts focused on the core role of universities: to help prepare students to live and work in a global community. Ultimately, many observers contended that by making the commitment to prepare students to be global citizens, universities would ensure they achieve what is most meaningful and important in their internationalization efforts (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011).

In summary, the four groups of rationales were dissimilar enough to review them separately and to merit individual categories, but they were not distinct or entirely exclusive at the same time. An institution’s rationales to internationalize are comprised of a complex and multifaceted set of reasons that change over time and in response to evolving needs and trends. This thorough review of the four categories demonstrated the sheer breadth and
complexity that is involved when institutions seek to articulate their most important reasons for internationalizing their institutions (Knight, 1999). Which rationales higher education leaders decide to follow will depend on the respective institution’s history, resources, and the stakeholder’s influences (Knight, 1994).

As with any developing educational phenomenon, internationalization is faced with barriers to its process and brings with it important benefits, as well as risks. The following sections will extend the discussion on the current context of internationalization by focusing its most prominent barriers and the risks involved in the process.

**Barriers and Risks of Internationalization**

While internationalization was noted in the literature as a prevalent goal of contemporary higher education institutions, significant barriers to its institutionalization continue to exist (Childress, 2009). A lack of resources was a commonly cited barrier to internationalization, with the structure of the university itself also noted as a common barrier for institutions pursuing internationalization. More specifically, as internationalization is a process of institutional transformation, a paradigm shift is required to alter institutional stakeholders’ assumptions, values, and practices from that of an inward focus to a broader international focus (Knight, 1994; Schoorman, 1999). As such, a significant obstacle to the internationalization process is the “normal structure of the university itself, which neither lends itself to sweeping reform nor centralized coordination” (Aigner, Nelson, & Stimpfl, 1992, p.9). Internationalization, as a process of institutional transformation, requires leaders not only access and communicate with all levels up and down the institutional hierarchy, but
also across the vertical silos in which many units are located (Mestenhauser & Ellingboe, 2005). Consequently, the inherent complexities embedded in the institutional transformation process serve as a substantial barrier to internationalization (Childress, 2009, p.291).

The current study was a qualitative research study focused on gaining insight from individuals directly involved in the internationalization process at the institutional level. Administrators, academics, and staff from up and down the institutional hierarchy were interviewed to better understand their assumptions and perceptions of the internationalization phenomenon at Trinity. In the process, insight was gained on how a paradigm shift and focus on internationalization was unfolding at the institution. Such knowledge was a valuable addition to the literature as a scholarly contribution that provided greater understanding on a common barrier to internationalization.

In addition to barriers to internationalization, risks are involved in the process. The results of the 2005 International Association of Universities (IAU) survey indicated that while 96% of responding institutions said internationalization brought important benefits to higher education, 70% believed there were substantial risks associated with the international dimension of higher education (Knight, 2007). As the internationalization phenomenon evolves and grows in importance, a number of adverse consequences of the process have begun to appear and were widely acknowledged in the literature (Altbach, 2008; Altbach & Welch, 2011; Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; de Wit, 2011; Egron-Polak, 2011; IAU, 2012; Knight, 2008, 2009, 2011; Scott, 2010). These consequences posed particular risks for some institutions.
Various trends that were frequently noted in the literature signaled a level of risk for the field of internationalization. For example, the mobility patterns of the more than four million tertiary students enrolled outside their country of citizenship in 2012 flowed largely in one, consistent direction, notably from developing and emerging economies to the wealthier nations, especially to English-speaking countries (Altbach, 2012). Large numbers of international students were increasingly choosing not to return home after completing their studies abroad (Altbach, 2012; IAU, 2012). Recent research confirmed growth in the ‘brain drain,’ or the emigration of highly trained and intelligent people leaving the developing world (Altbach, 2012; IAU, 2012). Much has been written about the brain drain undermining the capacity of developing countries and their institutions to retain the talent needed for their prosperity, cultural advancement, and social well-being (IAU, 2012).

Research also noted recent growth in ‘brain drain’ and attributed that growth to a number of factors, key among them the fact that salaries and facilities in developed countries continue to outpace the home country, and developed countries were keen to maintain their global advantage by having the world’s best and brightest stay to work upon graduation (Altbach, 2012).

Additionally, the increasingly proposed viewpoint that the internationalization phenomenon is “the white knight of higher education” (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011, p. 2) poses a risk. More specifically, the assumption has gradually grown over the years that the more international an institution - in terms of students, faculty, curriculum, research, agreements, and network memberships - the better its reputation (Knight, 2011). This belief
is tied to the false notion that an institution with “a strong international reputation is a proxy for quality” (Knight, 2011). Knight (2007, 2008, 2011) and others in the research community (Altbach, 2008; Altbach & Welch, 2011; Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011) regarded these arguments as faulty “myths” (Knight, 2011) and pointed to such “cases of questionable admission and exit standards for universities highly dependent on the revenue and ‘brand equity’ of international students as concrete evidence that internationalization does not always translate into improved quality or high standards” (Knight, 2011). At the heart of these arguments (or ‘myths’) lies a significant problem: as internationalization gains moral weight, observers, conversely, become less focused on questioning or monitoring internationalization’s effectiveness and essential nature (which, ultimately, is to improve the quality of education and research) (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011). Hence, a significant risk lies in potentially unregulated internationalization processes that could lead to destructive international pursuits at higher education institutions.

Furthermore, institutions’ fixation on increasing the number of international students is often based on the belief that “more foreign students on campus will produce more internationalized institutional culture and curriculum” (Knight, 2011, p. 2). However, the reality of international students’ experience paints a very different picture. Research noted that in many institutions, “international students feel marginalized socially and academically” and “tend to band together…without having deep engagement with the host country culture” (Knight, 2011, p. 2). Institutions often claim the primary reason they recruit international students is to help internationalize their campus. This unquestioned claim puts international
students at risk of feeling isolated and having to face increased “tensions” (Knight, 2011) while studying outside their home country. While programs and support systems to address the needs of international students can be found, they are often lacking in support and resources (Andrade & Evans, 2009).

In addition, the growth of transnational programs and the establishment of branch campuses raise a number of unanswered questions. Most pressing among those questions is how branch campuses enhance the educational capacity of the host nations and how they are able to provide an education that is promised to be comparable to that delivered by the sponsoring institution in its home country. Branch campuses are predominately established by Western industrialized nations and located in developing countries (Altbach, 2008). A foreign educational presence that is perceived to be prestigious has the potential to disadvantage local higher education institutions in their efforts to respond to national needs (IAU, 2012). Additionally, host nations can have trouble in maintaining oversight of the branch campuses and in regulating the presence, activity, and quality of foreign programs (IAU, 2012).

Given these challenges, leading researchers in the field of international education have increasingly called for the international higher education community “to rethink and redefine the way we look at the internationalization of higher education in the present time” (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011, p.5). Indeed, the overriding consensus in the literature was to become more attentive, reflective, balanced, and transparent (Altbach, 2008; Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011, Knight, 2008, 2009, 2011) in order to build a healthy international higher
education environment. For her part, Knight (2004) called for greater reflection and clarity in the articulation of the values guiding internationalization, as values are noted to give shape and meaning to the rationales and expected outcomes that underpin institutions’ and nations’ drive to internationalize. Robson (2011) and Altbach (2008) reiterated Knight’s (2004) call for reflection and added to the list the need for an inclusive environment with transparent policies and practices.

The literature noted that forward-thinking universities have begun to address the need for a more reflective, iterative, and balanced approach to internationalization. Through constructive dialogue with their university community, institutions can determine the scope, scale, and content of their internationalization agenda (Altbach, 2008; Knight, 2004; Robson, 2011). Altbach (2008) emphasized the timely nature of becoming a more reflective international education arena, noting: “Now is the time to look at what actions are sustainable and what are not, what policy will serve the interests of students and the academic community, and what actions constitute mistaken policy or simply greed” (p.1). The literature also stressed the need for monitoring and evaluating internationalization initiatives and the necessity to determine appropriate measures to track the progress and quality of the different elements and strategies of internationalization (Knight, 2001).

In summary, the literature signaled that as internationalization grows in size and prominence within higher education, now is the time to question and monitor its processes (Altbach, 2008). Knight (2009) encouraged the international higher education community to remain vigilant to potentially negative and unexpected consequences, because the twists and
turns along the road to internationalization can lead to unanticipated spin-offs and dire implications. The current study addressed this call to monitor the process of internationalization, as it provided a qualitative examination of the process at the institutional level. In the process, actions that are or are not sustainable and those that may not be aimed at the essential nature of higher education (notably, to improve the quality of education and research) can be discussed. Learning more about the internationalization process in this study will help to ensure internationalization pitfalls are avoided and best practices are pursued. Having discussed the adverse consequences of internationalization and various suggestions on how to address them, the following section will explore theoretical models of internationalization.

**Theoretical Models of Internationalization**

Although the field of international higher education research is relatively young, several noteworthy attempts have been made to create models of organizational strategies that represent the internationalization process, including Neave (1992), Rudzki (1998), Davies (1995), van Dijk and Meijer (1997), Knight (1994), and Rumbley (2007). The approaches to the theoretical modeling of Neave (1992), Rudzki (1998), Davies (1995), and van Dijk and Meijer (1997) presented descriptive and prescriptive methodological and analytical tools to assess and promote the institutionalization of internationalization (de Wit, 2002). Together, the four models offered a means for examining an institution’s formal commitments to internationalization and offered a way to include in their theoretical approaches the important fact that institutional strategies may be implicit or explicit (de Wit,
In contrast to the linear nature of the four described models, an alternative approach to the development of an organizational model is to consider the internationalization process as a continuous cycle. This approach is not focused on the institutional organization as such, but on the process of the internationalization strategy as a whole (de Wit, 2002). The formative Internationalization Cycle (see Appendix A), developed by Jane Knight (1994), attempted “to identify the steps or phases in the process of integrating an international dimension into the university/college culture and systems” (Knight & de Wit, 1995, p.25). Knight’s (1994) cycle had six phases: (a) awareness, (b) commitment, (c) planning, (d) operationalize, (e) review, and (f) reinforcement that an institution moves through at its own pace. While a progressive sequence is clear to the six phases, a two-way flow can occur between the different steps (de Wit, 2002).

Knight’s (1994) model was a seminal framework in the field of international higher education and has been particularly serviceable to academics in their research on internationalization at the institutional level. In particular, Knight’s model served as the conceptual framework for Lisa Childress’ (2009) research study *Internationalization Plans for Higher Education Institutions*. Childress (2009) and the American Council on Education’s Center for International Initiatives analyzed the types, prevalence, development, implementation, and monitoring of internationalization plans at 31 institutions worldwide. In the process, Knight’s (1994) framework presented a useful lens to understand why
institutions develop, implement, and monitor internationalization plans and how they transition from the planning to the operationalization phases (Childress, 2009).

At the same time, during the application process of Knight’s (1994) model, Childress (2009) realized the Internationalization Cycle (1994) was limited, as it presumes institutions proceed through the six phases *in sequence*. Childress (2009) asserted that rather than proceed in sequence, it was plausible that some institutions may not follow the exact same path. For example, some institutions may start at the review phase to gain insight of their resources and how they contribute to internationalization, and because of that review, decide to develop an internationalization plan. Thus, Childress (2009) highlighted that institutions may not necessarily progress sequentially through the internationalization phases as initially indicated by Knight’s (2009) model.

While Knight’s (1994) model has been instrumental in the field of international higher education for the clear and process-orientated conceptual framework it provided, most significant to the current discussion was a second model that considered the internationalization process as a continuous cycle and depicted an enhanced framework for understanding and analyzing internationalization at a case study institution: Rumbley’s (2007) Delta Cycle for Internationalization. The Delta Cycle represented a revised and expanded graphic representation of Knight’s (1994) Delta Cycle and attempted to fill in the gaps that Rumbley (2010) pointed out are missing from it.

Rumbley (2010) applied Knight’s (1994) model to four Spanish universities’ experience with internationalization. In doing so, Rumbley (2010) learned that while
Knight’s model was applicable to the Spanish context in many ways, vital aspects were missing in representing the internationalization of Spanish universities. Rumbley’s (2010) revised and expanded graphic representation is highlighted in Appendix B. Rumbley’s (2010) model used Knight’s (1994) six phases ((a) awareness, (b) commitment, (c) planning, (d) operationalize, (e) review, and (f) reinforcement) to highlight the steps an institution moves through. Rumbley (2010) determined that the six phases were applicable to the four Spanish case study institutions’ experience with internationalization and incorporated the cycle into her model. Phase one began with institutional awareness of the need for internationalization by engaging campus communities in discussions regarding the “need, purpose, strategies, controversial issues, resource implications, and benefits of internationalization” (Knight & de Wit, 1995, p. 26). This phase was normally followed by an institutional commitment by senior administration, board of governors, students, faculty, and staff. The planning stage involved “developing a comprehensive plan or strategy for the internationalization of a university” (Knight & de Wit, 1995, p. 27). The implementation stage was followed by a review stage whereby institutions assessed and continually enhanced the quality and impact of the different aspects of the internationalization process. Finally, Knight (1994) recognized that in order for commitment to be sustained, it was important to build in incentives and rewards in the reinforcement stage. Reinforcement and rewards then led back to renewed awareness and commitment.

Rumbley’s (2010) model challenged Knight’s (1994) model to move beyond discrete categories of interest and to dig deeper to explore the motivators that highlight why
universities internationalize; how and in what ways universities choose to act on these interests; the end results of these efforts; and their impact on the institution and its international interests. Furthermore, four key contextual/environmental factors - opportunities, imperatives, obstacles, and resources - were determined by Rumbley (2007) as pivotal factors in shaping Spanish institutions’ international engagements, and were found to have a significant impact on the study and practice of university internationalization (Rumbley, 2010).

Additionally, Rumbley (2007) concluded the concept of change was the critical component behind all of the other components of internationalization. To elaborate further on this important concept of change, the Delta Cycle emphasized the need for relevant institutional decision makers to remain cognizant of both the changeable nature of the external environment and the ways in which the internationalization phenomenon has already, or may in the future, transform the institution itself (Rumbley, 2010). Rumbley’s (2007) revised graphic representation (see Appendix B) of Knight’s (1994) model depicted a clearer and more comprehensive illustration of the key phases of the internationalization process, particularly given that the important elements missing in Knight’s (1994) original model (notably, contextual factors and acknowledgement of the rationales, strategies, and outcomes behind internationalization) were incorporated into Rumbley’s (2007) model.

To date, no other research study has applied Rumbley’s (2010) model to a context outside of Spain. This highly refined and easy-to-follow theoretical framework could be a highly serviceable and seminal work in the field of international higher education, should its
applicability be demonstrated outside of the Spanish context. The application of Rumbley’s (2010) conceptual model to an Irish case study institution will fill a considerable gap in the literature given the lack of research on the topic and the void in knowledge on the applicability of such a distinguished but under-analyzed framework. Additionally, the cyclical/process-oriented model originated in Knight’s (1994) model and then adapted into Rumbley’s (2010) model was the most appropriate for the context of this research study. The internationalization phenomenon in Irish institutions has developed gradually, in phases that progressed sometimes in succession and sometimes in a two-way motion, depending on various influencing factors. As such, Rumbley’s (2010) process-oriented model was the most ideal for examining an Irish institution’s experience with internationalization.

Furthermore, as will be reviewed in more detail in forthcoming sections of this study, the Irish state generally and the Irish higher education system more specifically have undergone considerable changes in the last 20 years, with influencing environmental factors playing a large role in that change. Given that the concept of both change and environmental factors are considered in Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle, the proposed analysis was ripe and ready for consideration.

Before an examination of current developments in Irish higher education can take place, a discussion of a broader dimension will be had. In order to paint the most comprehensive portrait for understanding the context of this study, a review of the origins of European integration and the subsequent harmonization of European higher education will be reviewed.
The European Higher Education Context

A brief historical review of the evolution of European integration is necessary, because to understand the contemporary European setting, it is essential to place current developments in a historical perspective (de Wit, 2002). This historical review picks up in the aftermath of two destructive world wars when European leaders decided in the late 1940’s that in order to secure peace, Europe’s victorious and vanquished nations must be brought together as equals by cooperating politically and economically within shared organizations. Thus began the process of European integration, with member states negotiating the 1991 Treaty on European Union (also referred to as the Treaty of Maastricht), which established forms of cooperation between European governments in the fields of foreign and defense policy, in judicial and internal affairs, and in the European monetary union (Jezierska, 2009). The Treaty of Maastricht also officially marked the official beginning of the European Union (EU). By 2007, the total European Union membership had grown to include 27 European countries, with eastern, central, and western parts of Europe all represented (Fontaine, 2010).

In the process of European regional integration, creating a European higher education community emerged as a key development. Beyond a minor mention of vocational training (de Wit, 2002), little attention was paid to education in the first formalized step towards European cooperation set forth by the 1957 Treaty of Paris (de Wit, 2002; Fontaine, 2010). Not until the 1980s did educational cooperation in Europe take full flight. The 1980s saw Europe move to the active recruitment of fee-paying foreign students (de Wit, 2002, p.48);
European research and development policies were officially established (Kehm & Teichler, 2007); study abroad became recognized as an integrated part of a student’s degree, with the establishment of study abroad mobility schemes (i.e., the 1987 ERASMUS program); and the European Union officially opened up academic cooperation and exchange with the rest of the world (Kallen & Neave, 1991; Teichler, 1999).

The literature was clear to highlight that educational cooperation between EU members continued to be recognized through the 1990s with the signing of the 1992 Maastricht Treaty (de Rudder, 2000; de Wit, 2002), when education officially became an area for which the European Union could take action (van der Wende, 2000). Additional moves toward educational cooperation were made through initiatives of a voluntary but highly formal and popular nature, most notably the Sorbonne Declaration of 1998 and the Bologna Declaration of 1999.

The 1998 Sorbonne Declaration aimed to create a common frame of reference within Europe whereby mobility would be promoted for students and teaching staff. The Declaration brought attention to the “outdated and harmful” (Benelux Bologna Secretariat, 1998) European higher education area segmentation of the European higher education sector. One year after the signing of the Sorbonne Declaration, 30 European countries gathered in Bologna, Italy to engage in a voluntary process to create the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) by signing a stated intent of agreement named the Bologna Declaration (The Bologna Declaration, 1999). Participating members were called upon to implement the
following six main objectives, outlined in the 1999 Bologna Declaration (Bologna Declaration, 1999):

- Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees;
- Adoption of a system essentially based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate;
- Establishment of a system of credits – such as the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS);
- Promotion of mobility by overcoming obstacles to the effective exercise of free movement;
- Promotion of European co-operation in quality assurance; and,
- Promotion of the necessary European dimension in higher education.

The Bologna Process has been revolutionary for cooperation in European higher education, as it has grown considerably to include 46 European nations (Gaston, 2010). From its inception, the aim of this joint declaration was to harmonize the European higher education system (The Bologna Declaration, 1999). Further objectives highlighted as particularly important aimed to strengthen the competitiveness and attractiveness of European higher education (de Wit, 2002; Gaston, 2010; van der Wende, 2000) and to establish quality assurance standards to ensure the highest quality of the postsecondary degrees were awarded in European universities (de Wit, 2002; Gaston, 2010).

“Bologna has attracted many admirers” (Gaston, 2010, p. xxi) based on the profound transformation it has had on the consolidation and enrichment of European higher education
and the achievements it has made in meeting its many intended objectives. Concerns exist, however, with reports of some nations implementing some priorities while ignoring others and with opponents claiming the Bologna Process ultimately represented commercialization and the restructuring of public education for economic interests (Gaston, 2010).

Although not without its faults, the Bologna Process is distinguished as an “epochal effort to harmonize dozens of very disparate university systems” (Gaston, 2010, p. xii) and a monumental move towards ensuring the highest quality degrees are awarded by participating European institutions. The Bologna Process was also widely recognized as a key component of “Europeanization,” or the consolidation and enrichment of European citizenship. Furthermore, the Bologna Process gained universally recognized support and a worldwide degree of attraction (de Wit, 2002) which, in turn, has elevated European higher education to a prominent level. To this end, the Bologna Process achieved the main objectives set forth at the signing of the original Declaration.

The consolidation of European countries and the subsequent harmonization of European higher education represent important steps towards realizing European higher education without borders and the development of a European Higher Education Area, which formally began by way of the Bologna Process. In the process of consolidating under the Bologna Process, universities and higher education establishments in Europe have changed in deep and significant ways over the last 20 years (Sursock & Smidt, 2010). The next section addresses the literature that pertained to the changes, challenges, and trends in European higher education over the last 20 years.
Massification

All European countries have seen a massive increase in the size of their educational sectors, reflected both in the increase in number and diversity of higher education institutions and the growing number of applicants for places in higher education (Altbach, 1998; European Commission, 2013; Rumbley, 2010; Scott, 1998) (often referred to as the massification of higher education) (de Wit, 2002). Overall participation rates in higher education in Europe increased by 25% on average between 1998 and 2006 (EUA, 2010). The global progression from agricultural and-labor-based societies to a "knowledge economy," (EUA, 2010) is the product of the current “Information Age” (EUA, 2010). This transition from a labor-based to a knowledge-based economy required that the rules and practices that determined success in the industrial economy be rewritten. The literature noted that, in the current interconnected, globalized economy, knowledge, resources, and expertise are vital (Ahlstrom, 2013). Also critical to a knowledge-economy is an educated citizenry; hence, the large number of applicants to higher education and the overall massification of tertiary education worldwide that increasingly characterized the field of higher education.

Funding

The literature was brimming with discussions regarding European institutions’ efforts to manage the massive increase in the number of students seeking access to higher education, in combination with the current global economic recession and major cuts in public funding for higher education (de Wit, 2002, 2010; Green, 2012; Hawawini, 2011; Hazelkorn, 2011; Scott, 1998). Major reductions in public funding to higher education in Europe have
occurred, particularly over the period from 2008-09 to 2013-14 in Ireland (35% reduction), Great Britain (35% reduction), Spain (15% reduction), Hungary (46% reduction), and Greece (54% reduction) (Grove, 2014). The impact at the institutional level of this challenging economic climate has been further cuts in public funding for higher education in addition to salary cuts, reductions in teachers and staff, and increased tightening over student access to higher education (EAU, 2010). These developments have compelled institutions to search for diverse funding sources, which can include (but are not limited to) increasing foreign student numbers, enhancing transnational education opportunities, seeking research grants and industry contracts, and in an increasing number of cases, increasing tuition (EAU, 2010). For many higher education observers, the concept of funding (and finding alternative streams for securing it) was a topic of critical importance and will continue to remain that way (for an unforeseeable time) in the future.

**Competition**

Another trend of notable interest in European higher education was that of competition. Indeed, one of the main objectives set forth in the European initiatives established over the last 20 years (i.e., the Bologna Process and the European Higher Education Area Joint Declaration) emphasized the goal to increase the international competitiveness of the European system of higher education (The Bologna Declaration, 1999; European Ministers of Education, 1999). These same initiatives also highlighted the need to safeguard that the European higher education system acquires a worldwide degree of attraction (The Bologna Declaration, 1999). The European Reform Model created
considerable interest and helped to enhance the attractiveness and competitive edge of Europe as a destination for students and scholars from around the world (Gaston, 2010). At the heart of this important trend is the fundamental understanding that the European Union’s future economic success depends on having a highly educated population so that Europe can compete effectively in a globalized knowledge-based economy (van der Wende, 2007).

From a national perspective, the increased flexibility and mobility of students and staff within the European Union, which was established through the Bologna process, led to increased competition between European institutions. In turn, the increased competition between institutions for students and staff led to a heightened sense of awareness and focus on developing internal mechanisms for monitoring and demonstrating institutional quality (EUA, 2011; Gaston, 2010). Finally, intensified competition was also evidenced in the growing number of international ranking schemes and the corresponding growth in attention that was paid to them (EUA, 2010).

**Research and Innovation**

Concerns over making Europe more competitive led to growing attention being paid in the literature to the role of universities as research institutions. Elevated levels of attention for research led to increased funding for basic research, as evidenced in the 2007 creation of the European Research Council (ERC) (EUA, 2010), which promotes excellence in European research and innovation. At the same time, the growing importance of research, innovation, and entrepreneurship led critics to comment (Bok, 2003; Oblinger & Verville, 1998) that universities had lost their monopoly on knowledge production and that a new type of
research had developed (EUA, 2010). This new research type was recently described as a “triple helix” (universities and public and private partners working together) and as the “knowledge triangle” (integrating education, research, and innovation) (Leydesdorff, 2003; Leydesdorff & Etzkowitz, 1996). The literature noted these new research associations had great influence on university policies and resulted in additional funding streams to higher education and greater diversity of institutional profiles (EUA, 2010). Finally, the literature pointed to the diversification of partnerships as an important trend within Europe and globally. Like most educational developments; however, it also brought with it additional challenges and obstacles, such as the question of who is to oversee university joint ventures and funding allocation decisions.

**Internationalization**

A major trend in the literature on European higher education and a central focus of this study was the internationalization of higher education in Europe, with a specific concentration on the phenomenon’s development over the last 20 years. This final section is dedicated to the patterns that have emerged from the body of literature on the ways that European institutions of higher education engage in “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension in to the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education” (Knight, 2004).

Europe’s national and institutional leaders recognize that Europe now operates in a global economy, and understanding other societies and cultures is both valuable and necessary to remain competitive (Enterprise Ireland, 2010; European Commission, 2013;
EUA, 2010; Strategy Group, 2010). With the goal to develop a “worldwide interconnectedness” (EUA, 2010, p. 2), European institutions increasingly seek to establish educational strategies for collaboration with the rest of the world. Manifestations of this growth in cooperation highlight another distinct trend in European higher education. More specifically, the increase in the range of cross-border activities (often grouped under the umbrella heading ‘Transnational Education’) frequently included joint programs, branch campuses, or common international research centers (EUA, 2010). Additional collaborative developments of an international nature that research indicated has been on the rise over the last two decades include the increase in exchanges and linkages between faculties and researchers; the increase in international marketing of curricula and academic programs; and the establishment of branch campuses abroad (de Wit, 2002; EUA, 2010; Reinalda & Kulesza, 2005). Some in the wider academic community regarded these transnational activities as mainly profit-driven and often hazardous enterprises (Reinalda & Kulesza, 2005). However, other observers argued transnational activities have now gained widespread acceptance. Regardless of the conflicting reviews, institutions are increasingly making the intentional choice to include these transnational activities in their international strategies (EUA, 2010).

Along with Europe’s global collaborations, similar collaborative trends with respect to internationalization of higher education within Europe can be discerned from the literature. The launch of the 1999 Bologna Declaration was among the first early signals of the need to organize and structure European higher education as a response to globalization. Such
collaborative efforts were increasingly referred to in the literature as “Europeanization” or “the regional version of internationalization” (de Wit, 2002; EUA, 2010).

Europeanization goes hand in hand with a clear pattern of activity over the past few years towards the progressive development of a more interactive model of internationalization (de Wit, 2002) between European institutions. Interestingly, a new strategy employed to increase collaboration between European institutions began with relatively small networks of like-minded institutions that increasingly searched for ways to collaborate and benchmark their internationalization activities. Memberships in these networks tended to serve as status markers for participating institutions due to the increased prestige and international visibility garnered through such affiliations (de Wit, 2002, 2011; EUA, 2010; Jaschik, 2012).

From an institutional level, more European institutions are developing an integrated internationalization approach to teaching and research, one that is central to the whole institution rather than the responsibility of an international office managing mobility programs in relative isolation (EUA, 2010). The more traditional responsibilities and modes of decision making regarding international issues are being decentralized and assigned to institutional actors outside of the customary international leaders. It is yet unclear whether moves to streamline internationalization into the broader purpose and function of European institutions will prevail over the more traditional form of insolated policy making and oversight of internationalization. What is clear is the trend for internationalization is quickly progressing (if not entirely there, in some cases) to a position of being fundamental and fully
integrated to the core functioning of the European institution (Altbach et al., 2009; de Wit, 2011; EUA, 2010).

Rarely left out of any literature on the internationalization endeavors of European higher education was the growing trend towards the commercialization of European higher education. Higher education institutions worldwide are increasingly being asked to do more while operating in an environment of diminished funding sources. More and more European tertiary institutions are responding by developing income-generating international activities and by gearing these activities towards the enhancement of their international reputation (Brandenburg & de Wit, p. 2, 2011; de Wit, 2011; Knight, 2011), which in turn, attracts more free-paying international students. While the declared purpose for these activities is often capacity building, most international activities are pursued as a result of their income-generating power (EUA, 2010; Zgaga et al., 2013). These activities often led to continued debates in the literature on the danger of the commercialization of European higher education and the subsequent demise of educational objectives in the process (Altbach et al., 2009; British Council, 2012; de Wit, 2011).

In sum, European higher education has changed in profound and significant ways over the last 20 years. Particularly given the strong and diverse heritage that is reflected in Europe’s roughly “5,000 higher education institutions” (EUA, 2010), it is difficult to discern trends that have emerged during this period of continuous transformation. Despite this difficulty, the growing literature on European higher education reflected some noticeable developments that have been drawn out and discussed in this section.
A final point of critical importance concerns the challenge that underscores any analysis on institutional aspects and effects of internationalization in Europe; that is, a research tradition dedicated to the topic does not exist in the field in Europe (de Wit, 2002). While many publications examined internationalization programs in the European Union (British Council, 2012; EAU, 2010), few have been published on internationalization processes at the institutional level in a European context (de Wit, 2002). The scant amount of literature on internationalization at the institutional level arguably reflects the lack of a research tradition in the field of international higher education in general. At the same time, researchers in the field of international higher education contend that recognition of the internationalization of higher education as a special research focus will be unavoidable and necessary in the coming years, given the field’s growing importance and emphasis, both in terms of practice and research (British Council, 2012; de Wit, 2002). This growing emphasis and investment in internationalization signals the need for studies focused on the process of internationalization from the institutional level, which was the focus of the current study. The current research study provided a level of insight into the internationalization process that is increasingly vital to informing those directly involved in the internationalization process and to those outside of the higher education arena in need of clarity as to how and why internationalization unfolds at the institutional level. In doing so, the literature extended on the rapidly developing phenomenon, and possible questions about internationalization process can be addressed. The following section of this literature review will examine research concerning internationalization within the Irish context.
The Irish Context

This study focuses on one Irish university’s efforts to become a more international institution in the midst of a tremendously volatile period of change. Described as “a case study in failure” (Fitz Gerald, 2000, p.2) due to its poor economic performance for most of the 20th century, Ireland suddenly experienced very high rates of economic growth in the 1990s. Ireland soon became internationally renowned as the ‘Celtic Tiger’ (a reference to the ‘tiger economies’ of East Asia) and as a model economy for other countries seeking to emulate its performance (Smith, 2006). Ireland quadrupled its gross domestic product over a two-decade period, often credited to joining the European Union, attracting foreign direct investment, investing in higher education, sustaining a low corporation tax rate, employing an English-speaking workforce, and maintaining business-friendly laws (High Level Group, 2010).

Ireland’s dramatic economic turnaround has also frequently been attributed to the country’s experience with globalization, as Ireland is largely exposed to the international economy, second only to Luxembourg of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries in terms of trade openness, and ranking first in the world for inflows per capita in terms of foreign direct investment (Smith, 2006). Foreign investment resulted in Ireland being the home to over 1,000 multinational corporations (MNCs) and the European headquarters to companies such as Intel, Facebook, Dell, IBM, Apple, Amazon, Google, and Hewlett-Packard, which have established sizable operations in Ireland (Crafts, 2008; Donovan & Murphy, 2013; Pearlstein, 2013). Indeed, for three years running, Ireland
was ranked as the most globalized country in the world (Foreign Policy, 2004). The country’s exposed international economy resulted in Ireland enjoying unprecedented economic growth, particularly from 1995 to 2007, when it vaulted into the ranks of the world’s wealthiest countries (Donovan & Murphy, 2013).

The boom abruptly ended, however, with the onset of the global financial crisis in 2008. The bust was devastating. Tax revenues evaporated. The previously flourishing housing market crashed. Giant banks collapsed. By late 2010, the Irish government was forced to bail out its banking sector and ultimately accepted a 67.5 billion euro rescue package led by the International Monetary Fund and the European Union. Ireland’s debt load quadrupled from a manageable 50 billion euros in 2007 to an overwhelming 160 billion euros in 2012. The interest payments alone now take up nearly 10% of the country’s declining revenues (Crafts, 2008; Donovan & Murphy, 2013). Extensive taxes have since been levied as a result of foreign lenders enacting a series of strict austerity measures aimed at decreasing Ireland’s annual deficit (Crafts, 2008). The country now has the highest ratio of household debt to disposable income in the developed world at 190% (Landhuis, 2012).

The impact on the average Irish citizen is likely best illustrated by the trend in Ireland’s unemployment rate. The average rate of unemployment between 2000 and 2008 was roughly 4%. Following the 2008 economic downturn, the number of unemployed Irish men and women more than tripled (Donovan & Murphy, 2013). In July 2013, the unemployment rate stood at 13.5%, down from its peak of 15.1% unemployment in February 2012 (For comparative purposes, the United States’ unemployment rate stood at 7.4% in July
2013, nearly half the size of Ireland’s unemployment rate during the same time.) (Crafts, 2008; Donovan & Murphy, 2013; Pearlstein, 2013). As of 2012, Ireland has the second-highest level of long-term unemployment of the 30 countries surveyed by the OECD, after Slovakia. Without work, emigration has surged to levels not experienced since the Irish famine in 1845, with more than 200 people a day leaving Ireland in 2012 to seek employment abroad (Donovan & Murphy, 2013).

One of the most apparent symptoms of the country’s travails concern the collapse of Ireland’s economic output, as evidenced by the country’s gross domestic product (GDP). Although most Western economies witnessed their outputs contract in 2009, Ireland’s contraction was unique in both its depth and duration (Hazelkorn, 2011). From peak to trough, Ireland’s GDP has declined by 20% and is still contracting (Donovan & Murphy, 2013). By comparison, and in light of all of the attention Greece has garnered throughout the financial crisis, Greece’s GDP fell by a modest 7%. The United States’ GDP was down a mere 5% from the peak (Crafts, 2008; Donovan & Murphy, 2013).

Taken together, the Irish economic landscape is bleak, at best, and has only shown meager signs of short-lived improvement since the boom ended in 2008. This rather depressing review of the literature on Ireland’s economic developments described the broader Irish context so that a topic of a more intimate relation to the purpose of this study, education, could be fully understood.
Irish Education

Although Ireland has historically had one of the lowest income levels in Europe, its educational system is highly developed, with participation rates higher than many other, much wealthier, European countries. Research notes that one reason for high participation rates is that the goal of Irish education has traditionally been based on religious, moral, and intellectual instruction, rather than economic growth or the preparation of students for careers. Consequently, the education of girls has been considered of equal importance as that of boys, thus accounting for higher female and hence, total participation rates overall (Rafterty & Hout, 1993).

Historical literature highlighted how a country that has endured centuries of poverty (until recent years) could afford such a highly developed educational system. Of particular importance is the religious control over Irish education. Notably, the majority of Irish primary and secondary schools are denominational and parochial. While funding for Irish schools comes from the state, the Catholic Church has powerful influence over the Irish State (and has since Ireland’s independence in 1922) and ultimately maintains control over the Irish education system. Oversight and teaching costs have been kept to a minimum over the years, as individual members of religious orders made substantial contributions of their services to Irish schools for little or no compensation. To that end, the Catholic Church historically channeled a large amount of money to education, which greatly aided in Irish schools’ viability and strength (Rafferty & Hout, 1993; Whelan & Whelan, 1985). Finally,
the Irish curriculum emphasized subjects that were less technical and hence, less costly, with Irish schools operating in an overall frugal manner (Tussing, 1978).

Presently, over 90% of State primary Irish schools are controlled by a board of management under Catholic diocesan patronage and often include a clergyman. Similarly, the majority of Irish secondary schools are State run. Higher education (also referred to as ‘third level’ education in Ireland) awards are conferred by more than 38 higher education institutions (National Qualifications Authority of Ireland, 2009; Whelan & Whelan, 1985). Under a binary system of higher education (Hazelkorn, 2011), Irish institutions, for the most part, can be divided into two categories (Whelan & Whelan, 1985). The university sector includes 7 universities, 5 university-recognized colleges, and 4 colleges of education. The university sector awards a full range of undergraduate and postgraduate qualifications, with 97% of research conducted in at this level. The non-university sector consists of 14 Institutes of Technology (IoTs), the Dublin Institute of Technology, 11 independent/private colleges, and 4 other state-aided colleges. The primary focus of the IoTs is on undergraduate programs with a more limited number of postgraduate programs and a growing involvement in applied research (National Qualifications Authority of Ireland, 2009). As is evident, the Irish higher education system comprises a range of higher education institutions that offer diverse types of programs.

This section highlighted the impact historical developments had on Ireland’s education system and provided a general overview of the Irish education structure. A general
understanding of Irish education at the various levels provided a framework for understanding the following discussion of higher education in Ireland.

**Irish Higher Education**

Higher education in Ireland has experienced considerable changes and challenges in the last two decades (Laffan, 2013). Five key areas that must be considered in any discussion focused on Irish higher education in the last 20 years are massification, funding, structural change, research and innovation, and internationalization. These developments account for the most profound changes that have affected higher education in Ireland during the last two decades and are at the core of the literature produced on Irish higher education during the noted time.

**Massification**

Starting in the late 1960s, Ireland has gradually moved from an agriculture-based to a knowledge-based economy. Since that time, increasing numbers of Irish students pursued higher education degrees in an effort to remain competitive in the ever-expanding knowledge-based global workforce. Around the same time, in 1967, tuition fees were abolished for Irish secondary schools and replaced by state grants. As a result, larger numbers of students were qualified to progress to third level education. Access to higher education was further increased the following year, in 1968, when a means-tested grant scheme for university students was introduced (Raffrety & Hout, 1993; Whelan & Whelan, 1985). Taken together, participation in higher education increased steadily and continues to do so.
Ireland’s Higher Education Authority (HEA) remains aware of this accumulated increase in higher education participation numbers. Indeed, the HEA is mindful of an issue of profound importance in relation to the massification of Irish higher education. Specifically, the HEA monitors the significantly large number of students from the late 1990s baby boom that are now progressing through the primary and secondary school sectors and will soon be entering third level education. Sometimes referred as a “demographic tsunami” (HEA, 2012), some predictions note undergraduate numbers in Ireland could grow by as much as 25% over the next decade as a result of this large cohort of pupils (Boland, 2013).

Perhaps more pressing is the question of where this additional 25% of students will pursue a third level education, as the Irish higher education sector is already close to capacity, with 170,000 full-time undergraduate and postgraduates and 30,000 part-time students, in addition to the growing number of adult-education participants who are signing up for courses as a way to improve their job prospects (Boland, 2013; Higher Education Authority, 2012). Ireland already has one of the highest participation rates in higher education in the world (Strategy Group, 2011). Almost 65% seek entry to third level education and over half of the Ireland’s 30- to 35-year-olds hold third level qualifications (51%), the only EU country to pass the 50% mark (and distinguished as “the most educated country in the European Union”) (Dunne, 2013; Irish Independent, 2013). Record-level participation rates in higher education are extremely commendable for any country. However, taken together with the issue of an additional 25% increase in a system that is
nearly to capacity, the massification of Irish higher education becomes a large and eminent matter that is also lacking in answers on how to address the problem (Boland, 2013).

Increased funding could certainly help to compensate for the increase in student numbers; however, the budget and student numbers are going in opposite directions (Hazelkorn, 2011). As the literature review in the following section will highlight, funding Irish higher education has been a considerable challenge, even during the prosperous years of the “Celtic Tiger.”

**Funding**

Ireland historically has invested in education, especially during times of trouble (Fearn, 2010). History has not repeated itself in this regard over the last 20 or so years in Ireland. Rather, rising participation rates, a prolonged recession, and intense competition for public and private funds have precipitated significant cutbacks in higher education funding (Donnelly, 2004; Hazelkorn, 2011).

Interestingly, research notes the “Celtic Tiger” years benefited higher education, with a core budget increase of over 3 billion euros invested in higher education research and infrastructure between 1998 and 2008 (Hazelkorn, 2011). At the same time, however, participation rates rose from 44% in 2000 to over 50% in 2013. While the actual amount of funding increased, once adjusted for the mixture of inflation and significantly increased student numbers, the financial picture is far grimmer than initially perceived. Hence, even in the midst of the affluent “Celtic Tiger” years, funding for Irish higher education in real terms actually declined significantly (von Prondzynski, 2013).
Indeed, during the peak of the “Celtic Tiger,” Ireland had the fourth lowest level of spending on education among the 31 members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), according to the annual OECD Education at a Glance report. In the same report, Ireland is close to the bottom of the international league table in terms of spending on education as a percentage of gross domestic product or total income. For comparison purposes, countries in the OECD spent, on average, 6.3% on education. In contrast, Ireland only spent 4.7% on education in 2005 (5.2% was spent in 1995) (OECD, 2010).

At the same time, Ireland was noted to be one of the only countries making cuts in higher education as student numbers increased (OECD, 2010). The cuts on higher education were largely attributed to major funding reductions made in order to meet the terms of the four-year austerity plan. The plan was established to pay back the 111 billion euro bailout loan the Irish government accepted from the International Monetary Fund and European Union in an attempt to keep the country’s shrinking economy afloat (Fearn, 2010). Irish higher education, students, university lecturers, and staff have felt the impact of the austerity repayment plan and the economic recession.

Since 2008, Irish higher education has experienced an overall 17% reduction in core funding. Because the education budget is decreasing while student numbers are increasing, resources per student are also declining, from a high of roughly 10,000 euros to less than 3,000 euros per student (Hazelkorn, 2011). Beginning in the Fall of 2012, the controversial registration fees for students (which some observers have labeled unofficial tuition in a
country where university study is free for EU students) will increase by 332 euros to a maximum of 3,000 euros by 2014 (Grove, 2014).

Financial conditions for Irish lecturers are just as grim. Higher education employment levels are required to fall by 7% by 2014 as universities downsize. All new appointments will have 10% lower starting salaries (Hazelkorn, 2011). Lecturers in Ireland received a 15% pay reduction in 2010. Deadline dates were established as an incentive for lecturers to retire to avoid a corresponding 15% cut in pensions (Grove, 2012). Lecturers are consequently working extra hours to cover for staff that have left and will not be replaced. The literature was replete with articles by lecturers noting their level of frustration and exhaustion. Particularly after the recent fifth consecutive cut in funding (Laffan, 2013), Ireland’s education service was noted as being “routinely asset stripped” by the Irish Government, with lecturers described as “simply starved to death, rather than having any dramatic blow to knock them out. It’s a case of death by a thousand blows” (Grove, 2012, p.2).

A level of anxiety and uncertainty has been woven through much of the literature on the funding of Irish higher education. What is clear and brings a glimmer of hope to an otherwise overwhelmingly gloomy topic are the great efforts being made by various sectors of the Irish government and university sector to develop diverse resource streams to fund Irish higher education. Without such efforts, the only option becomes a race to the bottom, with declining quality and standards and the loss of Ireland’s educational reputation abroad. Indeed, a topic of much discussion focuses on quality; notably, if resources are not found,
quality will be the first thing to suffer in Irish higher education (Reisz, 2012; von Prondzynski, 2013). The need to address the significant tension between quality, high participation levels, and decreased funding is at the heart of the new policy aimed to significantly reform Ireland’s higher education sector through the process of university consolidation and greater coherence between education and enterprise (Reisz, 2012). Funding changes lead to structural changes within Irish higher education, which is a topic that will be reviewed in the following section.

Structural Change

The long-awaited *National Strategy for Higher Education 2030* (also referred to as *The Hunt Report*) by economist Colin Hunt, the Irish Education Strategy Group, and the Higher Education Authority (HEA) was launched in January 2011 to outline plans for Irish universities for the next 20 years. The report was intended to produce “a substantial reform of Ireland’s higher education sector” with recommendations to develop a “coherent system” by eliminating “unnecessary and wasteful duplication” (Strategy Group, 2011, p.12).

The Hunt Report called for all higher education institutions to form themselves into regional clusters that consist of collaborating institutions (a cluster would consist of universities, institutes of technology, and other providers) to work together to meet jointly agreed strategic objectives (Hazelkorn, 2011). For example, regional clusters would share backroom services (i.e., procurement, information technology support, and e-library facilities) to meet established consolidation objectives (Hazelkorn, 2011). Regional clusters
were intended to guarantee the broadest range of high-quality courses were available in each region, without unnecessary duplication (Boland, 2013).

The literature on Ireland’s structural reform discussed varying objectives and outlined intentions for launching the system reconfiguration. Rationalization and efficiency were identified as objectives for system reconfiguration, with the intent “to both rationalize the number of individual institutions and improve overall efficiency “by reducing waste and duplication across colleges” (Hazelkorn, 2011, p.4). Details on the reconfiguration of Ireland’s higher education sector highlighted that Irish universities would be more globally competitive by pooling resources and merging institutional strengths. Merging institutions and streamlining higher education was also intended to save money, cash that could potentially be used to increase student numbers without degrading quality (Hazelkorn, 2012).

Finally, perhaps the most prominent objective noted in the literature for structural reform was the creation of the proposed technological universities. The Irish government’s technological university model aimed to transform designated technological institutes into centers of technological innovation, through the sharing of knowledge and capital with industry links, which ultimately would aim to be a profitable collaboration. A point often highlighted in the research is that this is not a university in the traditional sense, but rather a new and unique kind of university (Boland, 2010; Laffan, 2012; Reisz, 2012). The new technological universities are to be developed with consideration for Ireland’s future economic development and their contribution of higher education. Put simply, the new technological institutions are intended to serve as a diverse funding source for Ireland. The
financial support provided by technology- and enterprise-oriented university-level institutions is anticipated to help ease the increasing tension between high levels of participation, depleted funding, and the need to maintain quality. The new technological universities are still in the development stage, so time will dictate if predications and estimations about their potential to contribute to the Irish economy and Irish higher education will come to fruition. Ireland’s transformation of higher education institutions into centers for technological innovation relates to the controversial but increasingly utilized revenue source that stems from industry-academic collaboration, which will be reviewed in the following section.

**Industry-Academic Collaboration**

Ireland is proactive and quite vocal in its deliberations to use higher education to promote economic development through industry and academic collaborations. In the last roughly two decades in particular, plans and policies were developed for Ireland to be internationally renowned for the quality of its research and being at the forefront of generating and using new knowledge for economic and social progress (High Level Group, 2010). As was previously noted, Ireland has gone so far as to reconfigure its entire higher education system in an effort to create technological universities that will facilitate economic development (Laffan, 2013). Additionally, Irish newspapers often featured Ministers of Education from diverse parts of the world on tours of Irish higher education institutions (Dundalk Democrat, 2013). The large draw to Ireland stemmed from Irish institutions being internationally renowned for their work with and support of local and regional industries in
an effort to create sources for economic development. For example, a 2010 report on Vietnamese Higher Educations suggested that Vietnamese policy makers should look at the Irish experience in using higher education as a means to drive economic modernization (Vallely & Wilkinson, 2008). Of particular interest to visiting policymakers were the systems that are increasingly being established at Ireland’s third level institutions to ensure that academic programs are responsive to local demands and relevant to industrial needs (Laffan, 2013).

Observers of the growing trend towards the commercialization of Irish higher education demonstrated conflicting reviews on the process. Proponents of the commercialization of Irish higher education often included various government representatives and university administrators who were searching for ways to stimulate the Irish economy and to protect Irish institutions from further economic hardships (Strategy Group, 2011). They heralded the prospect of the industry-academic connection and subsequent funding stream that it represents (Commercialisation Fund, 2014). Effective industry-academic collaboration was viewed by such representatives as essential for the successful translation of the best new ideas from the lab into innovative new products and services in the marketplace. These same examples of collaborative efforts were also thought to help deliver good, sustainable jobs for the Irish labor force (Doyle, 2012; Strategy Group, 2011).

On the other hand, the quick progression towards the commercialization of Irish higher education was attacked by others who see it as a problem for universities and a threat
to the preservation of academic freedom (Donnelly, 2004; Garvin, 2012; Limond, 2010). At the heart of this counterargument is the university. As one of the human race’s greatest inventions, at its core is the idea of the free exercise of intelligence and ideas, with knowledge being an end in itself, not a means to a financial end (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; de Wit, 2011; Garvin, 2012; Qiang, 2003; van der Wende, 1997). The increasingly proactive push towards the commercialization of ideas was viewed as a threat to this central core and an “intellectual tragedy” for universities (Garvin, 2012). This counterargument was perhaps best encapsulated by an unidentified University of College Dublin (UCD) academic who noted that “third-level education in Ireland went, in half a century, from the belief that higher education had nothing to do with economic development to the equally absurd assumption that higher education was about nothing except economic development: from one rather foolish barbarism to another” (UCD, 2012).

Similar to many other countries that are experiencing prolonged economic difficulties, Ireland is proactive in establishing industry-academic links as a funding source. As a result, the pressure to engage in intellectually derived and financially profitable research at the expense of traditional free inquiry has increased (Garvin, 2012). At the same time, a small economy relying, to a major extent, on inward investments towards innovative developments cannot afford to forgo the opportunity to secure a funding stream for an otherwise resource starved and asset stripped education sector (Doyle, 2012; Garvin, 2012; Strategy Group, 2011).
As is evident, great debates and deliberations have taken place over Ireland’s proactive pursuit to use higher education to promote economic development through industry and academic collaborations. The following section will highlight a final development that was prominent in the literature emanating on Irish higher education, notably, the internationalization of Irish tertiary institutions. Although various rationales exist for internationalization efforts, the generation of funding will be seen to be among the strongest motivators for such efforts.

**Internationalization**

Despite a relative abundance of newspaper articles, government documents, and conference proceedings that highlighted international dimensions of university activities and government aspirations, little published academic research exists that analyzes the internationalization efforts of Irish higher education, particularly from an institutional level. Likely the closest academic research to be found on the internationalization of higher education is by Ellen Hazelkorn (2011), the Head of the Higher Education Policy Research Unit at the Dublin Institute of Technology. Hazelkorn (2011) published on Irish higher education with internationalization serving primarily as a supplementary topic to her research. Hazelkorn’s (2011) research has been referenced throughout this research study, particularly for the rich contextual details it provided.

Additional academic research that also focused on Irish education is that of Donnelly (2004) with a *Critical Evaluation of the Impact of Global Educational Reform: an Irish Perspective*. The paper addressed if and how global trends in the new public management
(NPM) of education have manifested in third level education in Ireland. In the process, Donnelly (2004) highlighted recent developments and trends in Irish higher education. Although insightful and supplemental for the current research study, the article did not specifically concentrate on the internationalization efforts of Irish institutions. Finally, Smith (2006) and Schmitt (2000) discussed internationalization in Ireland, primarily from a socio-political perspective, with education referenced as a part of the larger policy change process taking place in Ireland. These research studies, along with detailed government documents, newspaper articles, and conference notes, encapsulated the primary sources for this topic. Within those sources, several trends emerged on the internationalization developments taking place in Irish higher education.

As one of the most open economies in the world, which relies heavily on external trading, it is in Ireland’s economic, social, and cultural interest to be engaged. Such international engagement in Ireland favors educational initiatives of the same kind. Consequently, an international dimension has been emphasized in Ireland’s educational policies from the 1990s to the present time. For example, over the years, Ireland fully participated in the various European Union educational and training initiatives. Additionally, through such contemporary exchange programs as Erasmus, the old tradition of students, teachers, academics, and researchers participating in visitations and exchanges continues.

Perhaps at no other time than in the last 20 years has Ireland been more aware that the Irish higher education system has a critical role to play in international engagement and in the development of global relationships (High Level Group, 2010). Stressed in recent
literature was the fact that, as a small, open, European economy, Ireland relies fundamentally on international engagement (O’Carroll, 2013). Government documents highlighted that an internationalized higher education system in Ireland has a crucial role to play in maintaining the country’s international profile and attractiveness by educating the next generation of leaders, entrepreneurs, and decision-makers in Ireland’s partner-countries worldwide, and by giving Irish students the intercultural expertise that is imperative in the global economy (High Level Group, 2010).

With this growing importance in mind, in 2000, the Irish government formed “The High Level Group on International Education” to lead the planning, development, and implementation of higher education internationalization strategies. The High Level Group maintained that, from a national perspective, the most compelling and pressing rationale for internationalization is investment in future global relationships with students educated in Ireland, who then will become advocates for Ireland overseas, with educational institutions that will be the research and teaching partners of the future, and with the countries that will be Ireland’s next trading and business partners. Ultimately, the strategic imperative to promote Irish education internationally went deeper than immediate economic benefits. It was a critical element to support Ireland’s international trading relationships and export-led economy (High Level Group, 2010).

**High and imminent expectations of Irish higher education.** It is clear that expectations of higher education in Ireland are large and imminent. High expectations are not a foreign concept to Irish higher education, however. Indeed, Ireland’s higher education
institutions have often been credited as a key to the country’s success during the “Celtic Tiger” years, particularly in their ability to attract significant inward investment. Irish institutions are being called upon, once again, as a key to the country’s recovery and eventual return to prosperity through their efforts to internationalize. In an effort to do so, various objectives and targets have been established including Ireland’s International Education Strategy (2010-2015). The primary objective of Ireland’s strategy is to “become internationally recognized and ranked as a world leader in the delivery of high-quality international education by providing a unique experience and long-term value to students” (High Level Group, 2010). Other targets and objectives of notable importance outlined in the Ireland’s international strategy note that by 2015, Ireland will (High Level Group, 2010):

- Increase total international student numbers (including full-time, part-time, and exchange) in higher education institutions to 38,000, an increase of over 12,000 or 50% on current numbers
- Increase the number of offshore students (i.e., those undertaking Irish education programs outside the jurisdiction) by 50% to 4,500
- Enhance the economic impact of international education by some 300 million euros, to approximately 1.2 billion euros in total.

By 2015 Irish higher education institutions will:

- Strengthen institutional relationships with priority partner-countries to include greater collaboration in mobility, research, and teaching
• Increase outward mobility of staff members and students to make significant programs towards Bologna and EU goals in this regards.

By 2015 the English-language sector (of Irish Higher Education) will:

• Significantly diversify to include more higher education pathway programs, teacher training courses, greater transnational deliver, and further collaboration with the wider tourism sector

• Increase direct employment levels by 25%, to a target of 1,250 full-time jobs.

Economic impact of Irish international education. A common thread woven through each of these objectives is the potential for Ireland’s international education services to make a significant contribution to economic recovery in Ireland (Department of the Taoiseach, 2008). At the forefront and of particular prominence in this list of objectives is the stated goal to double the number of international students studying in Ireland by 2015. The heavy push to recruit international students stemmed from their potential to have a significant economic impact on Ireland. More specifically, international education is now estimated to be a 1 billion euro sector for the Irish economy, with international students in higher education contributing approximately 700 million euro and English language students approximately 300 million euro (Education in Ireland, 2012). Additionally, over 60% of medical students in Ireland are from outside the EU, with a total income reported to be 78 million euros in 2009/10, accounting for 52% of the total university sector income (Enterprise Ireland, 2010). The economic impact of international students is stressed to the point that Irish newspapers have highlighted how much each full-time international student is
worth to the Irish economy (20,000 euros/year) (Donnelly, 2013). Additional published figures highlighted the impact of international students from an employment perspective. Every 100 additional international students who come to Ireland support the creation of approximately 15 local jobs, through spending on tuition, accommodation and other living expenses (Kenny, 2012). As a result, international education was a priority area in the Irish Government’s *Action Plan for Jobs 2013* (High Level Group, 2010).

In an effort to increase international student numbers and to become a world-class destination and education hub for international study, Ireland developed a large scholarship program (High Level Group, 2010). The Government of Ireland launched a new international scholarship scheme aimed at attracting students from emerging and priority markets, including China, India, Brazil, and the United States. Over 40 recipients have all fees and registration charges waived and receive 10,000 euros to cover living expenses for one year of study in Ireland (Chase, 2013; Kennedy, 2013). Ireland’s rationale for allocating these scholarships is part of a long-term economic plan. More specifically, as a trading economy, Ireland sees the need to develop their links with major emerging markets, such as China, India, and Brazil. By awarding scholarships to top students from these countries, Ireland believes they are making an investment in future trading relationships which will, in turn, benefit Irish business, tourism, and cultural interests overseas (Kennedy, 2013).

In addition to scholarships, large delegations (often consisting of academics, government, and multinational corporation representatives) travel to the noted priority markets to promote Ireland and to attract more students to study in the country. For example,
with less than 1,000 Indian students enrolled in higher education in Ireland in 2012, delegations travel to India with the hope of increasing Ireland’s share of the 200,000 Indian students who attend overseas universities every year (Carroll, 2012). Irish government and university leaders alike are well aware that the Indian education sector is one of the largest in the world, worth over $100 billion in 2011. As an additional incentive, the pool of potential international students to recruit is significant, as India has the largest youth population globally (Kenny, 2012).

The development of a revised student visa and immigration regime has often been discussed in recent literature as a means to improve Ireland’s general competitiveness and ability to recruit international students (High Level Group, 2010). The new visa policies include a fast-tracked system for degree program students and a visa stay-back option (High Level Group, 2010; Ramgopal, 2013; Smith, 2006) that gives international students the opportunity to remain in Ireland for up to one year for the purpose of gaining relevant work experience or developing a business idea (High Level Group, 2010). This is all done with revenue generation as the intended outcome.

**Transnational education developments in Ireland.** Finally, increasing amounts of academic research, Irish and international newsprint, and government documents have discussed a relatively new way for Irish institutions to educate increasing numbers of international students, a development often referred to as transnational education (TNE). TNE is a rather complicated definitional subject, but is generally agreed to refer to any education delivered by an institution based in one country to students located in another. In
its broadest definition, TNE covers “online and distance learning, articulation agreements, twinning programmes that typically lead to double or joint degrees, franchising and validation arrangements, and international branch campuses” (Matthews, 2013). Ireland is not alone in its endeavors to pursue educating “offshore students” through transnational education (Altbach & Knight, 2007). Indeed, in the United Kingdom in 2011, TNE numbers overall surpassed the number of incoming international students. Although there were 428,000 international students in the United Kingdom, the TNE number stood at 504,000. The salient issue for Ireland to pay attention to is that the current growth of TNE is outstripping that of international student mobility (Education in Ireland, 2012).

The inclusion of offshore and distance education activities changes international education demographics for Ireland quite dramatically, with 23% of Ireland’s international student population being offshore (Education in Ireland, 2012). Student dimensions are also impacted. For many years, the United States ranked first on the country of origin list for Ireland. In 2011/12, however, China assumed first place with 5,100 students registered in Irish higher education institutions (accounting for 16% of the total international enrollment) (IIE, 2012). Almost half (46%) of these students studied on offshore or distance education programs; hence, the United States continues to be the most important country for those studying in Ireland (O’Carroll, 2012), but not in terms of numbers participating on Irish programs. Hence, such a change in demographics has led to a more targeted marketing focus by Irish institutions in key recruitment areas (i.e., Asia, India, and Brazil) (Education in Ireland, 2012).
The positive aspects of transnational education have been recognized in the literature as one of the best parts of modern education (Garvin, 2012; Matthews, 2013). The Irish government and Irish institutions have benefited from TNE by tapping into the unmet demand for higher education in other countries through transnational education. Much discussion has also taken place in the literature regarding the negative aspects of this approach for education (Garvin, 2012). For example, for Irish and institutions worldwide, the lure of money is a powerful force that is fueling the market of distance education (Gladieux, 2000). The downsides of the commercialization of education have been discussed in previous sections of this paper, notably the academic freedom to explore ‘knowledge for knowledge’s sake’ is lost when knowledge is pursued for the sake of financial gain. Perhaps most important and relevant to the current study was transnational education’s potential impact at the institutional level. Oftentimes at the institutional level, the same principles and standards to evaluate campus-based programs cannot be used to assess the quality of transnational education programs without significant adjustments (Salmi, 2000). The literature pointed to the pursuit of knowledge for profit and to declining quality as among the many significant challenges Ireland faces as the country continues to increase its transnational education options (Kenny, 2011). Given that the large boom in TNE activities has predominately taken place in the last 15 to 20 years, more time and information will be required to fully understand and analyze this growing trend (Reisz, 2012). In the meantime, Ireland is aware of the shifting approaches to international education and is actively seeking ways to better understand and expand it. With a review of international education in Ireland
complete, the following section will discuss literature pertaining to internationalization efforts at the institutional level in Ireland.

**Institutional Approaches to Internationalization in Ireland**

While previous sections of this study discussed the internationalization of higher education in more general terms, this section entails a more pointed discussion on internationalization efforts at the institutional level in Ireland. With virtually little to no published academic research to reference on Irish institutions’ experience with internationalization, this discussion must rely on a somewhat piecemeal approach to determining trends and patterns of activity on the topic. Irish and European government and university documents and academic research focused on internationalization in Ireland in a broader, national context are referenced. Trends discerned from the literature include Irish institutions being called upon to implement lofty objectives set forth by the Irish government under extremely difficult circumstances (Carroll, 2010; High Level Group, 2010). Also apparent from the literature is that many Irish institutions are understaffed, under-resourced, and are in the midst of both an economic recession and a major restructuring of the Irish higher education sector. Additionally, Irish institutions are attempting to garner greater collaboration in mobility, research, and teaching by strengthening institutional relationships with priority partner-countries. Likewise, Irish institutions are working on ways to increase mobility opportunities for Irish staff and students (High Level Group, 2010).

Communication channels for internationalization initiatives can also be discerned from the literature. Notably, the literature signaled that a great deal of Ireland’s
internationalization efforts are centralized and administered at the national government level. National goals and policy objectives are then filtered to the institutional level for implementation. Additionally, rather than seeking to create a few world-class universities, Ireland has taken a whole of country strategy, built on coordination and collaboration between institutions and the adoption of a single-quality brand (i.e., *Education Ireland*) to increase global competitiveness (Hazelkorn, 2011). Ireland’s national strategy for internationalization sees all higher education institutions engaged in teaching, research, and international engagement in partnership with one another - “with each institution seeking to achieve some form of unique global leadership” (Hazelkorn, 2011, p.2).

The literature also highlighted the importance for Irish institutions to assume a balanced approach in their efforts to internationalize. The Irish government recognizes that in order for the country to be successful, internationalization will need “to be developed as a long-term and sustainable process, based on high-quality and balanced engagement with international partners” (High Level Group, 2010). The literature in this area noted that a balanced approach to internationalization would need to include the following objectives: facilitating greater outward mobility and international experience of Irish staff and students; increasing collaborative institutional and research links; internationalizing curricula; developing transnational education; and continuing to engage in European Union and multilateral initiatives (Donnelly, 2004). Without a balanced approach to internationalization, the Irish government has acknowledged it could put itself at risk for relying too heavily on international student funds to sustain the higher education sector.
Given the unpredictable and ever-changing nature of international education, overreliance on international student funding could result in something equivalent to a catastrophic financial downfall for Irish institutions.

In sum, although Ireland has been rather blatant in highlighting the vital role the internationalization of Irish institutions could have on the country’s economic recovery, other social and cultural rationales have been noted (albeit briefly) in the literature. For example, the literature highlighted internationalization’s potential to enhance the quality of teaching, learning, and research (IAU, 2012; Sutton & Rubin, 2004, Van de Berg et al., 2009). Internationalization was further touted as a means to enrich Ireland’s classrooms and campuses and as a benefit to all students, providing them with vital international and intercultural experiences and perspectives (Hennessy, 2012). Although these altruistic goals are noted in the literature, a review of the patterns and trends highlighted in this literature review and the objectives and targets set out in Ireland’s long-term strategic plans indicated that the economic rationale is the strongest force behind the campaign for Irish institutions to internationalize.

Ultimately, Ireland’s overt efforts to internationalize their higher education sector, as seen both in the literature and reflected in this study, indicated that internationalization is and will continue to be a phenomenon of central importance to Ireland for quite some time. Ireland as a society and Irish institutions individually have been challenged in their efforts to internationalize but have also reaped rewards from the heavy emphasis and efforts placed on internationalizing the country’s higher education system.
The literature in this section signaled that the internationalization of Ireland’s higher education institutions is of central importance at both the institutional level and the national level. Ireland is invested in and relies up on the internationalization of their country’s institutions from an economic, social, and political perspective. The country has placed a large priority on developing internationalization at each of its major higher education institutions, and in the process, has made clear the importance for Irish institutions to develop long-term plans that are based on the successful implementation of internationalization at the institutional level.

Given the clear importance of this topic, the lack of research activity on the internationalization of Irish institutions is surprising, but at the same time, leaves room and reason for the present study to fill such a significant void. By describing in-depth and with great detail the process of internationalization at Trinity College Dublin, the present study will provide a deep level of understanding on how internationalization is unfolding at Ireland’s leading higher education institution. From this study, Ireland’s national and institutional leaders can not only learn how and why internationalization is developing at Trinity, but they can also learn more about the potential benefits and challenges that other institutions within Ireland could face in adopting a similar approach in their own internationalization efforts. Based on this literature review, understanding the process of internationalization at an Irish institution is important, as Ireland is deeply invested in successfully developing and expanding internationalization at each of the country’s institutions.
Chapter Summary

Irish Minister for Education and Skills, Mary Coughlan, noted in Ireland’s National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030, “It is clear that Ireland requires a network of outward facing institutions that are ready and empowered to respond to a varied set of challenges…” (Strategy Group, 2013, p.7). This research study sought to address the requirement set forth by Minister Coughlan and Ireland’s National Education Strategy by describing an Irish institution’s experience with internationalization over the last 20 years.

This chapter began with the various ways internationalization has been defined and included the definition that was determined to be most fitting for the current study, notably Knight’s (2004) 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” (p.11). Motivations to internationalize were described in detail and included political, economic, social/cultural, and academic motivations. Although all four motivations were highlighted as important in the literature, economic rationales were noted as the most dominant motivating force for institutions to internationalize. In order to understand how the internationalization of higher education manifests on university campuses, the next section of the literature review included a discussion on academic activities and programs and the organizational strategies that were determined as the most prevalent in the internationalization process. Attempts to measure academic activities and organizational strategies were noted to be difficult to do with a quantitative approach, as the method missed illustrating important
details on how and why the internationalization process unfolds. This study’s literature review indicated the more appropriate method was a process-based, qualitative approach to understanding how and why internationalization takes place, which was the approach taken in the current study. A review of the current context of the internationalization of higher education included a discussion on the barriers and risks involved in the rapidly growing phenomenon.

A discussion on theoretical models for internationalization highlighted that Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle for Internationalization was the most appropriate for the context of this study. A review of the various trends taking place within European higher education, Irish education in general, and Irish higher education specifically followed. The trends indicated that European and Irish institutions were facing increasing competition and the massification of their higher education sectors. Severely tightened budgets due to various reasons (largely credited to the global economic crisis) led to funding being noted as the most prevalent and dominating issue facing higher European and Irish higher education institutions. In order to address these growing trends, internationalization was discussed as a large and eminent expectation of Irish higher education institutions. With a government mandate issued for Irish universities to internationalize, this literature review concluded with a discussion on institutional approaches to internationalization in Ireland. Evident in this literature review was the potential insight that could be gained from understanding how and why internationalization unfolded at an Irish tertiary institution. The broad patterns or trends in the literature provided an understanding of the larger context for this analysis and the
environment in which the case study institution exists. Collectively, this literature review highlighted those topics most germane to the objective of this study - to describe the internationalization process at a case study institution in an Irish context over the last 20 years.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to describe the experience of a single Irish higher education institution in its efforts to become a more international university. This section will discuss the methodology used to address the study’s research questions. Specifically, qualitative case study methods were used to describe the internationalization process at Trinity College Dublin (TCD). Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle for Internationalization was also assessed to determine its applicability to the Irish context.

Rationale for Qualitative Methods

This study described the internationalization process at Trinity College Dublin using qualitative research methods. Qualitative research methods were used for several reasons. Merriam (2002) and others (Creswell, 2007; Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011; Mertens, 2010; Miles & Huberman, 1994) agreed there are several identifiable characteristics that distinguish qualitative from quantitative research methodology. First, qualitative researchers seek to find meaning in how people make sense of their lives, experiences, and structures of their world (Creswell, 2007; Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011; Merriam, 2009; Mertens, 2010). Second, the qualitative researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis (Merriam, 2009). Data are mediated through a human instrument, rather than surveys, questionnaires, or machines, as qualitative research refrains from using standardized measurements (Creswell, 2007; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Third, qualitative research involves fieldwork. The qualitative researcher physically goes to the people, setting, site, or institution to observe
or record behavior in its natural setting. Fourth, qualitative research is descriptive in that the researcher is interested in process, meaning, and understanding gained through words or pictures. Instead of utilizing quantifiable measures, descriptive procedures are used that concentrate on a participant’s “spoken or written words and observable behavior” (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975, p.2), with in-depth, rich description used at every level of the study. Fifth, unlike the deductive process of quantitative research, the process of qualitative research is inductive as the researcher builds abstractions, concepts, hypotheses, and theories from the data (Merriam, 2009).

At the heart of qualitative research is understanding meaning, particularly as researchers perceive and create it (Merriam, 2009). As the primary instrument for exploring these meanings, qualitative researchers must immerse themselves in the research process throughout the entire research study. The qualitative research process, by its nature, is an inductive, recursive, reflective, and interactive process (Creswell, 2007).

Throughout the entire process of interacting with the data, the researcher engages in reflective exercises such as journaling (Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and self-reflections to discover personal beliefs and biases that could potentially influence the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Patton, 2002). As a largely interpretive and inductive exercise (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Krathwohl, 2009; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002), qualitative research entails making interpretations based on smaller units of data and identifying from those smaller units overarching patterns (Patton, 2002). The reflective and incursive nature of qualitative research is actualized through the continuous cycle of
interpretation and reflection throughout the entire course of the study. Indeed, qualitative researchers engage in an ongoing cycle of recursive analysis throughout both the data collection and data analysis. Lincoln and Guba (1985) noted that, “on site, the investigator must engage in continuous data analysis, so that every new act of investigation takes into account everything that has been learned so far” (p.209). Ultimately, the continuous interaction with the data required in qualitative research allows the researcher to provide rich, in-depth description of the particular phenomenon being studied.

Case Study

This study used a descriptive case study methodology. A descriptive case study was most fitting for an analysis that was dedicated to answering “how” and “why” questions about a given phenomenon (Yin, 2009). The purpose of the current study was to learn how and why internationalization has developed at Trinity College Dublin. Case studies allow for selective sampling strategies, employ multiple methods of data collection, and provide a richer understanding of the topic (Merriam, 2009; Mertens, 2010). They focus on the particulars and the complexity, the uniqueness and commonality, of cases within certain circumstances (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011; Merriam, 2009; Mertens, 2010; Stake, 1995). Furthermore, a case study can be selected for its uniqueness, for it can reveal about a phenomenon, “knowledge we would not otherwise have access to” (Merriam, 1998, p.33). Because this study covered new ground in the emerging line of research on internationalization, case study methods were most appropriate.
Likewise, if a researcher needs information about the characteristics of a given population or area of interest, a descriptive study is in order. Results, however, will be focused on describing the phenomenon rather than predicting future behavior (Merriam, 2009). Perhaps because a case study focuses on a single unit, the issue of generalizability stands larger here than with other types of qualitative research (Merriam, 2009). Much can be learned, however, from qualitative case study research that focuses on knowing and understanding a particular case well (Stake, 1995).

Taken a step further, Briggs and Coleman (2007) defined an educational case study as “a critical inquiry aimed at informing educational judgments and decisions in order to improve educational action” (p.142). Hence, educational case study research presents the following characteristics: (a) it is conducted within a localized space and time, (b) it looks into interesting aspects of an educational activity, program, institution, or organization, and (c) it is analyzed within its natural context and within an ethic of respect for persons (Briggs & Coleman, 2007).

Additional strengths of a case study include the ability to “retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events” (Yin, 2009, p.4) and to use “a full variety of evidence - documents, artifacts, interviews, and observations” (p.11). Because of its strengths, a case study is a particularly appealing design for applied fields of study such as education. An applied field’s processes, problems, and programs can be examined to bring about understanding that in turn can affect and perhaps even improve practice (Merriam, 2009).
The variability of case studies aligns well with my constructivist viewpoint. Specifically, given the unpredictable nature of fieldwork and human interactions, researchers cannot anticipate how a case study will unfold. As such, the ability to focus on issues as they progressively emerge from the case study was appealing to me as I approached this qualitative study. Taken together, all of these factors serve to illuminate why the case study approach was employed in this research.

**Site Selection and Sampling Procedures**

The site and selection for this study were chosen based on criterion and purposive sampling strategies (Creswell, 2007; Krathwohl, 2009; Merriam, 2009; Mertens, 2010; Patton, 2002), a term that is based on the assumption that I wanted “to discover, understand, and gain insight” through this analysis, and I therefore selected a sample from which “the most can be learned” (Merriam, 1998, p.61). Site selection criteria included an accredited college or university in Ireland that demonstrated a commitment to internationalization through specifically outlined university objectives and long-term plans. Additional criteria included an institution that was willing to participate in the study and one that was accessible for fieldwork (Krathwohl, 2009; Mertens, 2010). Such criteria were important to my selection process because time for fieldwork was limited, which required that I pick a case study that was accessible and hospitable to my research inquiry (Stake, 1995).

Based on advice from consultations with key informants (Spradley, 1979), I explored Trinity College Dublin (TCD) as a possible case study institution. My initial interest in TCD was largely due the institution meeting the site selection criteria. As a former graduate
student in Ireland and as an alumnus of Trinity College Dublin, I was made aware of
Trinity’s generally receptive nature towards research of its institutional processes.
Additionally, more extensive research revealed TCD’s commitment to internationalization
illustrated in the form of its “Global Relations Strategy.” The strategy highlighted how TCD
proposed to become Ireland’s university on the world stage by embedding
internationalization into the institution’s culture and by creating a Trinity community that
was inclusive, integrated, and global. Trinity’s commitment to internationalization was
further illustrated in its goal to be a major hub for international cultural, social, and
intellectual exchanges in the country (TCD, 2014). Ultimately, a study of this type can be
particularly illuminating for all that can be learned from a case study dedicated to describing
the internationalization process at Ireland’s leading university, whose central objective is to
become the country’s “major hub” for international education.

I contacted Trinity College Dublin and was granted permission to conduct this
research study at TCD. TCD met my site selection criteria, as TCD was an accredited and
accessible university in Ireland that was committed to internationalization and was willing to
participate in the study (Krathwohl, 2009; Mertens, 2010). Taken together, the steps
employed in selecting the case study institution ensured that a valuable and meaningful
discussion ensued from the analysis.

The Setting

Founded in 1592 and based on the general structure of the ancient colleges at Oxford
and Cambridge, Trinity College Dublin is the oldest university in Ireland and one of the older
universities of Western Europe. Trinity’s major academic disciplines include the arts, humanities, engineering, science, and human, social, and health sciences. In 2011, Trinity was ranked in the top 1% of research institutions in the world in 17 fields, including Molecular Biology and Genetics, Immunology, Microbiology, Chemistry, Life Sciences, Social Sciences, Computer Science, Clinical Medicine and Engineering (TCD, 2014).

Trinity College Dublin’s 47-acre campus of cobbled squares and historical buildings is located in the center of Ireland’s capital city. The university’s library is the largest research library in Ireland, likely best known for its extensive collection of manuscripts, the most famous being the Book of Kells. Today, Trinity has a large international community of almost 17,000 students, 92,000 alumni, and 2,860 members of staff. The student population represents 122 nationalities and a wide range of social backgrounds and cultures. The university also prides itself on attracting academic staff from around the world, with 40% of Trinity’s academic staff originating from outside of Ireland.

**Participants**

The participant selection process was guided by the criteria that interviewees were employed by Trinity College Dublin as a university administrator, academic, or staff and were directly involved in the decision-making and implementation of internationalization plans. Participant selection was intentionally focused on recruiting participants from the three categories of Trinity personnel at the administrative, academic, and staff levels to capture the perspectives from each.
Participants were recruited through targeted personal communication including email, phone, and Skype. Participants were asked to pass on information about the research study to individuals they knew who met the criteria of the study. I provided participants with a copy of the recruitment letter (see Appendix G) and my contact information to give to others who they thought may be interested in participating in the study. In this way, the recruitment of participants for this research included chain referral sampling (or snowball sampling). With this method, participants used social networks to contact people who could potentially participate in or contribute to my study, and then provided my contact information and details on my research to the potential participants so they could then contact me to discuss the study. Snowball sampling was ideal for both my circumstances and in an effort to find and recruit groups that may not have been accessible through my targeted personal communication.

The participants for this study consisted of university administrators, faculty, and staff who were directly involved in Trinity’s internationalization process. More specifically, the participants included two senior-level administrators and academics, three mid-level administrators, three academics, and three staff. Two of the interviewees served in dual roles as senior administrators and academics. To maintain the highest level of anonymity in this study, interviewees’ names, actual titles, and roles were not disclosed. Interviews were limited to administrative, academic, and staff posts and did not include students, as the objective for this study was aimed primarily at capturing the perspectives of institutional
actors most directly involved in the decision-making and implementation of internationalization plans.

Data Collection

The main methods of data collection for this study entailed conducting interviews with participants; document analysis, which included documents dedicated to Trinity’s internationalization process (i.e., university promotional brochures, fliers pertaining to international student events, and materials dedicated to various international activities and student support services); examining university documents on the internationalization planning process; and observing Irish government web sites and web sites pertaining to multiple aspects of Trinity’s internationalization process. In light of the fact that interviewing and observations are mutually reinforcing, qualitative techniques (Patton, 2003), field observations (and field notes) provided supplemental details for the context of this study. I also kept a journal to record my observations, hunches, and any ideas or questions that surfaced in the process.

Interviews

A central characteristic of qualitative research maintains that “the researcher must physically go to the people, setting, site, institution (the field) in order to observe behavior in its natural setting” (Merriam, 1998, p.7). As such, visiting the case study institution in Ireland and talking personally with the selected participants served as the primary mode of data collection. Interviews are considered the most fundamental data source in case studies (Krathwohl, 2009; Mertens, 2010; Yin, 2009). The interviews were conducted over a period
of three weeks with 12 interviewees. This number was determined based on the number of interviews conducted for similar case studies (Knight, 1994; Rumbley, 2010).

Ragin (1987) suggested that qualitative research should be focused on identifying commonalities between types and then drawing out the implications of these commonalities to the larger whole. According to Ragin (1987) and Wolcott (1998), saturation in the data is central to determining the ideal number of participants for qualitative sampling. Thus, I engaged in recursive and interpretative methods for analyzing my data throughout the course of the interview process in Ireland to ultimately determine a level of saturation.

I conducted semi-structured interviews (one per interviewee), with a “mix of more and less structured questions” (Merriam, 1998, p. 73). By following a prepared interview guide (Appendix C, D, and E) (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 1990), I had a list of questions and topics to cover during the interview, and at the same time, I was able to follow topical trajectories in the conversation (Creswell, 2007; Dexter, 1970; Merriam, 1998) that strayed from the guide. General topics covered in the interview guide focused on interviewees’ understanding of university goals for internationalizations and interviewees’ roles in meeting those goals; motivations, obstacles, and outcomes from the process; levels of awareness and satisfaction; and definitions for the internationalization process. Interview questions were sometimes altered based on the participants’ understanding (or lack thereof) of the interview questions that led to restating the interview question in a manner that was clearer to the interviewee. Stake (1995) noted the concept of “progressive focusing” encourages altering the interview design if questions
are not working or if new issues arise. The option to alter questions was particularly useful given the cross-cultural nature of this study and the diverse accents and word choice variations that necessitated making changes to the interview questions.

Semi-structured interviews are considered most appropriate when “you won’t get more than one chance to interview someone” (Bernard, 1988, p.204). This distinctive feature of semi-structured interviews was of particular appeal, given that I traveled to Ireland once for a finite amount of time (three weeks) to conduct research. To ensure high quality interviews, I conducted two pilot interviews. The first interview was with a former colleague and current director of a study abroad office in the United States and the second was with a native Irish university administrator who was not an interviewee in this study. The pilot interviews informed changes to the interview guide by highlighting those questions that were redundant and needed to either be either eliminated or consolidated with other questions and questions that needed to be rewritten in a way that was clearer and more concise.

To maximize my time in the field, interview dates, times, and meeting locations were scheduled well in advance of my travel dates to Ireland, and I emailed each participant to reconfirm our interview details a week prior to my arrival. The participant determined the location of our interview, each of which lasted between 60 and 100 minutes in length. I assigned a pseudonym for each of the participants, and I used two recording devices for the interviews, with each interview labeled or saved under the respective pseudonym.

I shared important details regarding the purpose and procedures of the study prior to the interview, including information about Institutional Review Board (IRB) review and
strategies to protect participant confidentiality. Once approved by the IRB at North Carolina State University, the interview protocol was made available to participants prior to the interview itself. Also vital in the interview process, I secured a completed informed consent form from the participants as well as permission from the participants for me to keep a secured (password protected) copy of the interviews.

I took detailed field notes during the interview (Merriam, 2009) to add contextual insight and points of interpretation. Soon after each interview, I took reflective notes on the interviewee’s responses to the questions, any observed non-verbal communication “to describe what I saw, heard, felt” (Cherry, 2000, p.67), and my initial thoughts and interpretation of the interviews. Finally, I left my contact details with the participants, and made it clear that I could be contacted in the event that they had follow-up questions for me or had additional information to share following the interview.

Field Observations

Additional observations were conducted which served as supplemental information to richly describe the institutional context. In the process, I took field notes in accordance with the observational protocol (see Appendix G). These notes served as supplemental and contextual data to substantiate other data sources (Yin, 2009). Observations included international student events held on campus (i.e., International Green Day; international student tours; and international student lunch gatherings) international university office settings, and international student service departments. Within those settings, I observed the actual set-up of the office space, with a particular observatory lens focused on how
accommodating they were to Trinity and international students. Also observed were people’s interactions (for example, Trinity staff and their dealings with students), student traffic within the office, and the actual services or activities that international students availed of in the given setting.

**Document Analysis**

Document analysis included reviewing documents related to Trinity’s internationalization process (including university promotional brochures, fliers pertaining to international student events, and materials dedicated to various international activities and student support services); university reports on the internationalization planning process; Irish government websites; and websites pertaining to multiple aspects of Trinity’s internationalization process. In judging the value of a given data source, Merriam (2009) suggested the researcher ask whether the document “contains information or insights relevant to the research question and whether it can be acquired in a reasonably practical yet systematic manner” (p. 124). According to Merriam (2009), if these two questions could be answered in the affirmative, the data source was deemed appropriate for use for this study.

If no documents existed or if the documents were meager and seemed uninformative (Guba & Lincoln, 1981), this also informed me on something about the context, value placed on the topic, and possibly resources and support mechanisms (or lack thereof). Hence, even incomplete and/or uninformative documents could be hugely enlightening and provide insight to support the rich, thick descriptive component of this qualitative research study.
Finally, and similar to field observations, document analysis notes served as supplemental and contextual data to substantiate other data sources (Yin, 2009).

**Field Notes and Self-Reflective Journal**

Finally, I used field notes and a self-reflective journal to record my own thoughts, feelings, experiences, and insights as the study occurred. Field notes were recorded throughout the collection and analysis of all three sources of data, including interviews, observations, and documents. Throughout this study, I also kept a self-reflective researcher journal to detail my thoughts, feelings, perceptions, and discoveries (Merriam, 2009). The journal was a confidential document kept on a password-protected flash drive. The saved research did not refer to any participants by name.

**Data Analysis**

The major task of analyzing qualitative interviews and observations is data reduction, because the amount of qualitative research data tends to be voluminous (Cherry, 2000). In order to manage the large volume of data, I analyzed data simultaneously with data collection (Merriam, 1998). As such, data review and reflection were an ongoing, cyclical process with data collection (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011; Krathwohl, 2009; Merriam, 2009; Mertens, 2010; Stake, 1995).

Ultimately, data analysis is the process of making sense out of one’s data (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009). “Making sense” of my data was both rigorous and systematic (Patton, 1999). I took a two-phase approach to the data analysis portion of this research study. The first phase of data analysis took place after the interviews concluded, when I
found a place at Trinity to sit and reflect. In accordance with the recommendation by Bogdan and Biklen (2006), I took researcher field notes during the course of the interviews about possible themes or ideas that emerged. Once each interview concluded, I reviewed my researcher notes and wrote in my journal with my thoughts, hunches, feelings, metaphors, or analogies that came to mind about the conversation I had with the participant.

The second phase of data analysis, when all of the interviews were completed, involved organizing and storing the collected data in multiple locations, followed by a period of transcribing the recorded interviews. I had the interview audio recordings transcribed as interviews took place by a transcriptionist service (Verbal Ink). Although there can be risks involved with using an outside transcription service, including lack of familiarity with terminology used in internationalization (Merriam, 2009), I verified transcriptions through my researcher field notes and by listening to the audio recordings to confirm their accuracy. Transcriptions were labeled by pseudonym and name only.

With the organization and transcription of the interviews complete, I then read the transcripts, and I wrote in my journal to record my thoughts about the data, an exercise I continued throughout the data analysis component of this study. Next, I took the first step in coding, termed “open coding,” which is the process of making notes directly on the transcriptions; this allowed themes to emerge as interpretation occurred (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011; Merriam, 2009; Mertens, 2009). I first analyzed the data through the process of individual case analysis (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009). Each individual participant was analyzed to determine their perspectives on the internationalization process at Trinity as they
related to research questions. During this process, I created a codebook to define common
codes and to help organize my data, codes, and themes (Creswell, 2007; Mertens, 2010). By
the end of individual case analysis, I had 60 codes defined in my codebook.
Next, data were synthesized across participants. More specifically, through the process of
axial coding, I compared data across participants to determine similarities and differences,
and examined common themes that emerged on the internationalization process at Trinity, as
perceived by the participants (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009). Axial coding
further entailed grouping my long list of open codes into patterns, which gradually developed
into categories or themes (LeCompte, 2000; Merriam, 2009). Throughout this process, my
initial codes were revisited and in some cases, eliminated or consolidated with other similar
themes, with new codes also being incorporated where appropriate. I then reviewed the text
from the document analysis component of this study and incorporated it to the analysis and
interpretation of the data. Field observations provided supplemental details to the coding
process, as an additional level of support to the themes that developed. Throughout this
entire process, I took notes on my observations, which were used to provide additional level
of insight and understanding on the internationalization process. The processes of coding,
theming, and comparing as the three core steps to qualitative data analysis (Creswell, 2007)
were continued throughout the data analysis process. In doing so, I identified recurring
regularities or patterns within the data that led to the eventual construction of statements to
describe the general findings.
Trustworthiness

It was critical that data collected was considered trustworthy and of high quality. Several methods were employed to maximize accurate representation of participants’ perspectives in the study (Stake, 1995). Methods of trustworthiness such as triangulating data, pseudonyms, and researcher reflexivity were employed to address credibility, transferability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

To address the important issues of credibility and dependability, data triangulation (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Cherry, 2000; Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011; Krathwohl, 2009; Merriam, 1998, 2009; Mertens, 2010; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009) was addressed by comparing the data collected from the administrative interviews, academic interviews, field observations, and the document analysis component of this study. Triangulation was used to establish credibility by gathering and comparing information from multiple sources (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). By triangulating information, an objective representation of the data was demonstrated (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

Bloomberg and Volpe (2008) defined credibility as making sure “the findings are accurate and credible from the standpoint of the researcher, the participants, and the reader” (p.86). Conducting member checks (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Tracy, 2010) by sending data and interpretations back to the individuals from whom they were derived and asking the interviewees if the results were plausible, further served to enhance the rigor and credibility of this study. Member checking has been described as the most important technique in establishing credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Once the interview process
was complete, I emailed the participants the transcripts from our interviews. In a separate email, I asked each participant to verify the accuracy of their responses and to clarify and/or modify them as they determined appropriate. Three interviewees responded to me via email with minor edits to their interview transcripts.

Peer debriefing is another way to establish credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I asked three peers with qualitative research expertise in a doctoral program at North Carolina State University to review my codes and themes and to engage in discussion regarding my data collection and interpretations made. By employing the skills of other qualitative researchers, I sought to ensure a level of accuracy was achieved (Creswell, 2007; Krathwohl, 2009). The researcher’s feedback provided support that my codes were appropriate and aligned with their interpretation of the findings.

I provided rich, thick description of the data to enhance the possibility of transferability, or the potential applicability of the research in an alternative context (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2008; Merriam, 2002; Mertens, 2010). Erickson (1986) argued that since the general lies in the particular, what we learn in a particular case could be transferred to similar situations.

I left an audit trail through the process of detailing the methods, procedures, and decisions made in carrying out the study (Merriam, 2002). Details for an audit trail were established through my thick description of the research design and process. Throughout the entire course of the study, I engaged in reflexivity through the use of a research journal. In
my research journal, I documented “biases, dispositions, or assumptions” that I had about the study that could otherwise potentially affect the investigation (Merriam, 2009, p.219).

**Ethical Considerations**

“Qualitative researchers are guests in the private spaces of the world. Their manners should be good and their code of ethics strict” (Stake, 1994, p.165). As a qualitative researcher who collected data from people regarding their professional lives, I recognized my duty to use the most ethically appropriate measures to protect the individuals and institutions taking part in this research study.

Ethical measures already highlighted included providing an explanation of the study’s purpose to the participants, obtaining a statement of informed consent from the participants, recording the participant agreeing to participate in the research interview, and seeking to avoid researcher bias through the use of notes to describe “what I see” (Cherry, 2000). Additional steps were taken to abide to the human subjects procedures that are detailed by North Carolina State University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). The data collection process for this study did not begin until this study was approved by the IRB at NC State. The approval process required me to summarize the contents of this document and to provide copies of the instruments I used to collect data and the consent form I had participants sign before commencing data collection.

Finally, an additional consideration was the privacy of the participants (Creswell, 2007; Mertens, 2010; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009). I recognized that even with the use of pseudonyms, participants could be identified in the study due to the small number of
participants and the limited number of positions with administrative oversight of internationalization activities at TCD. As such, as an additional confidential measure, I did not detail the university roles for the participants, but described interviewees’ positions in general terms. I included confidentiality details on the participant consent forms, and I discussed the same details as part of the introductory conversation I had with participants (Creswell, 2007; Mertens, 2010; Yin, 2009).

**Researcher Paradigm, Role, and Subjectivity**

Central to the constructivist paradigm is the belief that people assign meaning to the objective world, that there can be multiple realities, and that their experiences are valued and unique (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011; Merriam, 2009; Mertens, 2010; Stake, 1995). My personal view of research aligns with the constructivist worldview, as I embrace these convictions. As a constructivist researcher, my goal for this study was to understand the participants’ multiple social constructions and interpretations of meaning and knowledge (Mertens, 2005). The internationalization phenomenon touches upon multiple layers of experience within the Trinity case study institution. Each university participant had a distinct experience with internationalization that could only be understood through the examination of their point of view. The constructivist paradigm allowed for an interactive process, one that was authentic and encouraged reflection and rapport between the researcher and the participants (Merriam, 2009; Mertens, 2010).

As a qualitative researcher, I served as the primary instrument for gathering and analyzing data, and consequently, designed the interview questions, created the observation
protocol, and obtained, analyzed, and synthesized all necessary documents (Merriam, 2009; Mertens, 2010). As an observer-participant, I sought to obtain insider information while maintaining some outside perspective (Yin, 2009). In doing so, I made my presence known to the participants but did not attempt to disrupt or alter any environments or situations encountered (Merriam, 2009; Mertens, 2010).

I recognized that my role as the primary investigator was limited in that I am a human instrument - that is, I was capable of making mistakes, missing opportunities, and allowing personal bias to interfere in the research process (Merriam, 1998). Therefore, it was important that I recognized the subjectivity I brought to this analysis (LeCompte, 2000; Merriam, 2009; Stake, 1995), as researcher bias is a central dilemma in qualitative research (Cherry, 2000; Merriam, 1998) and has been the source of some criticism of both the case study method (Yin, 2009) and research directed in a cross-cultural context (Cherry, 2000).

I am a first generation Irish-American, with my father emigrating from Ireland. My husband was born and raised in Ireland, and I have many Irish friends and family that have garnered positive feelings about my connection to the country. I acknowledged that my enthusiasm for and history of personal engagement with the topic of study could create a level of bias. I also acknowledged that my role as a credible researcher relied upon my ability to recognize and manage these potential biases.

I was personally familiar with the case study institution, as I attended graduate school at Trinity College Dublin. I kept in mind that my experience as former study abroad student must not bias my expectations of what I learned about the case study institution’s experience
with internationalization. Although my cultural ties and a portion of my education are Irish-based, I am predominantly a product of U.S. American society. I was continually mindful throughout the course of this cross-cultural study that my understanding of and experience with internationalization was acquired primarily from observing the phenomenon from a U.S. American perspective. I recognized that an U.S. American’s viewpoint of internationalization could vary greatly from a European perspective, which potentially could lead to some form of confusion and possible conflict. Finally, I worked as an international educator for over 10 years and acknowledge that I was predisposed to see internationalization as a fundamental element of the university experience.

I understood it to be vital throughout the course of this study to monitor these potential biases and conflicts and to continue to examine them throughout this study by seeking the feedback and the objective perspectives of my dissertation chair and key informants. By listening carefully, being a good communicator, and being sensitive to the feedback of the participants, I was able to maintain a level of reflexivity and ultimately generate reasonable and meaningful conclusions.

**Chapter Summary**

This descriptive case study sought to describe the internationalization process at Trinity College Dublin. My constructivist paradigm ideally aligned with examining a case study to achieve this objective. This chapter discussed characteristics of qualitative research and case study methods, justifying both as appropriate for this study. I also explained the site selection process and sampling procedures, the setting, and the participants. Moreover, I
described the data collection process, including interviews, field observations, documents analysis, field notes, and a self-reflective journal. Data analysis procedures were described, as were the important issues of trustworthiness, ethical considerations, and finally, my researcher paradigm, role, and subjectivity were outlined in the final section, describing my biography and potential biases I brought to the study as the primary research instrument.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

This qualitative case study was conducted to better understand an Irish university’s efforts to become a more international institution through an in-depth and descriptive examination of the internationalization developments taking place at Trinity College Dublin. Similar to many other major universities worldwide, TCD is making efforts to respond to the increasingly inter-connected and globalized world where ideas, knowledge, and innovation know no boundaries. The globalized world has profound implications on higher education institutions, as world leaders increasingly turn to education as a means to transform their societies in response to the seismic shifts taking place in the global economy. Trinity College Dublin and institutions around the world are responding to these global trends through internationalization efforts at their respective institutions.

Internationalization in this dissertation was understood to refer to “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions, or delivery of postsecondary education” (Knight, 2004, p. 11). The first research question that guided this study focused on describing the ways in which TCD responded to global trends to internationalize. Specifically, the first research question that guided this study was “What is the process of internationalization at Trinity College Dublin (TCD) for the last 20 years?”

The following chapter will include a theoretical analysis of the research findings, and in the process, will respond to the second research question that guided this study, notably: In what ways is Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle for Internationalization an applicable conceptual framework for the internationalization process at TCD?
Trinity College Dublin, located in Dublin, Ireland was used as the research site where I conducted semi-structured interviews to explore 12 participants’ perspectives on TCD’s internationalization process. The interviewees consisted of two senior-level dual-functioning administrators and academics, three university administrators, three university academics, and four university staff. A new but increasingly adopted practice by institutions and a distinguishing feature of TCD was the assignment of a senior-level academic to oversee Trinity’s internationalization efforts. Pseudonyms were assigned to each participant as detailed in the following chart, with the university positions held by the interviewees also included.

Table 2. Interviewees’ Pseudonym Names and University Titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee Pseudonym Name</th>
<th>Interviewee University Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiona</td>
<td>Senior Administrator &amp; Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Senior Administrator &amp; Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damien</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings discussed in this chapter were drawn from data collected through the 12 interviews, observations, and document analysis, which provided appropriate triangulation for this case study. Three overall themes emerged in the process of analyzing the data collected. The three themes were ordered in consideration of the natural progression of the findings and in response to the research question and ultimate purpose of this study: to describe the process of internationalization at Trinity College Dublin. As I grouped the codes into the patterns and themes during the data analysis process, it became apparent that two of the three patterns that emerged from the coding process were questions:

1.) “Why Internationalize Trinity College Dublin?”
2.) “How does Trinity College Dublin Internationalize?”

The questions of “Why” and “How” the institution internationalized were the first two main themes that emerged from the coding process. Themes emerged as questions because subsequent patterns (or subthemes) that emerged from the data emerged as a series of answers in response to the two main questions. More specifically, participants’ various interpretations on “Why” and “How” the case study internationalized were the subthemes under the first two main themes. The final theme emerged as the “Challenges to Internationalization Efforts at Trinity,” or the obstacles Trinity faced in their internationalization process. Taken together, these three themes served to describe the process of internationalization at TCD. The findings discussed in this chapter were drawn from the data analysis and are substantiated by interviewees’ quotes, field observations, various government documents, university websites, and university documents.
A point of clarification is required regarding the data analysis process for this study. The main themes that emerged from the data analysis process were similar to some of the elements included in Rumbley’s (2010) theoretical model. While the main themes were similar, I did not analyze my data nor did I develop codes based on Rumbley’s (2010) theoretical model. Rather, I deliberately set aside and did not refer to Rumbley’s (2010) theoretical model throughout the data analysis process in order to allow the codes and themes to emerge as I interpreted them. In the process, I was able to freely develop codes and subsequent themes based on my understanding of them as they emerged, without being guided by a specific framework or list of categories.

This chapter will begin by answering the question to the first theme: “Why Internationalize Trinity College Dublin?” Included in the response to this theme are Trinity’s multiple motivations and rationales for pursuing internationalization efforts. Next, the question, “How Does Trinity College Dublin Internationalize?” explores Trinity’s internationalization business plan, the Global Relations Strategy, and Trinity’s process of integrating internationalization into university structures and functions. Finally, a description of the challenges confronting internationalization efforts at Trinity will conclude the chapter.

**Why Internationalize Trinity College Dublin?**

Included in the various ways used to describe internationalization at Trinity College Dublin are the rationales that motivate the institution to integrate an international dimension into their teaching, research, and service functions. This section will examine what motivates Trinity College Dublin to internationalize by exploring answers to the simple question: “Why
internationalize?” Several, interconnected responses exist, which will be discussed in the following sections.

**Catching Up With Peer Institutions**

A strong sense of urgency was evident in interviewees’ discussions regarding a strategic plan to internationalize TCD. The immediacy for pursuing internationalization efforts in a swift, concerted, and timely manner was largely due to the Trinity lagging behind peer institutions in their efforts to internationalize. Trinity quickly realized their peers were far ahead of them in terms of meeting the challenges of a changing global environment and the subsequent expectations placed on institutions worldwide to internationalize.

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, TCD was regarded as very international in focus, given the institution’s vast international influence and global research and scholarly connections at the time. As Fiona noted, “the truth is, Trinity was a more cosmopolitan institution in the 1950s and 1960s.” During the 1970s and 1980s, great efforts were made by the Irish government to increase the number of students in third level education in Ireland. Hugh noted, “A large expansion in higher education took place, and the numbers went from 8,000 up to 17,000.” The Irish government sought to provide expanded opportunities to large number of Irish citizens and in the process, address the growing needs stemming from the massification of their higher education institutions. With the focus turned to massification efforts, Ireland became very parochial and insular in focus, and Trinity’s international efforts dropped significantly in importance as a result. Not until the late 1990s, when, as Fiona noted, “the Celtic Tiger unleashed its fury” (and the world economy shifted
in such a way that significantly affected Ireland’s economy) did Trinity realize the institution’s comparatively slow and deficient internationalization efforts. Fiona added, “All of a sudden we’re like, ‘Oh, hang on. There’s a big, bad world out there. And we’ve fallen behind’….So I think there was a realization that if we didn’t wake up, we would be left behind. So what we’ve been doing is playing catch-up for the last two years.”

Aware of their need to internationalize, Trinity devoted a considerable amount of time, beginning in September 2011, to researching global strategies of some of the world’s top universities, with a specific concentration on the global developments taking place at Trinity’s peer institutions. Based on this research, it was clear that the majority of Trinity’s peer institutions had embarked on internationalization a decade prior, and with significant effect. As Maureen noted,

…other institutions, not even necessarily peer institutions, but other institutions lower down in the rankings with less of an international reputation are actually further ahead and more internationalized than Trinity. So there was a very clear decision taken when the current provost/president was selected about two years ago to…be proactive and strategic about it [internationalization] in a way that hadn’t been the case before.

The urgency for Trinity to internationalize became apparent as leaders recognized how far behind their peers Trinity was in their internationalization efforts. According to participants, Trinity was at least 10 years behind, and in some cases, (when comparisons were made between Trinity and very internationally progressive institutions) as many as 20
years behind their peer institutions. As such, Trinity was faced with the reality that entailed catching up on 20 years of practice. As Maureen noted, “I think that realization is only something that has started to hit since the imperative to internationalize has been taken seriously.”

Trinity realized it was far behind other institutions in their internationalization efforts and the realization resulted in the very real imperative and strong motivation to pursue strategic internationalization efforts in a timely manner. Also instrumental in Trinity’s decision to internationalize was revenue generation, which is the motivation discussed in the following section.

**Generating Revenue**

Revenue generation was a prominent motivator and objective for TCD’s internationalization efforts. As a Trinity academic noted, “Internationalization is seen as a way to bring new resources into the system.” Before elaborating further on this significant motivating factor, a brief review of the historical context behind TCD’s various sources for income generation is merited.

An interviewee noted that for nearly all of TCD’s existence, Trinity had been self-sufficient and relied upon internally generated income. Indeed, since TCD’s founding in 1592 as a largely self-funded institution assisted by private support, TCD achieved a great deal, including the construction of a world-renowned campus and library. Additionally, many noteworthy Trinity alumni became leaders in their fields and made a significant impact
on the world in the process, including such renowned graduates as Beckett, Berkeley, Goldsmith, Walton, and Wilde (TCD Web Author, 2014).

TCD’s reliance on its own generated income continued until relatively recently. In the 1970s, the Irish government sought to increase higher education opportunities for larger numbers of the Irish population. The massification of Irish higher education was fueled primarily by state funding for buildings, facilities, and student support. As with most European universities experiencing the same growth in student numbers, Trinity became increasingly dependent on public funding. Irish public funding, however, was significantly impacted and challenge in 2008 with the global financial crisis.

Participants for this study described the 2008 global financial crisis as severely influencing the Irish economy, compounded by the economic problems related to the collapse of the Irish property sector that took place at the same time. The unprecedented economic crisis in Ireland resulted in an increasingly unstable fiscal environment, with the country falling in and out (but mostly in) of a recession since 2008. Economic challenges and the subsequent recession continued in Ireland, and resulted in drastic austerity measures being implemented. Public sector funding was cut, notably funding for Irish higher education institutions. Interviewees noted that with State funding under significant pressure, Trinity experienced the consequences of the reduction of and over-reliance on government financial support.

In light of Ireland’s unstable fiscal environment and the subsequent reduction in government funding support, TCD was faced with the challenge to find its way back to the
times when it relied upon its own resources to support the institution. Trinity administrators and faculty alike recognized that austerity measures and the significant pressure on State funding were unlikely to reverse soon. Therefore, they knew they must come to terms with the sudden challenge to find alternative revenue sources to supplement the loss of government financial support. Interviewees noted that at that time, a new era of greater autonomy began whereby Trinity had to become more in control of its affairs and less reliant on government funding.

Interviewees noted that in order to supplement the loss of government funding, Trinity turned to internationalization efforts as one core component to produce revenue. Some of the interviewees noted specific internationalization goals that were dedicated to increasing the annual return to Trinity’s bottom line included increasing Trinity’s number of non-EU, fee-paying international students by 1,000 (from 1,200 to 2,220) by 2015/16; increasing fundraising by 50% by 2015/16; and increasing alumni giving from 2% to 5% by 2015/16. In their own way, these revenue-producing goals served as motivations for Trinity to internationalize, which will be discussed in this section.

Some interviewees were clear in noting the Trinity community generally understood the dire financial climate in which Ireland and Trinity existed and the subsequent reasoning behind international student recruitment, as Claire noted:

…everybody knows that the universities, all the universities are in crisis in terms of funding. Funding is being cut back, cut back—and, so the most straightforward mechanism, and I think all the other universities are doing the same thing, are
bringing in international students. That’s where the big fees are, obviously. I think that’s obviously one of the biggest objectives.

Indeed, Trinity’s internationalization motivations were considered by several of the interviewees as primarily to make money, as Claire noted “…money, money, that’s all it is.” Kathleen concurred, but added that such efforts are promoted under the guise of lofty, more altruistic reasons, “So I’m afraid for all of the joy and altruism of internationalizing education, the bottom line is what it’s all about.” Regarding the main motivation for internationalization efforts at Trinity, Kathleen noted:

…austerity and money, basically, but - covered over by a pattern of concern for global international education and the value of diversity and all of that stuff, but very much about [the money]…I’d like to say it was just for the value of having a diverse campus and giving overseas students a great experience, but I’m not sure that’s what it’s really about…

While some viewed money as the primary motivator, many of the interviewees had a more varied viewpoint on the various rationales behind Trinity’s efforts to internationalize. As Jack noted:

I’d say the primary incentive has to be financial. Because, as you know, the Irish university sector, like the Irish economy in general, has been hit quite hard over the last few years, but I mean, that’s been a trend even before the current economic crisis. The level of funding towards the third level sector in Ireland has been declining,
really, so universities are looking for other sources of funding and international students are seen as a source of money through fees and so on.

In addition to international student recruitment, philanthropy was the other form of major revenue generation at Trinity. Fiona noted, “...the income is coming from philanthropy and student recruitment…so they'd be the two primary ways of bringing money in, but very important in the current economic climate.” The philanthropic goals highlighted in the Global Relations Strategy were to increase fundraising income by 50% from 2011 to 2015.

A valid question to ask is how fundraising relates to institutional motivations to internationalize. Interviewees addressed that question by noting that at Trinity, motivations to internationalize were intricately tied to the potential philanthropic opportunities that could be developed in the process of expanding Trinity’s global relationships. More specifically, global relationship building was a central part of Trinity’s Global Relations Strategy and was recognized in the strategy as an ideal opportunity to fundraise for the university. Representatives from the Trinity Foundation (the Trinity organization in charge of fundraising for the university) accompanied the Global Relations Office on their international trips, along with high-level university representatives and academics. The trips to key geographic world regions could include such activities as meeting with industry leaders, alumni, and higher education institutions who could become potential exchange and research partners and in the process, contribute financially to the institution in various ways.
For example, the Trinity Foundation staff used the international trips with the Global Relations Office as a gateway to create relationships with industries in key geographical regions of the world (i.e., India, Asia, and the United States). As Hugh noted, the relationship building process was a gradual, but strategic, one:

The thing is, what I've done is, gone in and embedded us, research-wise, in their industries…worked really hard to meet the owners, and what [we] do is use the provost’s visit…we had been introduced to various people, so then I was able to say, ‘Well, our president is coming; can we meet X?’ So that just opened the door to X, and then that filtered back down, so…since last year, [we’ve] been getting in on the research level with each of the companies that [the Provost] has seen the owners of. [The Provost] is going back again…so there are proposals around research…as a result of this last trip.

By creating relationships with industries abroad, the Trinity Foundation could generate research contracts with those same industries that eventually lead to philanthropic gifts. Visibility and physical presence in the country was described as paramount to the fundraising process, as Hugh noted:

Because they can see that you're in the schools, that you're in the universities, and that you're in the industry. Basically what [Trinity has] done is…used the industries and…used Trinity’s STEM expertise to get into specific industries whose owners [Trinity is] after.
Additionally, a vital component to Trinity’s international fundraising efforts was their efforts to follow-up with initial relationship building engagements. The Trinity Foundation followed up with potential international fundraising sources through repeated trips to visit international industries. “Because,” as Hugh noted, “basically, what we’ve done is, we’ve gone deeper.” More specifically, the Trinity Foundation began with a formal introduction to potential industry links. As Hugh noted: “…to begin with, it was, ‘We’re Trinity College, we’re good at this.’” Then, the industries came back to Trinity to discuss potential collaborations between the industry and Trinity. At that point, Hugh noted, “then there’s a chance that we will get research funding from the company, because that’s the way it operates. So, they will either sponsor Ph.D.’s in the area where they want the research done, and so on…” The Trinity Foundation developed relationships with the hope and intent that international industry links would lead to varying types of funding (in the form of sponsorship of Ph.D. students, sponsored research collaborations, sponsorship of research labs and/or Trinity buildings). In this way, motivations to internationalize were strategically tied to the potential philanthropic opportunities that the phenomenon offered, such as global relationship building with institutions, industries, and partners abroad.

Similar to philanthropy, interviewees noted that financial motivations to internationalize were tied to potential alumni engagement opportunities that could be developed in the process of expanding Trinity’s global relationships. Alumni engagement was included as a main pillar of the Global Relations Strategy, with the goal to increase alumni giving from 2% to 5%. The long-term approach to increased alumni donations
required efforts to raise awareness among the current Trinity student body on the importance of giving back to the University. The short-term, more immediate goal was for the GRO (in collaboration with the Trinity Foundation) to focus its efforts on relationship building with alumni. Given that Trinity was relatively new to alumni relations development, the initial question they asked themselves, according to Fiona, was, “How do you develop a relationship with your alumni?” Increased contact with alumni was determined as the initial stage. Once contact was made with alumni, the pressing need to increase alumni giving led to the second question posed, notably: “How do we engage with high net worth alumni?” A Trinity senior level academic and administrator questioned how to engage high net worth Trinity alumni: “[Trinity] would be interested in the high net worth across the globe. So it’s been identifying these people. How do we engage them for Trinity?”

Trinity began to develop relationships with international alumni (including high net worth alumni), particularly on the Global Relations Office international trips. As a Trinity administrator highlighted “…when high-level delegations are traveling to some of TCD’s major areas of development (i.e., the United States, India, China), then they would usually bring alumni into some of the recruitment events that they run.” Indeed, the Global Relations Office staff and the delegations that accompany them on trips abroad used international travel as an opportunity to form relationships with high net worth Trinity alumni worldwide.

Interviewees noted that revenue generation was a motivation for Trinity to pursue internationalization, as is evidenced in the specific internationalization goals outlined in the Global Relations Strategy that are dedicated to increasing the annual return to Trinity’s
bottom line (i.e., increasing Trinity’s fee-paying international student numbers, increasing fundraising, and increasing alumni giving). The Irish government also played a role in motivating Trinity to internationalize, which is the topic discussed in the following section.

**Following an Irish Government Directive**

In light of the increasing globalization and interconnectedness of the world today, the Irish government recognized the need for Ireland to play an integral role in global developments. The Irish government highlighted the imperative for Ireland to take a strategic approach to developing global relationships, with particular recognition given the important role the Irish higher education system had to play in the country’s international engagements and development of global relationships (Strategy Group, 2011).

The document, issued by the Irish Department of Education and Skills, titled, “Investing in Global Relationships: Ireland’s International Education Strategy 2010-2015,” detailed plans, expectations, and timelines for Irish higher education institutions to internationalize. The document served as an outline and instigator for the development of internationalization strategies at Irish institutions. The following are summary points of key objectives and targets for the internationalization of Ireland’s higher education institutions by 2015, which are fully outlined in “Investing in Global Relationships” (High Level Group, 2010):

- increase total international student numbers (including full-time, part-time, and exchange) in higher education institutions to 38,000, an increase of over 12,000 or 50% on current numbers
• increase the number of full-time international students in higher education to 25,000
  an increase of 8,500 or 50% on current numbers

• increase the proportion of international students pursuing advanced research to 15%,
  or 3,800 students (up from the 2,600 present figure, or 8% of Ph.D.’s and 2% of
  research masters students)

• increase the proportion of postgraduate international students from 13% to 20%,
  representing 5,100 students

• increase the number of exchange and junior year abroad students from outside the
  European Union to 6,000, from its present approximate level of 3,600

• examine educational sectors in which domestic demand has decreased and in which
  more ambitious targets are possible - these will be examined as part of the overall
  review of capacity development

• increase the number of English-language students by 25% to 120,000

• significantly diversify offerings in the English-language sector to include more
  teacher training courses, greater transnational delivery, and further collaboration with
  the wider tourism sector

• enhance the total economic impact of international education by 300 million euros to
  approximately 1.2 billion euros in total

• increase direct employment in the English-language sector by 25%, to 1,250 full-time
  jobs
• increase the number of offshore students (i.e., students pursuing Irish education programs outside the Irish jurisdiction) by 50% to 4,500.

The objectives and targets outlined in the government document ultimately served as an impetus for Trinity to pursue a focused strategic internationalization plan. The same objectives also served as a blueprint for the strategic internationalization plans that Trinity began to research, develop, and implement. Kevin noted:

The Irish government really took a concerted approach towards the internationalization of higher education here and so obviously the launch of Investing in Global Relationships - the government strategy 2010 to 2015 with the internationalization of higher education is very important as a driving force in mobilizing the sector as a whole…

Interviewees noted the Irish government’s most compelling rationale to internationalize Ireland’s higher education institutions was due to the long-term benefits gained from the process. For example, Ireland’s international students could be future advocates for Ireland, and relationship building with institutions and industries could develop into trading and business partners for Ireland. In this way, the Irish government’s enactment of internationalization efforts at Ireland’s institutions was recognized to have larger, long-term, national, and economic implications.

**Enhancing Reputation and Increasing Visibility**

Highlighted by interviewees and in the promotional materials on Trinity’s global endeavors was the goal “to build on and increase the institution’s global reach and
relationships as Ireland’s university on the world stage and as one of global consequence” (TCD, 2014). Inherent in this goal was the prerequisite for Trinity to increase its visibility at a global level. Fiona noted, “Say Trinity’s a great institution, but if the world doesn’t know that, you’re a bit scuppered [wrecked or destroyed]. And we’re not Oxford. We’re not Cambridge. We’re not Yale. We’re not Harvard. You have to go out there and tell people about [Trinity]. So visibility and profile was hugely important.”

Conversely, the alternative to not pursuing efforts to develop a strong global reputation, one that is both recognized and respected, also served as motivators for Trinity to internationalize, as Fiona highlighted:

…in a sense, a university of this age and standing cannot afford not to do this.

It’s an imperative that we do it because the consequences of not doing it mean going into a different league and going very downward. It’s what’s driving it all.

Efforts to increase the visibility, reputation, and brand recognition were manifested through the institution’s touted “Science Gallery,” a unique model of public engagement that was originally conceived in 2008 to act as a bridge between Trinity and the wider Dublin community. Publicized as a place “where science and art collide” (Science Gallery, 2014) and where imagination and invention unite, the Trinity organization was sponsored by Google.org to internationalize its efforts. Although difficult to define, the Science Gallery is described as an exhibition that brings together works designed by artists, designers, scientists, and engineers on a given topic (for example, addressing the question “How to work and live when weather changes take place in the future?”). Discussion and debates take
place on the chosen topic and encourage participation from the public. Due to its large success, the Science Gallery branched out from Dublin and is planned to open eight Science Gallery locations in partnership with leading international universities in urban centers including New York, Singapore, and Moscow by 2020.

According to Kevin, The Science Gallery exhibitions were considered “very important in terms of creating visibility.” Kevin elaborated upon the strategic advantage of the Science Gallery in terms of the impact it could have on potential or existing academic global partners with Trinity:

So the idea is to open up nodes internationally of Science Gallery. Already exhibitions of science gallery are traveling internationally, but the idea is to have permanent exhibitions with a strong academic partner in key international destinations.

The Science Gallery was perceived to assist in Trinity’s efforts to increase its brand recognition and to develop an internationally recognized and respected reputation at the same time.

As an additional note regarding enhancing Trinity’s reputation and visibility, Trinity was acknowledged by several interviewees as being the best university in Ireland. Also acknowledged was the necessity to internationalize and to be active on a global level in order to continue to be the best. As Hugh noted:

Trinity is definitely, without a shadow of a doubt, the best university in Ireland. Like, way ahead in terms of - and it’s got a very good history going for it, and it’s very
ambitious, and it’s got a lot of excellence, so if they want to continue to develop that, they have to go out there and push it [the internationalization agenda].

Fiona concurred, noting that Trinity “…can be a little sleepy, parochial university, ‘that number one in Ireland,’ but who cares, or you say, ‘Actually, that’s not good enough.’ You really want to be up there with the very, very best.” The alternative, as Hugh noted, is to be left behind and to no longer be the best: “…you have to, if you want to be the best, or you want to be up there, you've got to do these things [internationalize], because if you're not doing them, you're going to get left behind.”

In order to be the best institution in Ireland and to provide a high-quality educational experience, attracting the best students and faculty was a noted imperative. Fiona remarked, “…the best universities attract the best faculty and students.” Additionally, from a university administrator’s perspective, the importance of recruiting the best academics was also stressed:

Well, I guess the most important job I do…is to help my academic schools get the best possible academics. I look for people who are good at research, very good at research. Even the junior members, I want to see that they have potential to work at the international level of research. After that, I need to ensure they can teach and have the will to teach. Those are my criteria, in that order. A lot of those people are gonna come from abroad, or will be Irish people who’ve been abroad for a substantial amount of time - i.e., four years or so. I'm not biased against the Irish, but I want the very best academics.
Also stressed by a Trinity academic and administrator was the importance in establishing research links with the world’s best institutions. Joe noted, “I’m trying to build up the research interactions of the academics here with key countries—the best institutions in key countries.”

From a faculty perspective, attracting the world’s best students was of great appeal, as Fiona noted:

The thing is, I think any professor wants the best students. You don't care if they're where they're from as long as they're bright students. So... again, as long as you're providing quality students, they don't care if they're from India, from Ireland, from Pakistan; it's irrelevant.

Faculty also acknowledged the benefits of a diverse student population for the enhancement of both teaching and learning. Fiona noted, “…we've all taught classes of mixed [students]. There's a huge difference in terms of the quality of the class, if it's a mixed cosmopolitan group, it's a far superior discussion group.” While increasing international students was viewed by many to enhance the quality of Trinity education, critics of internationalization often pointed to efforts made by Trinity and institutions worldwide to recruit large numbers of fee-paying international students. In response, Fiona noted, “But I think it's unashamed…it's not about the money. Trinity will always focus on quality, not quantity. That we're absolutely clear about, definitely.”

The influence an institution’s global visibility, brand recognition, and reputation have on a university’s ranking were also included in this discussion on reputation and visibility.
Hugh recognized “…reputation is very important in how you come up in the rankings.”

Most, if not all, university ranking systems include a section on internationalization. As a result, interviewees noted that Trinity was even more motivated to internationalize and consequently, to attempt to improve their global ranking in the process. Taken together, Trinity’s efforts to internationalize were motivated by its desire to increase its visibility, reputation, brand recognition, and rankings.

Prepared Globally Minded Graduates and Other Holistic Rationales

Included in Trinity’s reasons to internationalize was the hope and expectation that their students would be globally minded graduates. Fiona highlighted, “We wanted Trinity to be a global campus, educating people to be global citizens.” Educating students to be global citizens requires what Fiona calls a “cosmopolitan” university. Joe concurred, noting that while 40% of the academic faculty was international, only 6% of Trinity students were non-EU students (the average for Trinity’s competitors was 20%). As such, Trinity’s efforts to recruit international students extended beyond monetary reasons, to include a diverse educational population. Fiona noted:

You want a mixed, cosmopolitan campus…And we’re doing a disservice to the Irish students by having simply an Irish-only campus or a European-only campus…We have to recognize that. And one way of recognizing that is ensuring that we are educating Irish people along with the future leaders of Africa, Asia, the Americas, wherever it may be. And so from an institution, but also from a national
perspective, especially little countries like Ireland; five million people? Geesh, it’s a suburb of Delhi. So that puts it all in some sort of perspective.

Additional efforts to prepare students to be globally minded graduates included infusing an international perspective into Trinity’s teaching and curriculum. Maintaining their already large percentage (40%) of international faculty was also noted by Kevin as “integral to creating a multicultural learning environment and to preparing Trinity’s students to work with diverse populations.” Finally, efforts to create outward student mobility options for Trinity’s own students were noted by interviewees as integral preparing students to be global-minded citizens.

Ultimately, developing a campus that was international in orientation was fundamental to Trinity’s efforts to ensure an inclusive and multicultural environment for students of all backgrounds. Interviewees noted that by increasing international diversity among the student body and by creating a more diverse culture on campus, Trinity’s graduates could experience a more globally balanced education. The exposure to different beliefs, viewpoints, and values in the classroom setting, laboratories, and residences was noted as essential for Trinity students who could then enter the marketplace as fully engaged global citizens.

In addition to graduating global citizens, included in interviewees’ discussions on Trinity’s motivations to internationalize were additional holistic motivating factors that extend beyond the potential to generate funds and touched upon rationales more altruistic in nature. Indeed, reasons beyond just the financial were highlighted by interviewees as
motivations for Trinity to internationalize and in some cases, defended. Kevin noted, “Fundamentally it’s about growing numbers [student numbers]…However, I think that that’s very crude, and I think that every university would understand that this is about a much bigger thing than just revenue generation.” Trinity’s more holistic list of rationales for internationalizing, beyond the money, are further noted and justified by Hugh: “It’s much bigger than that, because if it’s only about the money, it won’t work. It definitely won’t work, because it’s a lot about the relationships. It won’t last if it’s only about the money, that’s the thing. That’s probably why some people fail at it, actually.” Brian concurred, referring to a more holistic set of motivating factors behind Trinity’s internationalization efforts: “…it’s not just about the financial targets, it’s about the bigger picture as well.” Jack extended the same line of discussion, noting:

    But there is, at the same time, there are good kinds of academic and cultural reasons as well. Maintaining Trinity’s profile in a global or international context, academically, and in terms of research and so on, is also seen to be extremely important, both in terms of quality of - in terms of academic quality, in terms of reputation, credibility, and so on.

When highlighted by interviewees, the holistic reasons to internationalize, focused on enhancing the quality of education and research at Trinity, were noted after and in less detail than the more economically and politically focused list of rationales discussed above. While mentioned as an addendum to the more central reasons to internationalize, the more holistic and academically focused rationales were included by many interviewees.
The various motivators described in this section contributed to Trinity’s reason to internationalize. Taken together, Trinity’s motivations were aggressive in nature due to a strong drive to catch up with its peer institutions’ internationalization efforts, to follow the directives of the Irish governments, and in the process, to enhance its visibility and reputation as the best institution in Ireland. Particularly given the dire economic climate in Ireland and within Trinity, the motivation to generate revenue also contributed to the aggressive and timely nature of Trinity’s internationalization efforts. Interviewees referenced this list of motivations as a means to enhancing the quality of a Trinity education. As the same time, less emphasis was placed on those objectives noted to be the purpose of internationalization, namely preparing globally minded graduates and enhancing the value of Trinity education and research. The following section will review the next logical question, “How does Trinity College Dublin internationalize?”

**How Does Trinity College Dublin Internationalize?**

In response to the main theme and question that emerged from the data, “How Does Trinity College Dublin Internationalize?” the internationalization process was integrated into Trinity’s institutional structures and functions. Trinity’s “Global Relations Strategy” was the strategic plan that detailed the multiple approaches taken on how such a process would unfold on campus. This section will begin with a brief background on the Global Relations Strategy in order to gain a general understanding of the strategy as interviewees and relevant documents described it. A detailed description of how Trinity pursued internationalization will then be discussed. By taking an institutional-level perspective, the process of integrating
internationalization into Trinity’s structures and functions will be described, as will how that process meets the objectives outlined in the Global Relations Strategy.

**Trinity’s Internationalization Plan: Implementing the Global Relations Strategy**

In 2010, the Irish government issued a report “Investing in Global Relationships,” which outlined for Irish institutions internationalization objectives, targets to meet, strategic actions to enact, and implementation goals. Trinity followed the national government directive and used that report to design its own institutional strategy. The outcome was the creation of a robust and aggressive business plan titled the “Global Relations Strategy.”

The main goal of the Global Relations Strategy (GRS) highlighted in promotional materials and echoed by interviewees was for Trinity “to build on and increase Trinity’s global reach and relationships as Ireland’s university on a world stage and one of global consequence.” The GRS was highlighted as a symbol of Trinity’s long-term commitment to achieving its internationalization goals and to building partnerships and cooperation among leading educational institutions worldwide. From a national level, relationship building was noted to positively impact Ireland. More specifically, the GRS was discussed as a means to enhance the quality of education and research in Ireland and to promote cultural and economic exchange. Those efforts ultimately would enhance Ireland’s efforts to transform itself into a global innovation hub.

From an institutional level, the GRS recognized (through a formal business plan) that for Trinity College Dublin to succeed in an increasingly competitive environment, internationalization needed to be developed as a long-term and sustainable process, based on
high-quality and balanced engagement with international partners. Developing a global focus through the implementation of the GRS was intended to raise the profile of Trinity as an international education destination and research hub.

Individual Irish higher education institutions responded to the national government’s mandate to internationalize through their own unique approach. According to interviewees for this study, Trinity spent considerable time researching peer institutions’ internationalization plans in order to determine and design the ideal internationalization strategy for Trinity, which was eventually approved in December 2011 as the Global Relations Strategy.

The main goals of the Global Relations Strategy were to increase Trinity’s number of non-EU, fee-paying international students by 1,000 (from 1,200 to 2,220) by 2015/16, increase fundraising by 50% by 2015/16, and increase alumni giving from 2% to 5% by 2015/16. Less central goals included doubling the number of Trinity students studying abroad, improving Trinity’s international reputation and global visibility, and improving the quality of a Trinity educational experience. The GRS strategy and concept behind the strategy will be highlighted in the following sections.

Managing international services with a business plan. Universities worldwide have traditionally approached their international endeavors by centralizing their international activities through an international office. The international office was traditionally housed on campus and included a director and various levels of administrators and staff who worked on the details involved in sending and receiving students and faculty abroad. In many cases,
the international office would also contribute to the design of university internationalization plans (EUA, 2010).

Trinity took a different approach from the more traditional in their internationalization strategy. Rather, the GRS is an aggressive business plan, with a Global Relations Office (GRO) appointed to implement the strategy. To support the implementation of the GRS, Trinity dissolved the institution’s former international office and replaced it with the Global Relations Office, hiring 32 new staff over the first two years of the GRS’s implementation. The office operated as a business, with a specific business plan, clear goals, and key performance indicators (KPIs). Under the new division of labor for international operations, the GRO handles international student recruitment up until the point when international students commit to attending Trinity. International students are then streamlined into the same administrative procedures as all other Trinity students and work with the Academic Registry for all of their administrative and admissions questions.

Several interviewees recognized the divided process to the recruitment of and admissions for international students represented an unfortunate turn in Trinity’s international student support services. The recent division of international recruitment and admissions responsibilities was (up to the point of writing this dissertation) still under review for possible change. Issues faced because of this new division of labor under the Global Relations Strategy will be further discussed in the upcoming “Challenge” section of this dissertation.
Funding institutional internationalization strategy with university resources.

Included in the features of the GRO was its rather distinct source of funding - the office was entirely financed through university sponsorship. Under a self-funded model, the total investment required to plan the strategy and to hire staff was financed by Trinity College Dublin funds (or ‘non-exchequer’ funding - money that is not from the Irish government, but rather is university generated). As a result, the Global Relations Office staff was paid from non-exchequer income and was not liable to the “Employment Control Framework (ECF).”

The implications of being immune to the ECF were significant. To understand why this was the case, a brief review on the background of the ECF is merited.

The Employment Control Framework was enacted after Ireland declared itself financially bankrupt and sought a bailout from the EU and IMF in 2010. The Irish government then had to enact a series of austerity measures to pay back its debt. Included in the repayment plan was the Employment Control Framework, under which the Irish government enacted a series of significant cuts in the number of public servants employed and in public sector pay (von Prondzynski, 2013).

The implications of the GRO not being subjected to the Framework were significant, as Maureen noted:

I think where this office has been funded by Trinity's own funding, it isn't affected to the same extent as the rest of the university by the government cutbacks and the employment control framework, which is very important, which means that basically, there can be no additional staff recruited anywhere in the publically funded areas of
the university, which means that if someone goes on maternity leave, no replacement. If somebody is out sick, no replacement. If somebody retires [no replacement] - and we're in the third or fourth year of this now, so the knock on effects are pretty dire really.

Although the GRO was established in the midst of a national recession and measures for drastic financial cuts were in the process of being enforced, the GRO was not subjected to nor largely impacted by the austerity measures. The implications of other university units being subjected to the Employment Control Framework and additional austerity measures will be discussed in future sections. The point most relevant for this section, however, is that Trinity’s commitment to their internationalization strategy was important enough that Trinity self-funded the operation and kept it immune from potential financial challenges that the dire national economy and exchequer regulations could otherwise impose upon it.

**Utilizing senior-academic to lead internationalization.** Several of the interviewees noted the significance of the leader of the Global Relations Office and the position’s responsibility to lead Trinity’s internationalization efforts. The leader of the Global Relations Office was noted as significant, as new title of Vice Provost of Global Relations was the first appointment of its kind in Trinity’s 400 year history, and a senior-level academic was appointed to the position to start up the Global Relations Office and to implement the Global Relations Strategy. One interviewee described the creation of the Vice Provost’s position: “Basically, what happened was, we have a new provost, and internationalization was a big thing on his agenda, so he created a Vice Provost for Global
Relations, which is the first time that’s happened in the university.” By appointing a senior-level academic, Trinity was demonstrating its commitment to the internationalization process and recognizing the importance of having an academic lead the endeavor. Interviewees noted the rationale behind appointing a senior-level academic to lead the implementation of the GRS was to ensure the concepts of teaching and research would remain a primary focus in the internationalization process.

The advantage of appointing a senior academic to lead the internationalization process was noted to be significant in terms of setting a precedent at Trinity, and also in terms of being helpful in gaining clout and opening doors when visiting institutions and industries abroad, as a distinguished title and high position in the university hierarchy can be important to the external relationship building process. As a Trinity staff noted, “There’s a big difference between [the Vice Provost] going in and just myself going in.” For example, a Vice Provost would have more opportunity to meet with university representatives abroad at a higher level than a staff member. Such meetings could then lead to more productive and university recognized international developments. Along the same lines, in terms of internal relationship building, a senior academic was noted to be able to gain greater buy-in for the university’s internationalization endeavors from fellow Trinity academics who otherwise may not have paid as much attention to the process.

Additionally, the value and significance of an academic leading the internationalization process versus a pure administrator of higher education was further exemplified in interviewees’ candid thoughts on the topic: “The less administrators are
involved in the top of it, the better, I think.” A benefit and a key objective of including academics in Trinity’s internationalization process was the goal to keep the emphasis focused on education and research. Ironically, a Trinity administrator noted, “I think the academics need to lead it [internationalization], because the core business—is about research and teaching. The further you let an administrator in to run that, the more you'll **** it up, basically.” In this way, Trinity’s inclusion of academics demonstrated the potential to advance the internationalization agenda and main objectives through an academic’s efforts to maintain a focus on education and research.

Motivating objective: The bottom line. Trinity’s rationales to internationalize extended beyond the institution’s desire to generate revenue. Creating a diverse and multicultural educational setting, graduating global citizens, and increasing visibility and the quality of a Trinity education were all discussed as motivators to internationalize. These same rationales led to the creation and implementation of the Global Relations Strategy. The GRS, however, was a business plan. As a result, the GRO was held accountable to very strict rules and expectations, including the requirement to meet designated KPIs and, ultimately, a bottom line. Thus, while the rationales to create and implement the GRS were certainly diverse in nature, the strongest motivator was revenue generation. As Maureen explained:

While at one level, we have had resources invested in the Global Relations Office, those resources have been invested and underpinned by a very aggressive business plan, so this amount goes in, and this amount must come out at the end. So we’re operating more like a little business in a sense than probably anywhere else.
Trinity’s former international office was supported by government funds and was not focused entirely on a bottom line or on KPIs. Given that the Global Relations Strategy was a self-funded, Trinity initiative, the pressure was high to generate revenue, and consequently, was the dominant motivator. The business oriented, revenue-focused goals of the Global Relations Office was a distinguishing feature and approach to internationalize Trinity.

As an incentive for the Trinity community to generate revenue, the GRS also included an incentivization scheme for individual schools within Trinity to recruit international students. As Maureen highlighted:

Basically, the way the incentivization scheme works now is that the school will get 40% non-EU income generated by that school above a baseline. So baselines were set three years ago, which were taken to be, ‘okay, this is what you can do in peacetime, in a sense. So now, everything you earn from non-EU student income above this baseline, of that 100%, 60% of it will go to the university's bottom-line and 40% goes back to the school.’

The incentivization scheme was not yet implemented at the time data was collected for this study, but the scheme was due to function as a motivator for schools within Trinity to recruit international students, and once a school was above their baseline for the number of non-EU students, the scheme worked as a revenue generator for the schools. The Global Relations Strategy was a business plan and therefore, operated like a business, with the central focus to on meeting the bottom line and generating income. The design was distinct, more business-orientated, and illustrative of the increasing trend to fuse business with
academia, in comparison to the more traditional international office model, which operated as an academic unit, with the focus on education and learning.

Interviewees noted the recent implementation of the Global Relations Strategy plan necessitated more time to determine if a ‘bottom line/business model’ approach to internationalization would be the ideal approach for Trinity because, as Maureen commented: “I don't know yet whether [the Global Relations Strategy is] best practice.” Time was needed, according to interviewees, to determine the effectiveness and outcomes produced by the Global Relations Strategy.

Integrating Internationalization into Trinity Structures and Functions

Trinity leaders recognized that in order for internationalization efforts to take place in a strategic way, a fundamental shift in the university culture, structures, and functions were necessary for the Trinity community to be receptive and responsive to incorporating an international component into all aspects of the university. Since the GRS implementation in 2011, the Global Relations Office and its advocates across campus have taken steps to integrate internationalization into Trinity’s structures and functions through a variety of methods. The following section will discuss the interrelated methods used to integrate an international component into the structures and functions of Trinity College Dublin and in the process, further demonstrates how Trinity internationalized.

Developing internal relationships between the Global Relations Office and Trinity community. One of the methods for promoting and developing Trinity’s international initiatives was through cultivating relationships between the Global Relations
Office and the Trinity community. Indeed, the GRO recognized the importance of developing relationships with the university community in order to gain rapport and support for the Global Relations Strategy and for internationalization developments as a whole. A Trinity administrator acknowledged the timeliness and importance of the process, noting, “Aligning the interests of the Global Relations Office and university community is vital and takes time.”

The Global Relations Office worked to spread awareness about the internationalization developments taking place at Trinity. In addition to publishing monthly newsletters to update the university community on internationalization developments taking place, the GRO held town hall meetings. Town hall meetings were held every January and were open to the entire Trinity community. The town hall meetings served to inform the Trinity community of the work conducted by the GRO and functioned as a forum for the Trinity community to volunteer the international work they were pursuing and as a forum to open up dialogue between the Trinity community and the GRO, whose representatives were available for questions. The meetings were geographically themed in an effort to surface new connections across the Trinity community. For example, the town hall meetings helped the GRO become more informed on international research projects being conducted by academics with institutions in a given geographical region of the world that they otherwise would not have been aware of.

The GRO also worked to communicate with the Trinity community on the details involved in internationalization activities. As one administrator noted, “[The Global
Relations Office] is like a central advice center rather than a coordinating center.” For instance, if a department was approached for an exchange and did not know what to say or how to assess the potential exchange, the department could simply pick up the phone and the GRO would try to guide them through the process and provide feedback on the exchange. As one administrator noted in reference to this example, “I think those kinds of things are just really nuts and bolts and really important to people.”

**Cultivating buy-in from the Trinity community.** A significant amount of time was noted by interviewees to have taken place into securing buy-in from the Trinity community. A Trinity administrator noted, “[The Vice Provost’s] job in the beginning was all about buy-in, was all about explaining to the university community why Trinity had to do this and hearing what they had to say.”

The GRO sought to gain buy-in from academics across Trinity by inviting Trinity academics to travel with the GRO on their international trips. The goal was to expose academics to the benefits of building global relationships through first-hand experience so that they could return to Trinity as advocates for the wider internationalization process. Interviewees noted that buy-in from Trinity academics was secured for the internationalization process when academics learned how their own work could be assisted by the GRO. A Trinity administrator provided the following example:

One of the things that I've really seen start to happen…is the development of that buy-in where academics are realizing, hang on a second, actually this can help my work too because it can raise my profile because I may be trying to access a research
contact in X University in China, and I may be having difficulty, but the Global Relations Office might already know if there's someone else in Trinity who has contacts there.

Buy-in was also achieved on some levels due to the incentivization plan that compensated university departments and student services for the additional international students they were expected to serve. Under the incentivization plan, various student service departments would be compensated for every additional non-EU student confirmed by Trinity’s return to the government. For instance, if the amount of compensations was 20 euros, and a student service department (i.e., health services) had 100 more international students this year than last year, then the student service department would receive (100 x 20 euros = 2,000 euros) 2,000 euros transferred into their department account, in addition to their regular transfer of funds into their department. The units to be included in this incentivization plan were agreed upon and signed off on when the GRS business plan was initially created. As a Trinity administrator noted, “And it was very important actually, to ensure buy-in to the strategy because there was a lot of concern that additional international students would be a burden on the system.” The incentivization plan was not implemented at the time data was collected for this study. Interviewees noted the plan would be implemented soon.

**Embedding Trinity global officers in campus units.** Several interviewees noted the role of the Trinity Global Officers as profoundly important to developing relationships between the Global Relations Office and the Trinity community and to integrating an
international dimension into Trinity’s structural processes. At the time of writing this
dissertation, six Global Officers were noted to be housed in Trinity’s nine schools.
Therefore, “in terms of embedding internationalization, that means that almost all of our
schools have someone in-house who is [a Global Relations Office representative] as well.”
The Global Officers were technically officers of the Global Relations Office, but they had a
dual reporting structure, reporting to both the GRO and to the Department Heads of their
respective schools.

Global Officers played a significant role in the internationalization process at Trinity
and served in a unique role in that they were “internally focused, as opposed to externally
focused,” as Maureen noted. That is, the Global Officers focused on internationalization
within their departments, with less focus on external global relations. The role of the Global
Officer was described as working across two Global Relations Strategy pillars:
internationalization and alumni relations. A Trinity staff member elaborated on the role of
the Global Officer:

So internationalization would be about embedding the culture of internationalization
within each of the departments that [they] work for, creating international networks or
developing those for the departments, engaging with prospective international
students, meeting with current international students when they’re here to get
feedback and measure how they’re doing, and then just gathering intelligence and a
list of stats and to feed back into the regional officers.
The alumni relation side of things [Global Officers] would be involved in organizing events for alumni across each of the four departments. [Global Officers] have a newsletter for each department. It’s a lot of events actually. And then, [Global Officers] also run a mentoring program which links in students with alumni, so it gives students a great sense of what graduates have gone on to do.

Being physically present within their designated department, amongst the academics and staff of their departments, was noted as a valuable aspect to gaining departmental buy in and rapport for internationalization efforts. In that way, they have the opportunity to interact with the department deans and heads of schools on the ground. In doing so, the Global Officers worked to build capacity for internationalization in the academic schools, and constantly fed information and updates to the GRO and to their respective schools.

Funding a Global Officer position was shared between the GRO and Trinity departments who chose to have one. The breakdown was described over a three-year period. In year one, the GRO funded 80\%, with 20\% paid for by the department with the Global Officer. In year two, the individual schools paid 50\%, and, in year three, the schools paid 20\%. A Trinity administrator described the long-term funding plan:

Over time, the idea is that they become self-funding by virtue of the increased income that they're generating via, not just student recruitment, but also philanthropy. So, they work a lot with the alumni office organizing events for alumni and linking in with alumni abroad.
The concept of the Global Officer was generally regarded as helpful and a significant part of integrating international awareness into a department’s structure and functions. Concern was noted, however, that smaller schools with fewer resources could not avail of a Global Officer due to lack of funds to sponsor one. Smaller schools would, therefore, be left at the disadvantage of not having the designated person to work on student recruitment or alumni relations. Subsequently, the department would also be left without the added monetary incentives that were distributed when departments recruit additional international students. The smaller, less-funded departments would then be left to use their current staff and limited resources and expertise to market their department and to develop alumni activities. Cost sharing ideas across departments were being discussed at the time of writing this dissertation that could develop into a process whereby a few smaller departments would share one Global Officer.

**Engaging Trinity academics.** The inclusion of Trinity academics on the Global Relations Office trips abroad is an additional illustration of how the Global Relations Office sought to develop relationships with the university in an effort to integrate a more international dimension into the university structures and functions. Interviewees made note of the more than 40 international relationship-building trips taken by the Global Relations Office in the past year and a half. The inclusion of a large number of academics on those trips was noted as integral to the internationalization process. As one interviewee explained, “The other thing is, when we travel, you tend to travel with academic colleagues. So I would have traveled over the last 18 months with about 100 different academic colleagues.”
Interviewees frequently noted buy-in from faculty was a key objective in the decision to include them on international trips, as the faculty could then return from the trips abroad as advocates for the wider internationalization strategy. As a Trinity academic noted:

So they might be from physics. Then they're the ones going back proselytizing for you in physics, or wherever. [Laughter] So what we've been able to identify are…you'd have academic champions across the university who - and we have 24 schools. So if 100 people have traveled, at least one or two people from every academic school will have traveled with us.

**Determining which academics travel.** The Global Relations Office may recruit academics, or academics or Trinity department heads may contact the Global Relations Staff and express an interest in being included on a trip. In describing the selection process for academics, a Trinity administrator noted, “And then you'll either go to the dean saying, ‘Well, I need a computer scientist,’ or, ‘I need an engineer,’ or, ‘I need somebody from politics.’ And if the dean is paying, the dean will choose that person. If [the Global Relations Office is] paying, [the Global Relations Office] will just go directly to the person or to the school and say, ‘Can I take X with me?’” The selection of which academics join the Global Relations Office trips was ultimately determined by what the objectives of the trip and who would be visited abroad, both of which were predetermined by the Global Relations Office.

Once abroad, academics were noted to be actively involved in the international relationship building trips, as one interviewee described:
And then [the academics], when they're on the road with us, they'll go into high schools, they'll go into colleges, they'll - sometimes we'll do fairs; not very often, but if we do, they'll go to the fairs. They'll also engage with the alumni, and we'll always have social events. So people or policymakers...[academics] will come in engaging with industry. You want your corporate people included in meeting academics too. So it just will depend on the schedule, who you'll bring in and out.

The findings for this study indicated faculty were selected based largely on the predetermined goals for the trips, which were outlined by the Global Relations Office. The following section will discuss the important question of why faculty was included on the international trips.

**Recognizing the value of including academics in internationalization.** Among the stated reasons for including faculty on the Global Relations Office international trips was that academics represented Trinity’s serious level of commitment to developing relationships abroad and Trinity’s dedication to maintaining an academic focus on the internationalization process. Interviewees noted that academics were integral to meetings with representatives of institutions abroad that Trinity hoped to form a partnership. Trinity academics could meet academics at the potential partner institution who shared similar research interests. This meeting posed the large potential for the establishment of future research collaborations and exchanges. In this way, academics served as an integral aspect to establishing long-term relationships with institutional partner abroad.
Additionally, academics’ role in meeting with industries abroad was noted as a central objective to including them on international relationship building trips. Trinity reached out to industries abroad to develop potential research links and collaborations. Trinity has, as one interviewee described it, “gone deeper” than the normal academic-industry relationship by bringing in more and more Trinity academics, or experts in a given field, to strengthen their industry relationship. For instance, when Trinity realized the specific needs of a given industry abroad, they then brought a Trinity academic with expertise in that particular research area to meet with potential industry partner. Trinity academics were noted to be able to detail how their research and research conducted at Trinity could directly align with the industry’s objectives. Additionally, a participant noted the reason for including an academic in this way was “then there’s a chance that we will get research funding from the company, because that’s the way it operates. So they will either sponsor Ph.D.’s in the area where they want the research done, and so on.” In this way, academics could advance their own research into the international arena, by linking with large industries abroad. At the same time, Trinity could secure additional revenue sources, with the potential for research funding and sponsorship of Ph.D.’s through the industry links.

*Understanding why Trinity academics would get involved in internationalization.*

The academics interviewed defined themselves and their counterparts as international in general academic terms. As a Trinity academic noted, “…I found out that most of my colleagues see themselves as international academics, because they interact internationally. Their research output is acknowledged internationally. They acknowledge other people’s
research.” Although they acknowledge themselves and their work as international, the same interviewees noted their priority was not on administrative components of the university, but rather on teaching and research: “I mean, academics are people who do research and teach, in that order. They spend a lot of time doing that. They don’t spend too much time thinking about what their institution is actually doing, the majority of them.” The findings for this study indicated that many academics wouldn’t really mind one way or the other how internationalization progressed, because, as one interviewee noted, “They're just doing their research and their teaching; that’s what they do. They're not the ones who are worried about whether the college will go bankrupt or not.”

With their focus on teaching and research, interviewees noted that getting academics involved the internationalization process could be difficult:

Academics are—they're almost like sole traders or franchisees, really. They want to get on with what they're doing and they don’t see themselves as employees, so sometimes when you want to sort of herd them in a particular direction to do things, it can be tricky…

At the same time, interviewees noted that getting faculty involved should not necessarily be viewed in a negative light:

That’s how it should be, really. You want these people to be self-driven in their own subjects and their teaching. You want them to be critical and therefore, they will be skeptical, you know? You want them to be selfish with their time for administration, really.
Given their clear focus and priority on teaching and research, what is important to understand then, is *why* academics become involved in the administration and development of internationalization. In response to why Trinity’s academics would be involved in internationalization, a few reasons were noted:

…they would all like to be involved with something good. Some of them definitely would take part in these exercises for the overall common good of the university or the country, but many of them will take part in it because they see they can benefit in their research or teaching. Those are perhaps two extremes, but there are lots of people in the middle.

A common response from interviewees was that academics became involved in internationalization when it somehow affected their research and teaching (for better or for worse):

We are changing the structure of the university over 10 years, and academics feel a bit frightened by that. If we're saying, ‘Well, we're going to change the composition of the student body’ - they're a bit worried about that, but only from the point of view of how it will influence their research and their teaching.

Although academics did not view it their responsibility to be involved in generating funds for the university, interviewees acknowledged that many academics are genuinely interested in internationalization and in the university continuing to generate enough revenue to function. A Trinity academic noted they become involved internationalization…
…partly out of interest, partly because they actually do see that we've got to run an organization and if we have to make sure the budget actually functions and income at least balances expenditure. I think those are the two reasons academics come on board. Many of my colleagues who go to Brazil and India and China are just doing it because they're really interested, and they feel they ought to put a bit of time into it. This study’s findings indicated that academics became involved in the internationalization process when it had the potential to affect their teaching and research. An example provided by an interviewee was of academics traveling abroad with the Global Relations Office to meet their counterparts at institutions abroad who are conducting related research, and as a result, they could collaborate on future research. The findings for this study further indicate that Trinity faculty were gradually beginning to understand the value that internationalization efforts could have on their research in terms of international activities serving to link them with research partners abroad. Conversely, interviewees also noted that Trinity academics became involved in internationalization when their research or teaching could potentially be impacted negatively. For instance, the prospect of changing the Trinity student population to include larger numbers of international students influenced Trinity faculty to become part of the internationalization process for fear the quality of students would fall. Hence, Trinity academics were inclined to participate in the university’s internationalization process when it affected their teaching and research. Just as building relationships internally between the Global Relations Office and the Trinity community was
integral to integrating a global dimension into university functions and services, building
global relationships with stakeholders external to the university were also important.

**Developing Global Relationships and Opportunities**

A cornerstone piece of the Global Relations Strategy was global relationship building.
Since September 2012, the Global Relations Office led 41 global relationship building,
recruitment, and profile-raising trips to 19 countries including such locations as Brazil,
Canada, China, India, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Singapore, Turkey, Sri Lanka, the United
States, and Russia. The objectives of these trips were varied and could include building new
research relationships and strengthening existing partnerships with universities abroad,
developing memorandums of understanding and student exchange agreements with potential
international university partners, meeting policy makers and funders, visiting targeted high
schools, and connecting with Trinity alumni. Interviewees noted the international trips taken
by the GRO also intended to provide Trinity with the opportunity to deepen relationships
with domestic stakeholders in the countries visited, including the countries’ Department of
Foreign Affairs and Irish government ministers in each of the visited countries.

To further illustrate Trinity’s commitment to international partners, senior-level
academic administrators also traveled abroad with the GRO. Rather than simply focus on
topics traditionally addressed by a representative of university international office (i.e.,
student exchange), the Global Relations Office sent senior academic administrators with
deleagations of other Trinity academics to forge relationships on a variety of internationally-
related topics. As Fiona noted:
The GRO was concerned with building relationships across the various silos...or, the totality of all of the external relationships, student recruitment, alumni, research, corporate...it's how you can take the totality of these relationships and leverage them in a horizontal rather than – because we're all very vertically oriented in the way we approach things. So this was an attempt to cut across the silos and leverage them in a very integrated way. So that was the thinking behind it.

Indeed, a key characteristic of the Global Relations Strategy was a focus on the totality of internationalization efforts abroad. By appointing a senior academic to lead Trinity’s internationalization efforts and by supporting delegations of senior academics to accompany the leader, Trinity was able to address more issues than those just associated with international student exchange. Indeed, senior-level representatives were noted as having the ability and status required to forge relationships across the various silos Trinity sought to bridge on their international trips. As Kevin noted, “I think that when you’re trying to make a splash, establish a new relationship, it’s important that it happens at quite a high level and that universities feel like we’re engaging at that level.” By “working across the silos” as Fiona noted and by “leveraging the totality of our global relationships (through research, education, corporate, and alumni)” at a very high level, global relationship building became an integral aspect to the Global Relations Strategy.

Follow-up was also noted as a key component to the process of building global relationships. Hugh noted, “…the most important thing is the follow-up.” Maureen concurred:
So, we're going back to the same institutions and to the same schools with different approaches each time, in a sense, so that the initial engagement would be introducing ourselves, and the next time you have a joint seminar with academics, next time you're signing an MOU, next time you're exchanging students, next time you're actually looking at potential research collaborations.

So, the challenge is building added value every time so that you look back over two years and you say, ‘Wow, this time two years ago, we had never been inside the door of China's top university, and now this is where we are with the relationship.’

Trinity’s efforts to follow up with initial visits abroad were noted as a new undertaking. As Hugh noted, “…that just wasn’t happening before.” Follow up and continued engagement with university partners and industry contacts abroad were noted as an essential step to global relationship building.

Finally included in the goals of the GRO was the development of international collegial relationships with Trinity’s international education administrators and staff consulting with their peers in the field of international education in other universities in the United Kingdom, Australia, the United States, for example. The noted benefits of building relationships with colleagues in the international higher education field outside of Ireland were attributed to Ireland being such a small country. Interviewees noted they welcomed feedback from colleagues abroad in the field of international higher education, as their feedback provided a broader, more neutral perspective on topics such as best practices for
internationalizing. The following section will detail how Trinity pursued internationalization through the development of international mobility opportunities.

**Developing opportunities for international learning.** Developing opportunities for international mobility was included in the goals outlined in the Global Relations Strategy. International mobility included both increased opportunities for international students to study at Trinity and for Trinity students to pursue international academic programs, both of which will be reviewed in this section.

**Recruiting international students.** Interviewees’ viewpoints on Trinity’s motivation to recruit international students varied, but they generally viewed international student recruitment in terms of the financial gain involved in the process. Interviewees noted that international student recruitment was a large revenue producing activity at Trinity. Several interviewees claimed the core objective and purpose of the Global Relations Office and the Global Relations Strategy was to recruit fee-paying international students. Kevin, a Trinity administrator, noted, “…international student recruitment, if you want to really boil it down to one thing, that is a key function of what [the Global Relations Office] is about.”

At the same time, several interviewees recognized the value of having a more international student population. The same advocates argued that motivations to recruit international students stemmed largely from the need for a more cosmopolitan, multicultural student body and were advocates of aggressive plans to recruit international students to Trinity as a result. International students were noted by some interviewees to increase the international fabric of Trinity through the diversity they contributed to classroom
demographics and discussions. Regardless of the conflicting debates over motives or purpose, international student recruitment was found to be a key and integral part of Trinity’s Global Relations Strategy.

The Global Relations Strategy included the lofty goal to double the number of non-EU international students studying at Trinity, which entailed recruiting 1,000 non-EU international students between 2011 and 2014. In order to meet this goal, representatives from the Global Relations Office met with the heads of each of the 24 schools across Trinity’s campus (and planned to continue to do so on an annual basis) to determine the target number of international students the individual schools were expected to recruit.

Once the individual schools were made aware of their target number, many were strategic in their approach to recruit international students. University academic and senior administrator Joe discussed his school’s target number and their plans to recruit international students:

I'm taking the long term view…We've decided that, since we only need about 100 students a year, we're going to triage down the best schools to about 50 of them and work at those to create a sustainable pipeline.

Joe’s comment demonstrates one example of how a Trinity department strategically approached the recruitment of their targeted number of international students. Internationalization strategies to recruit international students from a departmental level could also entail the inclusion of senior academics in the recruitment process:
It’s important that some senior academics visit these schools. I mean, most universities who visit schools in other countries send people from their international office or their marketing division. We’ve decided not to do that… I guess, because our motivation is different than others in terms of our numbers are different, we can afford to take a different approach to, I don't know, the University of ‘X’… which recruits 1,000 international students a year, you know?

By breaking down the number of international students each department had to recruit into a finite number, Trinity took a focused approach to international student recruitment. Senior academics were included in this approach, as they were asked to vet the recruitment process and potential schools from which a finite number of high-quality students could then potentially be recruited.

Additional strategic planning for the recruitment of international students included the GRO using research findings from Enterprise Ireland (the Irish government organization responsible for the development and growth of Irish enterprises in world markets) and additional internal market research sources to determine key locations in the world for international student recruitment. For instance, Kevin noted, “Texas is worth looking into for student recruitment, based on a number of factors: GDP per head, it’s doing very, very well.”

The key geographical markets identified by Trinity for student recruitment were the United States, India, and Asia.

Once key markets were determined, a “Country Advisor,” as a representative of Trinity’s GRO, worked in the key destination countries (i.e., the United States, China, and
India). The role of the “Country Advisor” in the key recruiting countries was to focus on international student recruitment and relationship building with partners abroad. At the same time, Trinity designated “Regional Advisors,” Trinity GRO representatives (who were based in Dublin) to manage aspects of international student recruitment and relationship building with prospective international students from the same key geographical areas of the world with the greatest potential for student recruitment (i.e., the United States, India, Asia).

Trinity’s Country and Regional Advisors were stationed abroad and in Dublin to develop key relationships with global partners, to recruit high-quality international students and in the process, to meet the target number of international student numbers outlined in the Global Relations Strategy.

Finally, the GRO continuously worked to establish relationships with universities who were already sending students to Trinity, whether it was through student exchange or a university that Trinity actively wanted to work with more deeply. Representatives from the GRO would travel to visit the partner institutions in an effort to increase the number of visiting international students from that institution. Through the relationship-building endeavors discussed above and through various forms of engagement and recruitment activities, Trinity strategically worked to meet the Global Relations Strategy goal to double the number of international students studying at Trinity.

*Outward mobility of Irish students.* Just as efforts were underway to increase the number of international students studying at Trinity, likewise, the Global Relations Strategy aimed to double the number of Trinity students spending a year, semester, or summer abroad.
According to a Trinity administrator, roughly 300 Trinity students spent time abroad in 2011/12. By 2015/16, the goal was to have 600 Trinity students spend time abroad. These figures were a surprise to some interviewees, as one administrator noted, “I was really surprised, actually…I was so shocked when I came here at how low the number of students from Trinity who study abroad during their degree program is.”

Because of the relatively low number of Trinity students who have academic experience abroad, a Trinity administrator noted, “One of the areas where the provost is particularly personally committed is to increase our own students’ outward mobility in a number of areas, both exchange, study abroad, internship opportunities.” Scholarships for Trinity students interested in an international academic experience were in development at the time data was collected for this study, as support for study abroad opportunities for Trinity students was seen as important to the internationalization process.

**Internationalizing the curriculum.** Incorporating a global perspective into the Trinity curriculum was also recognized as an important component to the internationalization process. Fiona highlighted the larger implications of ensuring students were learning from an international curriculum:

I think the curriculum; it's about educating our people to be global citizens. So you have to always have a curriculum that has an attractiveness in the wider global landscape, and that might include experiential learning or internships or - you always need to be thinking about what does it take to make a Trinity graduate more appealing to a prospective employer across the world. So I think that that's a really important
part of it, as well as obviously from a ranking/research perspective. You want to be the - one of those great universities in the - out there that's actually making a meaningful contribution to knowledge, to addressing the great challenges that the world faces.

In addition to preparing students to be global citizens and to increasing ranking and research profile of the institution, Trinity academics also recognized the benefits of an internationalized curriculum, as one academic noted:

I do see a return in the sense that it’s raised the profile of internationalization and globalization in the university, definitely. There’s a large number of people now who want to be involved. People are now talking a bit more about, “Well, what would we need to do about our curriculum, a syllabus for a particular course or a degree which might make it more satisfactory or more - would match more what an international student requires?” Because I don't think there’s much difference, actually, but by saying that, we probably improve the curriculum for our national students as well.

Interviewees’ discussions regarding the internationalization of the curriculum included recognition of its importance and increased interest by Trinity academics in learning more about how to incorporate a more global component into a class syllabus.

According to one of the academics interviewed, Trinity faculty have demonstrated increased interest in learning how to incorporate a more international focus to teaching and learning at Trinity. Additionally, 40% of Trinity faculty is international. In reference to the 40% international faculty figure, a Trinity academic noted, “I think that certainly would be
reflected in Trinity’s curriculum, because people had an international outlook because they came from different countries.” Several of the interviewees considered a natural byproduct of the 40% international faculty rate to be a more internationally focused curriculum by way of the academics’ diverse backgrounds and international perspectives that would be incorporated into approaches to teaching.

Establishing an international space on campus: Trinity’s Global Room. The Global Room is a large room (adjoined and easily accessible from the Academic Registry, or the main student service office on campus) developed and sponsored by Trinity as a social space for all students, international and Irish alike, to meet and engage with one another. The Global Room was established at roughly the same time Trinity’s international office was dissolved. One full-time Trinity staff member works at the front desk of the Trinity Room, with Student Ambassadors serving to assist all students (particularly international students) with questions. The room is equipped with over 300 news channels from around the world that students can sit and watch at their leisure. Headsets are available for loan, should students like to listen to a station from their home country.

Located right next door to the Academic Registry on the far side of the entrance to Trinity, The Global Room was designed as a special place for international students to seek assistance. Several interviewees noted they understood the Global Room to be an attempt to replace some of the student services previously provided by the former Trinity international office. The Global Room was also recognized as an important point of reference for international students, particularly in light of the fact that all other aspects of the
administrative and admissions processes that international students went through were mainstreamed with all of the other Irish student body.

Based on observations conducted for this study, the Global Room was a reasonably sized, modern room with an entire wall covered with flat-screen television screens. Several small, round tables were arranged on one side of the room, where international students were eating lunch together. Along one wall were brochures highlighting Trinity’s various international student support services. One administrator (who is employed by the Global Relations Office) worked behind a desk in an open office at the front of the Global Room and answered general questions asked by parents and students visiting the room. A rotating Trinity student intern also sat at the front desk to assist in answering student questions. The Global Room’s physical location on campus is located at the far end of the campus and was noted by interviewees and by my field observations as cumbersome to find. My initial field observations made note of the contrast of the physical location of the Global Room, or the main international student service office, versus the Global Relations Office, which is located in a prominent position within steps of Trinity’s renowned front gates. A few interviewees also made note of this contrast, specifically in terms of the more accommodating and prestigious campus location of the Global Relations Office compared to the rather “hidden and dark and institutional-like building” that is tasked with welcoming and serving international students.

The previous two sections presented findings related to the themes “Why and How does Trinity College Dublin Internationalize?” After discussing the rationales that motivated
Trinity to internationalize, interviews with 12 Trinity administrators, staff, and academics revealed how it was done by describing the process of integrating internationalization into university structures and functions, with the Global Relations Strategy serving as an outline for this process. Similar to any new university initiative (or perhaps more applicable in the case of the Global Relations Strategy, like any new business launch), there are always growing pains in the initial stage of implementation. As such, the challenges encountered in the process of implementing the Global Relations Strategy will be reviewed in the following section.

**Challenges to Internationalization Efforts**

This final section is dedicated to discussing the challenges Trinity faced in the process of integrating an international focus into university structures and functions. Trinity’s internationalization business plan (the Global Relations Strategy) was launched in 2011, and while previous sections of this chapter discussed why and how the approach to internationalization was implemented, this section will discuss challenges faced in the implementation process.

**Confusion and Lack of Awareness of Campus Internationalization Developments**

Although efforts were made to communicate and spread awareness on the internationalization developments at Trinity, a Trinity academic noted, “…communication in the college is not good…,” so the GRO was faced with a system-wide communication challenge from the start in its efforts to spread awareness and to communicate the details of the GRS. For example, some of the participants were unaware of Trinity’s international
office being dissolved and no longer existing. Interviewees described repeated, unsuccessful attempts to contact the former international office because of not being informed of the change. Another administrator noted, “…it can be hard to get a clear answer from the Global Relations Office.” A few interviewees noted a deep level of frustration after unsuccessful attempts to hear back from the Global Relations Office with feedback on important details such as how to formally establish a student exchange or international research collaborations with a partner institution abroad. Some interviewees noted the lack of communication between the Global Relations Office and departments across campus, but the issue was also often cased with the understanding that the Global Relations Strategy was new and still under development. “The global relations initiative…it’s kind of a new promise ship, so it’s a couple of years old, at most,” as Kathleen noted. Thus, while spreading awareness and communicating with the Trinity community was certainly a method used by the GRO to integrate internationalization into university services and functions, the newness of the office and lack of communication was also recognized as challenges to the process.

Some of the heads of Trinity’s academic departments were unaware and uninformed of the details of Trinity’s incentivization scheme, which was an expressed cause for concern. While expectations were placed on Trinity’s individual departments to increase their recruitment of international students and quotas had been established for the exact number they were to recruit, some Trinity departments were unaware of how exactly they would be compensated for such recruitment efforts. Details of the incentivization plan had not been fully conveyed to the departments at the time data was collected for this study. A few
interviewees noted that such information would be forthcoming and details would be fully discussed between the GRO and the department heads later.

**Concern for Appropriately Meeting International Student Needs**

The most expressed concern of the interviewees was whether Trinity would be able to provide the necessary level of student support services to accommodate the increasing number of international students. The international student experience was repeatedly noted by interviewees as important in general terms and specifically in reference to the success of the Global Relations Strategy. From a national level, the Irish government outlined the importance of providing a high quality, supportive, and exceptional education experience in “Ireland’s International Education Strategy 2010-2015.” The same objectives were outlined in Trinity’s Global Relations Strategy. Termed the “Trinity Experience,” the objective was for international students to have a fulfilling and top-notch educational and social experience as visiting international students so that they would return home and serve as walking, talking marketers to future Trinity study abroad students.

Interviewees also voiced concerns over the repercussions of not meeting the intended goal to provide a quality experience for Trinity’s international students. As a Trinity academic noted, “…if a student comes and doesn't have a good experience, then that's a disaster, because reputationally” Trinity is at a loss in the long term. If Trinity does not have the student support services or the capacity to accommodate international students to the high quality standards it intends, there is no point in recruiting them, as the same interviewee noted.
Concerns over the quality of the services provided to Trinity’s international students and their overall experience were noted to stem from the systems and processes in place to serve them, beginning with the recruitment process that was managed by the GRO. More specifically, the GRO managed the recruitment of international students. Once international students were recruited and “sign on the dotted line,” as Fiona noted, “and they’re admitted,” they “move out” with the care of the GRO. From that point on, international students were mainstreamed into the same admissions and administrative processes as all of the other Trinity students, a process referred to as “the mainstreaming of student services.”

International students were encouraged to seek assistance and answers to their questions from the Academic Registry. Referred to by a few interviewees as a “one-stop-shop” for students’ services, Trinity’s Academic Registry, as its website notes, represents the integration of six separate offices supporting student academic administration in the College (TCD, 2014). Academic Registry provided academic administrative services in support of the following student life cycle activities: undergraduate and post-graduate admissions, fees and payments, registration, lecture timetables, examinations and assessments, research degrees, study abroad, graduation, Seanad Éireann [the Irish legislature], university senate, and statistical reporting. International students were again encouraged to contact or visit the Academic Registry for a one-stop-shop experience in managing all administrative aspects of their Trinity international study experience. This less traditional division of labor and oversight of campus internationalization between the GRO and Academic Registry was elaborated upon by Maureen:
…a new Global Relations Office was established with many of the functions that would've been carried out by the former International Office in terms of student recruitment, but some restructuring in terms of admissions processing is now being done centrally in the Academic Registry. So some people would've worked in the International Office before, and rather than reporting into [the Global Relations Office] structures now, they're reporting into academic registry.

Dissolving Trinity’s former international office and disseminating its functions entailed reassigning staff who previously worked in international student admissions, for example, to work under the Academic Registry. Trinity’s former international office staff was reassigned to manage administrative components of international student admissions. Within the Academic Registry, a level of ambiguity was noted regarding the reporting structures and job responsibilities of the international admissions staff. For example, one Academic Registry staff member manages admissions for incoming international students from Country “A,” whereas, a completely different Academic Registry staff member manages admissions for Trinity students planning to study abroad in Country “A.”

Previously at Trinity (and more traditionally in the administration of international student admissions) the same international office staff manages regions of the world for both incoming international students and outgoing study abroad students. Consistency in staff managing the same region of the world was noted as important by interviewees and missing in within the Academic Registry. The current division of world regions between international staff in the Academic Registry was noted as a cause for great confusion within
the Academic Registry by Trinity’s university partners and across the Trinity community. In addition, the same two Academic Registry staff members referenced above reported to different managers within the Academic Registry and as a result, sat in entirely different offices. Such a disjoint and division of responsibilities was an additional cause for concern and confusion.

An additional concern expressed by interviewees was that international students were often confused on who to turn to with concerns and questions they needed addressed upon arrival to Trinity. Given that many of the students initially worked with the GRO, “most of them still will go back to [the Global Relations Office], to their initial contact in the office,” as Fiona noted. The same interviewee commented, “…it does get a bit fudgy with the visiting students because they tend to come back to [the Global Relations Office] when the intent is for them to access various other international service options available to them.”

Based on research observations taken in the Global Relations Office, international students would walk in the door of the office looking for assistance. When the Global Relations Office receptionist learned they were an international student, they would direct the student to the back of the campus, to the Academic Registry or the Global Room (depending on their need) for assistance.

Trinity’s international visiting students do indeed have multiple student service options available to them, including Student2Student peer supporters (a peer mentor group for whom students can contact with questions about all aspects of college life at Trinity); Global Relations Officer (GRO staff who are housed within various Trinity departments and
were noted to be available for international student questions and concerns); Academic Tutors (a unique arrangement at Trinity whereby every Trinity student is assigned to an academic professor as a resource for academic and personal support during their term of study); the Global Room (a dedicated room with one GRO staff member at the front desk to answer international student questions); and Career Advisory Services (a division of this office is set-up to work directly with international student questions regarding potential employment opportunities). Clearly, a multitude of student support service options existed to serve international student needs at Trinity. The concern expressed was whether such a system was actually working and if international students were receiving the assistance (notably the pastoral care) they needed. The decentralized nature of the support services available to international students had several of the interviewed Trinity academics and staff confused as to whom exactly they should contact when an international student was in need of assistance, particularly in the case of an emergency. As one interviewee noted when confronted with an emergency international student issue:

And we just didn’t really know who or where to look in the university. Did they have a policy for repatriation of students who needed to go home for medical reasons? Or what about the pastoral care element, how to tap into that? And so and again, it’s maybe a lack of communication as well, but who are the right people to talk to? And who’s really in charge when something goes wrong for an international student and so on? It’s kind of relying on the goodwill of the immediate people around, which, you know, all of us want to do that.
Similar to the other challenges encountered because of the implementation of the GRS, communication and increased awareness were noted to likely prevent future areas of confusion, such as who to contact with particular international student service questions or concerns. In the meantime, international student experiences were noted to be monitored through a formal assessment called the “International Student Barometer (ISB).” Fiona noted the last two years of ISB results for Trinity were “poor,” but results for the most recent year were expected to be released and much improved from the previous years at the time of data collection.

From a capacity perspective, particularly given the aggressive timeline and swift pace of the GRS, some questioned whether Trinity was ready to meet the international student recruitment goals outlined in the GRS. More specifically, the question and concern expressed by interviewees was did Trinity have the accommodations, student services, and basic infrastructure required to accommodate the needs of an additional 1,000 international students on campus? The consensus in response to this question among interviewees was an overriding “No.”

Trinity had very limited student accommodation options on-campus. Given Trinity’s physical location (in the middle of Dublin’s city center where land and space was limited), the majority of international students found accommodation off campus. From a cultural assimilation perspective, some promoted the merits of living in an Irish community with other Irish and international students outside the walls of the university. In converse, others argued that limited on campus accommodation options for international students put the
students in the difficult position of needing to secure housing on their own, upon arrival to Trinity or before arriving to Dublin, both of which were noted to be incredibly stressful situations for international students.

Particularly in light of the austerity measures effecting Trinity (i.e., the Employment Control Framework), “the problem is that there’s not enough funding for the support services…they're hugely stretched,” as a Trinity staff noted. As such, the GRS’s goal to recruit an additional 1,000 international students would require student services to be stretched even further, beyond their already overstretched capacity. A Trinity staff elaborated:

…like the Counseling Service…they're hugely stretched. You ring the Counseling Service because we have a student in crisis - they're booked up. They're booked, yeah. They'll make space, but they really are absolutely booked up, wall to wall. The Health Service, all of these services. The tutorial system, even, there’s not enough tutors coming up. All of these kinds of things - but this has been going on for so many years, really, that whole resourcing of the support services. So that’s not new. If anything, the situation is getting worse because you're bringing in, trying to bring in more and more students.

Efforts to address these capacity issues were underway at the time of the writing of this dissertation. The incentiviation plan, whereby the student service departments would be compensated for the additional students they serve (beyond their predetermined baseline of students) was due to be implemented in the spring of 2014. This additional funding was
expected to be funneled into the student service departments and was anticipated to bring a
level of relief to the student service departments and subsequent support for the students
served by them. Furthermore, Trinity’s lack of capacity to meet the goals outlined in the
GRS was also recognized from a strategic perspective. As one administrator highlighted,
“…the cynics would say, ‘Oh, well, we're doing that, but actually we haven’t got the
structure here to carry it.’ But I don’t agree with that, because if the flow is coming, they're
gonna do something about it.” One interviewee noted international students needed to start
coming in order to justify the funding and creation of building infrastructures to meet the
needs of increasing numbers of international student. Instead of a strategy built on the
thinking: “if you build it, they will come,” Trinity’s strategy was in reverse and, rather, the
unwritten strategy was “if they come, we will build it.” As one administrator noted:

I don’t think you can say we're gonna set up the whole infrastructure for that and then
we're gonna go out to [to recruit international students] - that’ll never work.

Trinity has seen a marked increase in their number of international students; consequently,
the university was aware of the need to address capacity challenges.

Lack of Resources and Antiquated Trinity Systems

Given the dismal economic climate of Ireland during the research and writing period
of this dissertation, a natural and assumed response to the question, “What are some of your
greatest challenges in your efforts to internationalize?” would be “A lack of resources.”
Indeed, the majority of the interviewees replied with that same answer. A dire lack of
resources was a frequently noted challenge by the interviewees. The lack of resources was
further exaggerated by the severe government enforced Employment Control Framework, whereby staff were eliminated and the remaining staff were expected to assume the additional workload. The challenging working conditions made the additional expectation to implement elements of a new internationalization business plan rather challenging for many across the Trinity campus.

In addition to these conditions, Trinity still functioned in some ways with antiquated accounting and record systems. As one administrator bluntly noted, “The systems and processes in Trinity are crap. There's no other word to describe it.” Another administrator noted, “…the registration software was so old, it collapsed one year.” The same interviewee went on to note: “A lot of the local finance, until recently, was done by Excel spreadsheets, so our financial information system is 18 years old…so the new financial information system is gonna be web based, and everything will be done through the web.” Some Trinity systems were in the process of being updated, but up until the time data was collected for this study, interviewees were still noting the challenge of having to deal with antiquated registration and financial systems. The challenges faced with having to deal with old, slow systems were noted as a further burden to efforts to implement the fast-paced GRS within university departments.

Finally, interviewees discussed institutional procedures and policies that were barriers to Trinity students studying abroad, specifically Trinity’s rather inflexible and “old-fashioned” curriculum design. For instance, Trinity has four-year degrees with specific guidelines on which courses are required for the degree, without incorporating or being
flexible to accommodate any time abroad, as Maureen noted. Maureen also noted that certain degrees were encouraged to go abroad: “Yes, in some areas like language acquisition, so if it's in French or whatever, then it would be encouraged,” yet most Trinity degrees were not designed to include any kind of international academic experience abroad.

**Uneven Funding Distribution to University Departments**

The Global Relations Office was a self-funded Trinity initiative that was financed by non-Exchequer funds (university-generated funds, not drawn from the government). Although funding for the GRS was heavily monitored and controlled, the GRO did not have to worry about funding to the same extent as other Trinity offices. Indeed, the GRO was not faced with many of the financial challenges the other Trinity offices had to manage. The challenge that did exist for the GRO was that the successful implementation of the GRS relied upon the work of the under-resourced Trinity student service offices. As a result, challenges existed at the interface between the well-funded (non-exchequer funded) GRO and the under-funded (exchequer funded) student services departments that the GRO relied upon for the successful implementation of the GRS.

**Disconnect in Office Reporting Structures**

Establishing the Global Relations Office and dissolving the former Trinity international office resulted in a great deal of changes to staff job responsibilities, reporting structures, and communication channels. A Trinity administrator best summarized the reporting structures and transition of the former Trinity International Office staff:
So some people would've worked in the International Office before, and rather than reporting into our structures now, they're reporting into academic registry. I just note that managing that transition and sometimes the disconnect that exists now from a reporting perspective between us and academic registry and admissions is a challenge. It can be at times, so that change in structure, at the time, was done for a good reason, which was to centralize everything to do with admissions, student records, fees, in a one-stop shop for all students, which I think is a very good model and is run by many universities. But the transition to implement that, we're still very much part of that or dealing with that.

The division of labor between the GRO and the international admissions team (who now reports to Academic Registry) was clearly a challenge, but one that was also in the process of being addressed at the time data was collected for this dissertation. At the same time, however, a Global Relations Office position was in the process of being created that “would almost act as a bridge between [the Global Relations Office] and the international admissions team, looking at processes, and looking at how things can be streamlined so that [the two offices can be] working more effectively together.” Hence, the issue was acknowledged and being addressed, with the hope that a level of clarity in roles and responsibilities would be achieved.

**Maintaining Quality**

Maintaining quality was also viewed as a challenge and issue of concern amongst the interviewees. The concern over quality was heightened by Ireland’s dire financial state and
the Irish recession’s impact on Irish universities that resulted in severe cuts to all aspects of Trinity’s functions and services. As Kathleen noted, “We’re now in this situation where people are scrambling around for limited resources, staff-student ratios are getting worse and people are not being replaced as they retire. All related to the financial situation of the country and cutbacks in the public sector.” The impact of the Irish recession, in terms of working with limited staff and resources, was a noted challenge to Trinity’s ability to continue to provide a high quality education to its students, particularly amongst the academics interviewed. As a member of the staff at Trinity discussed:

…in terms of the buy-in, one of the big concerns that academics had was the effect increased international students would have - well, not only standards but also class sizes, so the ratio at the moment is 25 to 1 and if there was - they were concerned that if there was going to be a huge increase then the ratio would be effected and also their workload would [increase]…

Interviewees also expressed concerns over Trinity’s aggressive and strategic approach to internationalization in terms of the effect it would have on the quality of a Trinity education. For example, interviewees who worked directly with international students detailed the negative impact Trinity’s mainstream approach to international student services had on the international student experience. The loss of personal support for international students was noted with great concern expressed over the expectation placed on international students to follow the same student service processes as all other Trinity students. The
mainstreaming of international student services was noted as a great strain on international students’ ability to acclimate and succeed at Trinity.

In reference to the topic of maintaining quality at Trinity in the process of internationalizing, a Trinity administrator noted, “Trinity will always focus on quality, not quantity. That we're absolutely clear about, definitely.” The following section will continue a similar line of discussion with a review of the challenging nature of assessing the impact of internationalization at Trinity.

Assessing Internationalization’s Impact

Some interviewees addressed the topic of assessing internationalization efforts, noting the Global Relations Strategy was “aggressively monitored.” As Maureen noted, “…we’re reporting on a quarterly basis to key committees.” The reason for such “ongoing” and “rigorous” assessment processes was, as Fiona noted: “…the college wanted to be sure, quite rightly, that it’s getting a return on its investments.” The GRO was described as “a little autonomous unit” that reports to and is held accountable to several departments within Trinity. A Trinity administrator highlights the multiple levels of accountability the GRO was held accountable to:

… [The Global Relations Office] is constantly reporting… so there's a direct relationship with the provost. And so [the Global Relations Office] also though, feeds in through the Internationalization Committee to the university council, which would be the academic body of the university. [The Global Relations Office] also feeds in through the finance committee to the board or the governing body of the
university. So you're being monitored and assessed constantly. Probably quarterly, each of these committees will meet.

The GRO reported, on a quarterly basis, to the multiple departments they fed into. The GRO also reported and monitored daily progress and progress made in predetermined segments over a period. Interviewees noted the GRO constantly assessed where adjustments needed to be made and where opportunities existed that may not necessarily have been evident at the time the original strategy was conceived. Hence, in response to evaluating the effect of internationalization on Trinity, rigorous assessments of the various quantitative goals and objectives set forth in the Global Relations Strategy were discussed by a few interviewees as confirmation of doing so.

In addition, the Global Relations Office staff produced reports that looked at KPIs focused on the various components included in the Global Relations Strategy (for example, international student recruitment, global relationship building, philanthropy, and alumni engagement). As a Trinity staff noted:

So it’s kind of like ticking the boxes - so the number of alumni events you’ve had, the number of newsletters you’ve produced, the number of publicity material that’s been produced as well and number of meetings with prospective students and new collaborations, new contacts with overseas schools - there’s a lot to report on so…

Although the GRO was held to rigorous levels of accountability and reporting structures, not all of the interviewees agreed that they evaluated all of the necessary aspects of and impacts of internationalization. Participants questioned whether the otherwise
immeasurable goals of the GRS could be assessed (i.e., how does one measure if Trinity is graduating global citizens or enhancing students’ worldviews or if efforts to raise the profile of Trinity have been successful?). As one administrator and academic noted:

Have we assessed what we’ve managed to do in three years? I haven’t really seen a recent assessment of that. I’ve seen it in terms of student numbers, but that’s only one aspect of it. How would you assess it, though? I mean, if we’re trying to raise our profile in a country like India, what are the parameters that you’d use to assess it? The number of newspaper articles that mention Trinity? You could easily fiddle that…So I'm not sure what sort of KPIs we’d use. Because it’s a multifaceted approach.

While internal efforts to report on the KPIs of the Global Relations Strategy were noted to be frequent and rigorous, the reports included quantitative details that indicated such details as increasing numbers of international students and returns on investments. A few interviewees noted concern over the focus on revenue and lack of focus on internationalization’s impact on education and research at Trinity and whether the more altruistic goals of the Global Relations Strategy were being monitored and met (for example, graduating global citizens, enhancing world views, and so forth). The lack of attention in monitoring the developments of education and research had some interviewees worried about the direction internationalization efforts could take Trinity in the future.

As mentioned previously in this dissertation, a Trinity administrator did note that international students’ experiences at Trinity were monitored through the survey
measurement tool, the “International Student Barometer (ISB)” (a formal evaluation and benchmark for international students experience at an institution). The results for year one and two of the Global Relations Strategy “is not good” and “poor” according to one administrator:

We’ll benchmark ourselves across our competitors…say, the ranking is one to seven for student services, for processes, for all these things, we [Trinity] have been at the bottom of the class consistently, which is not good.

The results of this survey were not mentioned often in the interviews for this study, likely due to their dismal nature and lack of dissemination, so interviewees did not include their thoughts on Trinity’s poor rating. An important note for the context of this section of the dissertation, however, is that monitoring of international students’ experience at Trinity is taking place and being monitored, with discussions underway on how to address the rather poor results.

**Sustaining Fast-paced Internationalization Momentum**

Since its launch in 2011, the pace of the implementation of the Global Relations Strategy was extraordinarily quick and aggressive in nature, to the point that several interviewees questioned how the momentum could sustain itself in the long term. Trinity administrators, academics, and staff all posed a similar question, in their own unique way: “Can we maintain or sustain the momentum to internationalize?” Concern was expressed that the implementation of the GRS was so quick that there was not enough time to step back, to evaluate efforts taking place, or to think strategically about the future of
internationalization efforts at Trinity. When asked about the greatest challenges facing the internationalization process at Trinity, one Trinity administrator noted:

I would say not having enough time or capacity to look at potential and new developmental areas and to think strategically as well because there's a strategy and there's an implementation plan that [many at Trinity are] all involved in doing, but it's very difficult to do and think at the same time.

The noted difficulty “to do and think at the same time” led to those involved at all levels of the implementation of the GRS to recognize the importance of taking time to reflect and, as one administrator noted, “To see the wood through the trees now because it's just getting too crazy.”

Additionally, although the GRS was described as a focused and strategic plan, the same plan was discussed as being implemented very broadly, as Hugh commented: “The thing is, you can’t really do them all, and I suppose what we've done has gone out and been very broad.” As a result, the potential to not be able to sustain such a broad and aggressive plan was highlighted, particularly in light of the level of required follow up that was previously cited as vital for successful global relationship building. Indeed, concern was expressed that follow-up would not be possible, given the broad and numerous initiatives of the GRS:

Then what we're doing is, we're creating a lot of follow up, and how do you maintain that? It’s very important to maintain that, because it’s like going out and promising and then not delivering. That could be one place that could fall down.
Clearly, sustaining the intense level of activity and required follow up involved with the GRS was a noted challenge. The highly qualified staff in place to implement and to fuel the intense momentum of the GRS was noted as vital to sustaining the same momentum. With limited resources available to recognize the level of intensity and dedication by those involved in implementing the GRS, concern was expressed over Trinity’s ability to retain such a competent staff:

… [Trinity] cannot pay people more or reward them or incentivize them. And as the Irish economy improves, the greatest threat to our strategy is that we will lose the amazing team that we've put in place. So you become victims of your own success because these people are extremely marketable. We all know how important internationalization is. So that's where it would impact. It's sort of a - it's a slightly different way, but resources are extremely important.

By engaging the Trinity community in the internationalization process and by establishing Regional Officers in Trinity departments across campus, the hope and intent was that, once implemented and integrated, the momentum to internationalize would sustain itself. A Trinity administrator summarized the long-term plan on maintaining Trinity’s internationalization momentum, noting, “…we have a lot of pluses because it’s sort of embedded kind of innately.” Embedding internationalization into Trinity’s functions and structures was seen by interviewees to be the key to creating a sustainable internationalization process at Trinity.
Timing: In the Midst of a Recession

The timing of the implementation of the GRS was a cited challenge to the implementation of internationalization at Trinity. Although the interviewed administrators, academics, and staff recognized the time to internationalize was “now” and the implementation of the GRS was necessary for many different reasons, the timing was also acknowledged as unfortunate. On one level, Ireland was in the middle of a grave recession, with financially strapped higher education institutions feeling the pinch of the severe austerity measures being enforced by the Irish government. One interviewee noted, “We were building the infrastructure at the worst possible moment. There's no doubt about that.” Another interviewee commented: “It’s probably the worst possible time to start internationalization.” However, both continued the conversation by making counter arguments, citing: “But listen, there's no good time,” and “It’s probably the worst possible time to start internationalization, but sometimes it’s the best time, when you're in crisis.” Interviewees held a common opinion that the time to implement a university internationalization plan was never ideal, with benefits and drawbacks on the actual point in time that it is implemented being inevitable. As one interviewee commented, “…I mean, this would've been not a bother to everybody five or six years ago before everything tightened up. But actually, it’s probably quite a good time to be doing it, because it was very focused.” The financially challenged climate of Trinity has led to the GRS being very heavily monitored and being taken seriously by all of those who invest their valuable time and the valuable resources into the process.
On another level, in addition to the implementation of the GRS, Trinity was in the process of implementing two other major, university-wide initiatives: the overhaul of Trinity’s financial information system and Trinity’s admission systems, with both being updated and automated so that most students could apply online, instead of using paper-based applications. Therefore, the internationalization imperative ran side by side with two other major organizational challenges, all within a university structure system that had been the same for a very long time. As Maureen commented, the “massive amount of change all happening to the same people at the same time” was certainly a challenge for the Trinity community as a whole. Maureen elaborated:

I suppose in some respects, the development of the Global Relations strategy, and the new financial system, and the new online application form, and also broader reorganization of the university structures, if you could stand back from it and identify the ideal timing for all of those individual initiatives; it wouldn't be the way it's now happening.

Although the timing of the implementation of the GRS was not at all ideal from an economic or university perspective, interviewees were also quick to note the time would likely have never been ideal. Interviewees generally indicated that the Trinity community was progressing despite all of these changes and “there’s not too much moaning,” as Hugh indicated.
Resistance to the Corporatization of Higher Education

The move to internationalize through the implementation of a business model raised issues of concern over the potential change in university focus that a business model could entail. More specifically, the implementation of a business plan, with a bottom line and KPIs, was viewed by some interviewees as a possible shift from a university focused on teaching and research to one largely concerned with revenue generation. Mary commented: “There is money to be had out of education.”

The shift to incorporating a more corporate approach to university endeavors and to the process of university sponsorship of a business enterprise within the walls of academia (such as the Global Relations Office) was noted as an opportunity for Trinity, but perhaps not in the positive sense that the word could infer. As Mary noted, “I think there’s a lot of enthusiasm in college here for the new structures that are needed to exploit new opportunities.” Although viewed as a potential threat to some, at the same time, other interviewees expressed a sense of hope that a move to a business model and a more internationally-focused institution would be equally balanced with a focus on the core function of the institution; notably, to produce valuable research and critically-thinking, open-minded, globally-engaged graduates.

The changes came because the work of the Global Relations Office was resisted at first (and in some quarters of the university, are still being resisted). The Global Relations Office was, in essence, like a startup business placed inside a 400-year-old institution, as one interviewee described it. Many in the Trinity community were more comfortable with the
traditional, collegial university model. In contrast, the business model of the GRO appeared foreign and questionable to some. One Trinity academic shared his views on the resistance:

I think most academics resisted the move to the business model, which is probably still taking place here in Trinity. I’m sure it is. It was difficult to identify the developments in college as they were taking place as to what they were for. Was it just kind of for efficiency…? But that’s very recent, really, and I think because it seems to be universal, all universities in Ireland seem to have taken on the same kind of urgent transformation of their structures. It’s all pointing to advancing the economic welfare of the institution. I don’t think anyone would feel that it necessarily has anything to do with the international merit, or the scholarly merit of what we were doing.

Academics, in particular, were critical of the corporate approach to internationalization and the potential threat it posed to academia. While some Trinity academics noted they would like to believe internationalization was purely for altruistic and educational reasons, there was obvious acknowledgement by the same interviewees that internationalization was very much also about financing and resources and, ultimately about proliferating Trinity’s resources in an age of austerity.

Additionally, the new expectation for academics to be involved in internationalization activities and in the recruitment of international students was a noted challenged not necessarily a welcomed expectation by some of the academics interviewed. As Mary noted:
…the idea of getting some kind of brand, integrity, and seeing yourself as having to do a job of public relations - all that language is alien to academics. It actually doesn’t make sense to hold that view when at the same time you’re worried about your survival because you haven’t recruited enough students. And there’s a kind of feeling that, I don’t know, it’s God and the Holy Ghost sends you students. And there isn’t much you can do about it. And there’s a resistance to it.

Joe concurred, noting, “…academics don’t want to spend time on this. They’d like somebody else to spend the time on it for them, you know?” As an administrator and senior-academic himself, Joe understood academics’ reluctance to become involved in student recruitment and international activities:

…academics don’t want to get involved in these things until it impinges on their ability to do research and teaching. That’s how it should be, really. You want these people to be self-driven in their own subjects and their teaching. You want them to be critical and therefore, they will be skeptical, you know? You want them to be selfish with their time for administration, really.

Trinity academics interviewed for this study viewed teaching and research as the primary roles of faculty, with everything else being secondary.

Joe noted that while some academics were hesitant and worried about the changes taking place, many were, at the same time, gradually accepting of internationalization efforts and were even starting to take part in the process:
We are changing the structure of the university over 10 years, and academics feel a bit frightened by that. If we're saying, ‘Well, we're going to change the composition of the student body’ - they're a bit worried about that, but only from the point of view of how it will impact on their research and their teaching. But fortunately, I think, over two years, we've convinced quite a few academics that this is a good thing, and quite a few of them are taking part in the process.

Ultimately, as Hugh noted, “It always goes back to…obtaining the best students.” Academics want the best students and if recruiting international students is the way to ensure that, then many will likely do their part to help in recruiting them. Although the majority of the academics interviewed were skeptical of internationalization, most understood the challenging environment that motivated Trinity to pursue a corporate approach to internationalization, as one academic commented:

The traditional academic model simply wouldn’t survive today because with the growth of the business model, universities have acquired the capacity to get more money, and governments have acquired the capacity to stop funding them. And so more and more of the livelihood of the universities is being placed in their own hands. Governments are not going to fund them, so what else do you do?

Once a general level of understanding and acceptance was reached and buy in was established for internationalization efforts, the pace of change was strong and mighty, as one administrator described:
…there's been a sea change in the last three or four years. That's where we - so we've went from being sleepy and parochial and just sailing along on our laurels to being the absolute opposite, very focused, very strategic, very proactive…

Several interviewees noted the relentless pace of the implantation of the Global Relations Strategy and the subsequent changes made as a result of the corporate approach to internationalization. A few interviewees noted that a corporate pace within academia was unorthodox and created a level of discomfort in some quarters of the university. Despite several interviewees’ resistance and questioning of Trinity’s corporate approach to internationalization, they also recognized the process was in full force and becoming a norm in various ways throughout many other divisions and services of academia.

In summary, several academics and staff interviewed maintained a level of resistance to various aspects of the Global Relations Strategy and to the internationalization efforts taking place at Trinity as a whole. Although resistant, the same interviewees were also cognizant that internationalization was in full force and had the financial and university support required to continue at such an aggressive pace. As a result, many interviewees had reluctantly come to terms with what they perceived to be a new era of a business approach to academia. Given the newness of Trinity’s internationalization efforts, for the most part, those interviewed for this study were still in the process of learning how a business approach to internationalization actually worked and could only speculate the implications of the approach. Some interviewed hoped the rapid pace and momentum behind Trinity’s internationalization efforts would continue in order to sustain the process. Others expressed
a hope that a lull would come and as a result, perspective and balance would be gained in order to fully take account of the implications of internationalization efforts at Trinity, with a specific focus on what, if any, impact internationalization has had on teaching and research.

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the findings for this research study that emerged into themes in the form of two questions: “Why internationalize Trinity College?” and “How did Trinity internationalize?” This chapter began by answering the question to the first theme: “Why Internationalize Trinity College Dublin?” Included in the response to this theme were Trinity’s multiple motivations and rationales for pursuing internationalization efforts. Taken together, Trinity’s motivations were aggressive in nature due to a strong drive to catch up with its peer institutions’ internationalization efforts, to follow the directives of the Irish government, and in the process, to enhance its visibility and reputation as the best institution in Ireland. Particularly given the dire economic climate in Ireland and within Trinity, the motivation to generate revenue also contributed to the aggressive and timely nature of Trinity’s internationalization efforts.

In response to the second theme and question, “How Does Trinity College Dublin Internationalize?”, this chapter discussed Trinity’s internationalization business plan, the Global Relations Strategy, and Trinity’s process of integrating internationalization into university structures and functions. The challenges associated with internationalization efforts at Trinity were the final theme to emerge from the data gathered for this research study. The following chapter will synthesize the findings for this data in order to draw
meaningful conclusions and to demonstrate how the literature was extended because of this study. Implications for research, theory, and practice will round out the discussion.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this research study was to describe the internationalization process at Trinity College Dublin. More specifically, the first of two research questions that guided this study was, “What is the process of internationalization at Trinity College Dublin for the last 20 years?” To address this research question, this chapter includes a discussion of four major conclusions drawn from the findings of this study, which were discussed in depth in Chapter 4. As I discuss the research conclusions, I will address how they related to and extended previous research and theory.

This chapter will also address the second research question that guided this study, notably, “In what ways is Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle for Internationalization an applicable conceptual framework for the internationalization process at TCD?” In response to this question, this chapter will include a section dedicated to a theoretical analysis of the research findings to determine the applicability of Rumbley’s (2010) theoretical framework to the case study institution, Trinity College Dublin. Implications for theory, policy, and practice will also be included in this chapter. Ultimately, this chapter is dedicated to giving meaning to the research findings, partly by tying them to past theory and relevant literature and partly by extrapolating them to future theory, research, policy, and practice.

Summary of Findings

In response to growing rationales and imperatives to internationalize, Trinity College Dublin pursued a systematic and strategic business approach to internationalization. Trinity’s approach to internationalization included the design and implementation of the
university-funded Global Relations Strategy. The implementation of the Global Relations Strategy combined with deliberate efforts to integrate internationalization into Trinity structures and functions encompassed Trinity’s approach to internationalization. Of the three main themes drawn from the data for this research study, two emerged as questions: “Why internationalize Trinity College Dublin?” and “How does Trinity College Dublin internationalize?” The third and final theme focused on the “challenges” Trinity faced in their efforts to internationalize. Challenges to the internationalization process included some of the difficulties involved in the implementation of internationalization at the institutional level.

Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle for Internationalization was the theoretical framework that guided this study. Important elements in the findings shed light on the applicability of Rumbley’s (2010) theoretical model to the Irish context, which will be discussed in detail in this chapter. The following section will discuss how the findings for this study related and contributed to the existing literature.

Potential Influence of a National Mandate to Internationalize Higher Education

The first conclusion drawn from this study’s findings highlights the potential influence a government directive can have on institutional-level decisions and motivations to internationalize. The Irish government issued formal plans, expectations, and timelines for Irish higher education institutions to internationalize in the government document titled “Investing in Global Relationships: Ireland’s International Education Strategy 2010-2015” (High Level Group, 2010). Interviewees noted the government directive served as an outline,
instigator, and motivator for the development of Trinity’s internationalization strategy. National imperatives, such as Ireland’s, with specific plans, expectations, and timelines for a country’s higher education institutions to internationalize, are not very common in the literature. In this way, this study extended internationalization literature in describing the various ways a government directive to internationalize can influence institutional-level decisions and motivations to internationalize. The findings for this study indicate the Irish government’s directive for institutional internationalization in Ireland influenced Trinity’s rationales for internationalization, which is the main research conclusion discussed in this section.

**University Wake-Up Call to Being Behind**

After the mandate to internationalize was issued by the Irish government, interviewees noted that Trinity began conducting research studies on internationalization efforts of peer institutions. In the process, Trinity learned that it was between 10 to 20 years behind its peer institutions’ internationalization efforts. Participants noted Trinity was struck rather hard by the news and reality that they were behind and needed to catch up; thus, this realization marked a strong motivator for Trinity to design and implement an aggressive internationalization strategy of its own, resulting in the Global Relations Strategy.

Interestingly, higher education literature indicates that Trinity is somewhat of an anomaly in regards to their delayed approached to internationalize. At the same point in time that Trinity was pursuing its primary phase of internationalization, existing research noted institutions worldwide were generally in a far later phase of internationalization. More
specifically, Trinity implemented the Global Relations Strategy in 2011 and began, at the same time, to pursue systematic efforts to insert internationalization into the fabric of all Trinity systems and functions. In the same year, results were published in the *Global Survey of Internationalization* (Egron-Polak, 2011), which was based on questionnaires completed by 745 universities worldwide. The survey confirmed that internationalization had been mainstreamed and rooted in institutional strategic plans. Internationalization was recognized in the same survey as no longer being a luxury, but rather was understood to be an essential part of all university reforms (Egron-Polak, 2011), also referred to as “the mainstreaming of internationalization” (de Wit, 2011). The literature further highlighted internationalization was, undoubtedly, past the “new flavor of the month stage” and was “firmly embedded in institutional mission statements, policies, strategies, as well as national policy frameworks” (Knight, 2011, p.1). In this way, the Trinity case study appeared to conflict with existing literature, given Trinity’s late start in their internationalization efforts. Indeed, Trinity’s efforts to firmly embed internationalization into their university functions were only in the process of being initiated when the literature recognized internationalization had otherwise been mainstreamed and rooted into institutions worldwide. Furthermore, all of the interviewees regarded internationalization efforts at Trinity as a very new undertaking. One Trinity interviewee referred to internationalization as “the new promise ship.” Hence, the Irish government imperative to internationalize awakened Trinity to the realization that they were lagging behind their peers, as was further indicated by existing literature that highlighted the advanced pace of institutional internationalization efforts worldwide.
As a result of this wake-up call and other contributing factors, Trinity adhered to national strategy directives and took a systematic business approach to internationalization, defined in the literature as an institution’s “intensive involvement in international activities with structures in place” (Davies, 1995) by establishing the Global Relations Office and by implementing the Global Relations Strategy. The aggressive pace of Trinity’s Global Relations Strategy was largely attributed to the realization that Trinity needed to catch up with institutions worldwide who were noted to be well ahead in the institutional internationalization process.

**Moneymaking as a Motivation**

Should one delve a bit deeper and explore “Why” the Irish government was compelled to issue a directive for Irish institutions to internationalize, the economic rationale appears to be the strongest, based on the documents reviewed for this study and the sequence of events leading to the publication of “Investing in Global Relationships.” To elaborate, the Irish government maintained that, from a national perspective, the most compelling and pressing rationale for internationalization was “the investment in future global relationships: with students educated in Ireland who will become our advocates overseas, with educational institutions that will be the research and teaching partners of the future, and with the countries that will be Ireland’s next trading and business partners” (High Level Group, 2010). Ireland’s most compelling and pressing rationale for internationalization appeared to be largely economically motivated, with long-term investments in relationships noted to be integral to Ireland’s future financial gains. The literature highlighted a growing trend in the
international higher education arena in this way, with government and university leaders increasingly viewing education in terms of an export commodity (O’Carroll, 2012).

Additionally, based on the financially strapped status of the Irish government at the time “Investing in Global Relationships” was published in 2010, one could conclude revenue production was likely the strongest motivation in the Irish government’s directive for the country’s universities to internationalize. At the time of publication, the Irish government was faced with the grave impact of the 2008 global economic recession and the subsequent austerity measures the country was placed under to repay the massive national debt. The impact on Irish higher education institutions was drastic. As the literature highlighted, since 2008, Irish higher education has experienced an overall 17% reduction in core funding (Hazelkorn, 2011, p. 2). In light of and in the midst of these challenges, the Irish government issued a formal imperative for all Irish institutions to develop their own internationalization strategies, which led to Trinity making plans to initiate their own internationalization strategy.

Economic rationales influenced the Irish government’s directive to internationalize, and in turn, Trinity was largely motivated to internationalize based on economic rationales. Included in the various lofty goals outlined by the Irish government in “Investment in Global Relationships (2010)” and in Trinity’s Global Relations Strategy was the same major goal; specifically, to double the number of international student studying in Ireland and at Trinity.

Indeed, all of the interviewees recognized revenue production as a strong (if not the strongest) motivation to internationalize. The Irish government and Trinity are not dissimilar
to many institutions worldwide who include the recruitment of international students as a primary component of their internationalization strategy (Hayward, 2000). In the design of their internationalization strategies, the Irish government, Trinity, and many institutions worldwide followed the simple logic: “the more foreign students there are paying high tuition fees, the higher the economic return” (de Wit, 2002, p.91). Although similar to other national and institutional internationalization strategies in their efforts to recruit international students, Trinity is somewhat distinct in the multifaceted approach taken to internationalization, which will be discussed further in the following section.

In addition to international student recruitment, Trinity adhered to the national imperative to internationalize and took a multifaceted approach to revenue generation through the internationalization of the institution. More specifically, Trinity’s internationalization strategy included working across university silos to incorporate philanthropy, alumni relations, and global relationship building with global industries in their approach to revenue generation. Trinity was rather resourceful in utilizing internationalization endeavors (for instance, trips abroad taken by the Global Relations Office to build relationships with potential university partners) as opportunities to develop potentially profitable global relationships and partnerships. For instance, representatives from the Trinity Foundation (Trinity’s main fundraising organization) accompanied the Global Relations Office on their trips abroad to develop relationships with potential donors and to build research links with global industries. Additionally, international Trinity alumni
were asked to join in the various Global Relations Office events held abroad as a means to
tap into potential alumni donations.

Working across university silos and incorporating various campus units into
internationalization activities can certainly be a productive way of integrating the university
community into the internationalization process and can enhance levels of awareness and buy
in in the process. The literature highlighted that internationalization, as a process of
institutional transformation, requires leaders “not only access all levels up and down the
institutional hierarchy but also up and down the vertical silos in which many units are
located” (Mestenhauser & Ellingboe, 2005, p.43). At the same time, however, a level of risk
exists in categorizing anything and everything remotely international in nature as part of the
internationalization process (de Wit, 2002; Knight, 2004, 2011). For instance, a trip by the
Trinity Foundation to meet international Trinity alumni abroad for donation purposes was
noted by interviewees to be part of the internationalization process, when, in essence, the
primary goal was really to generate revenue. The Trinity case study extended the
international higher education literature as an example of how internationalization can
quickly become a “catchall phrase” (de Wit, 2002; Knight, 2004) and umbrella term used to
classify any university activity that is even remotely linked to the terms “worldwide,”
“intercultural,” “global,” or “international” (Knight, 2011).

The increasingly troublesome issue around the vague nature of internationalization
was highlighted in the literature by scholars who advocated for parameters so that
internationalization can be assessed and used to advance higher education in the manner in
which it is intended (namely, to increase the value of education and research) (de Wit, 2002; Knight & de Wit, 1995; Rumbley, 2007). Parameters can help to distinguish those internationalization activities that are part of the process that help to achieve the core goal of the university (namely, to prepare students to live and work in a global community) from those activities that view internationalization as an end in itself (i.e., preoccupation with increasing the number of international students on campus, the development of international industry links, etc.) (Altbach, 2008; Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; Hudzik, 2011; Knight, 2004, 2008, 2009). Without parameters, the literature pointed to the potential of internationalization losing its direction and a subsequent loss in focus on the academic goals and on the main objectives of the process. As internationalization gains momentum and moral weight across campus, the Trinity case study highlighted the importance in continuing to monitor and question activities considered part of internationalization so that the lines between those that are purely international in nature and focus are not blurred with those with a different, less academic objective.

**Consideration for Reputation and Visibility**

The primary objective of the Irish government’s internationalization strategy was to “become internationally recognized and ranked as a world leader in the delivery of high-quality international education…” (High Level Group, 2010). In this way, the Irish government recognized the importance of being visible globally and having a reputation as a high-quality institution. In order to develop and maintain such visibility and reputation, Ireland recognized in their national strategy the importance in recruiting and building
relationships with the world’s best students, faculty, and institutions. International students graduating from Irish institutions were viewed as future advocates for the country, with the acknowledged possibility that the world’s best and brightest might stay to work in Ireland upon graduation.

Trinity’s efforts to internationalize were, in turn, also motivated by the desire to increase visibility and reputation by attracting the best students and faculty and by building relationships with high-quality institutions worldwide. Several interviewees acknowledged Trinity as the best-ranked university in Ireland. Also acknowledged by participants was the need to internationalize and to be active on a global level in order to continue to be the best. As Fiona noted, Trinity “…can be a little sleepy, parochial university, ‘that number one in Ireland’, but, who cares, or you say, ‘Actually, that’s not good enough.’ You really want to be up there with the very, very best.” The alternative, as Hugh noted, is to be left behind and to no longer be the best; “…you have to, if you want to be the best, or you want to be up there, you've got to do these things [internationalize], because if you're not doing them, you're going to get left behind.”

Also important to note in this discussion on reputation and visibility is the influence an institution’s global visibility, brand recognition, and reputation has on a university’s ranking. Hugh recognized, “…reputation is very important in how you come up in the rankings.” Most, if not all, university ranking systems include a section on internationalization. Interviewees noted that Trinity was certainly motivated to internationalize and consequently, attempted to improve their global ranking in the process.
Taken together, Trinity’s efforts to internationalize were largely motivated by the desire to increase its visibility, reputation, brand recognition, and rankings.

International education scholars and practitioners worldwide have increasingly discussed these points with expressed concerns over the direction of internationalization that is increasingly focused on university ranking and prestige (Egron-Polak, 2012; Hazelkorn, 2008; Jaschik, 2012). Former Secretary General of the Association of African Universities and former Vice Chancellor of the University of Mauritius, Goolam Mohamedbhai, placed university concerns over rankings and prestige into a new light, noting that an outstanding internationalized university “would not aspire to be a world-class university or being globally ranked - as these would be irrelevant” to its real mission to serving people (Jaschik, 2012). Former Secretary Mohamedbhai went on to note that universities need to be evaluated on such factors as whether they are helping their country’s citizens, whether they are bridging class divides or enlarging them, and whether they are open to all parts of society (Jaschik, 2012). International education scholars and practitioners have increasingly had frank and self-critical discussions on universities increasing emphasis on ranking and prestige through internationalization (Altbach et al., 2009; de Wit, 2011; Egron-Polak, 2012; Hawawini, 2011; Jaschik, 2012; Knight, 2011), with the intent that the direction of internationalization will be less boosterish in nature and focused more on internationalization’s impacts on matters related to academics and research and service to people.

Does “the best” mean high quality? Trinity’s emphasis on recruiting the best and maintaining the best reputation and ranking calls into question whether such a title and term
translates into “quality.” More specifically, how do motivations to enhance visibility and reputation and the desire to be “the best” and to recruit the world’s best faculty and students lead to the ultimate goal of internationalization, namely to increase the quality of education and research?

Interviewees did recognize this important point in terms of how being “the best” could translate into valuable educational and academic goals. For example, Trinity faculty who were interviewed for this study noted that attracting the world’s best students was of great appeal from a quality perspective due to the far superior discussions and teaching and learning that were noted to take place as a result of a mixed cosmopolitan group of students. In this way, the importance in Trinity maintaining an elite status was significant in terms of the contributions the best faculty and students could have in in a classroom setting.

While one example was provided regarding the actual impact that enhanced reputation and visibility could have on educational quality, of particular concern and possible risk, however, is that the continued emphasis on internationalization’s influence on Trinity’s reputation, ranking, and visibility could lead to the erroneous assumption that the more international the institution becomes (in terms of students, faculty, curriculum, agreements, etc…) the better its reputation (de Wit, 2011; Knight, 2011). Trinity’s strong emphasis on reputation, ranking, and visibility risks developing the false institutional assumption that building a strong international reputation is equivalent to a high quality education. In turn, the literature signaled the risk of the increasingly proposed viewpoint that the internationalization phenomenon is “the white knight of higher education” (Brandenburg &
The heightened emphasis on maintaining superior ranking, visibility, and reputation are understandable for any elite institution seeking to maintain their status through efforts to internationalize. However, as Trinity’s internationalization process continues to unfold in an aggressive and strategic manner, this case study pointed to the importance of questioning and monitoring internationalization’s effectiveness in terms of its essential nature (which, ultimately, is to improve the quality of education and research).

**And More Altruistic Motivations**

Ireland’s national strategy for internationalization and Trinity’s Global Relations Strategy both noted similar altruistic motivations to internationalize, notably to prepare students to be global graduates, to improve educational quality, and to expand student’s intercultural expertise. Similar motivations and goals are generally included in institutional internationalization objectives and by national and institutional leaders in their list of objectives for internationalization (Childress, 2010; de Wit, 2002; Green, 2003; Henard et al., 2012; High Level Group, 2010; Jaschik, 2012; Knight, 1999; Lim, 2003; Reichard, 1983).

While some interviewees acknowledged altruistic motivations were integral to the objectives of Trinity’s internationalization process, others doubted the authenticity of such publicized motivations. Those doubtful of internationalization’s altruistic motivations noted they were simply a guise for moneymaking opportunities involved in the internationalization process. Interestingly, interviewees who worked more directly with students were more likely to doubt internationalization’s altruistic motivations, compared with interviewees who were more removed from daily student contact. The discrepancy is arguably attributed to
those higher in the institutional hierarchy lacking in the knowledge of how internationalization was affecting students and staff in the day-to-day implementation of the process (Forbes-Mewett, 2010). In this way, by interviewing Trinity representatives from up and down the university hierarchy, the Trinity case study provided insight into the conflicting views and interpretations that can exist within a university over motivations for internationalization. Interviewees demonstrated conflicting interpretations of Trinity’s altruistic motivations to internationalize, with variance in the level of importance placed on them and questions posed over their genuine nature. Interviewees’ conflicting interpretations of Trinity’s rationales to internationalize highlighted the value of a study that included multiple levels of representation, which this study provided. Overall, the findings for this study indicated less of an emphasis and levels of doubt over Trinity’s altruistic motivations to internationalize. The literature pointed to such a loss of focus on the real objectives of internationalization as one of the growing concerns with the growing phenomenon (de Wit, 2011; IAU, 2012; Jaschik, 2012) and the need for a return to a focus on internationalization pursuits focused on enhancing the quality of education and research.

In summary, the Trinity case study illustrated the large impact Ireland’s national mandate to internationalize had on Trinity’s decisions and motivations to incorporate an international dimension into the university’s structures and functions. As a small island, Ireland was in the unique position to be able to consider and avail of the opportunity to issue a national directive to internationalize. With seven major universities in Ireland, a national government mandate to internationalize was feasible in a way that would not have been
possible in a larger country, such as the United States, where thousands of universities of varying sizes and with diverse roles exist. Ireland was able to take advantage of the relatively small number of institutions for which the mandate applied, as a larger number of diverse institutions would have made a blanket mandate such as the one issued by the Irish government too difficult to implement or follow. While the mandate to internationalize was issued to all of Ireland’s universities, to date, no other qualitative study exists that examines how and why the internationalization process has unfolded at any of Ireland’s institutions. This study addressed how and why the implementation of Trinity’s internationalization process took place, and in the process, highlighted the potential influence a national mandate can have on a country such as Ireland.

**The Significance of Environmental Factors on Internationalization**

Another major conclusion drawn from the findings of this study point to the critical role and influence external environmental factors (such as resources, opportunities, imperatives, and obstacles) play in shaping an institutions’ experience with internationalization. The international higher education literature was lacking in research that focused on how and why environmental factors play such a significant role in internationalization decisions and strategies at the institutional level. The findings from the current study highlighted the considerable impact environmental factors had on Trinity’s internationalization motivations and objectives, and in the process, contributed to the scant amount of research on the topic.
Interviewees all discussed in detail Ireland’s extremely dire economic climate and the subsequent influence such circumstances had on Trinity. As the literature highlighted, Ireland experienced an economic boom lasting roughly from 1998 to 2008, which came to an abrupt bust in 2008 with the onset of the global financial crisis. The bust was devastating to countries around the world, and particularly to Ireland. The country’s housing market crashed and banks collapsed, leaving Ireland in severe debt after it was granted a financial rescue loan from the European Union. The subsequent cuts on higher education were largely attributed to the need to repay Ireland’s debt through a four-year austerity plan (Fearn, 2010). As a result, since 2008, Irish higher education has experienced an overall 17% reduction in core funding. Because the education budget is decreasing while student numbers are increasing, resources per student were also declining, from a high of roughly 10,000 euros to less than 3,000 euros per student (Hazelkorn, 2011).

Financial conditions for Irish lecturers depicted an equally grim reality. Irish higher education institutions were required to downsize, with employment levels required to fall by 7% by 2014. All new appointments had 10% lower starting salaries (Hazelkorn, 2011). Lecturers in Ireland received a 15% pay reduction in 2012. Deadline dates were established as an incentive for lecturers to retire to avoid a corresponding 15% cut in pensions (Grove, 2012). Ireland’s internationalization efforts were estimated to enhance the economic impact of international education by roughly 300 million euros, to 1.2 billion euros in total. Although specific numbers are difficult to find, interviewees noted that internationalization efforts at Trinity would produce multimillion euros specifically for the institution.
Similar to institutions worldwide, Trinity faced severe government cuts in higher education funding and needed to secure alternative forms of funding in order to replace the needed funds to prevent further loss of university personnel and the slow and subsequent demise of the institution. A common theme in the research findings was a general level of anxiety and exhaustion by the university community as a whole. Particularly after the Irish government implemented a fifth consecutive cut in funding (Laffan, 2012), Ireland’s education service was noted as being “routinely asset stripped” (Hanley, 2012) by the Irish Government, with academics “simply starved to death, rather than having any dramatic blow to knock them out. It’s a case of death by a thousand blows” (Grove, 2012, p.2). Trinity academics, administration, and staff were working extra hours to cover for staff that left and would not be replaced due to lack of funding. The concern was, if resources are not found, quality will be the first thing to suffer (Reisz, 2012; von Prondzynski, 2013). In light of the described dire economic context and the extremely limited resources available to Trinity, the opportunity to develop income-generating international activities was seen as a viable and profitable option that Trinity decided to pursue in an aggressive manner. For Trinity, the pursuit of internationalization income-generating activities could have potentially made the difference between having fully funded operations or needing to further eliminate activities to survive.

Interviewees for this study were unusually candid about the impact the economic climate had on Trinity’s approach and goals for internationalization. Indeed, interviewees recognized the dire economic context was a major factor that compelled Trinity to pursue
opportunities to generate much needed revenue. Some interviewees were critical of an institutional internationalization approach with the primary objective to generate funds. However, all of the participants for this study expressed some level of understanding that the reality of the environmental context in which Trinity existed necessitated the pursuit of financial opportunities beyond those previously explored.

At the same time, Trinity was faced with the imperative to internationalize due to factors that included globalization and the need for institutions to respond and adapt to the changing needs of a more interconnected world. Trinity was guided by the increasing pressure to respond to the forces of globalization and create a more international campus, and was bound by the imperative outlined by the Irish government in their internationalization efforts. Finally, the notion of obstacles was an environmental factor that bound and shaped Trinity’s internationalization process. Challenges such as limited resources and capacity issues for serving increasing numbers of international students were some of the noted obstacles Trinity faced in their efforts.

The environmental factors discussed in this section are impacting institutional approaches of universities worldwide, with national governments and institutions responding to those environmental factors in various ways. The literature pointed to the various ways governments and institutions have responded to the same environmental factors, with Australia’s response arguably similar to Ireland’s. More specifically, more than 20 years ago, the Australian government decided that international higher education should become a national industry and since then it has become a major income producer for the nation.
Similar to Trinity and Irish institutions’ response to Ireland’s government directive to internationalize, Australian institutions responded to the government imperative and outlined policies to marketize higher education, which subsequently led to substituting fees from international students for declining state support and severe budget cuts (Altbach & Welch, 2011). The result has been that the prime goal of internationalization has become moneymaking (largely driven by government underfunding) (Altbach & Welch, 2011; Marginson, 2011). From a financial perspective, the Australian government’s imperative to internationalize was a huge success (Altbach & Welch, 2011). International education brought great wealth to Australia (international education produced $15 billion in 2012-2013, making education the nation’s fourth-largest export sector after coal, iron ore, and gold) (Marginson, 2011). At the same time, international education also produced marked academic problems in Australia, such as issues with declining quality and questionable ethics in international student recruitment and admissions, all of which were noted to have significantly damaged Australia’s international academic image or “brand” (Altbach & Welch, 2011). Australia’s overreliance on international student income also created a dependence on the financial subsidy that brought with it negative implications of its own (Marginson, 2011). For some institutions (particularly smaller Australian institutions), international student income was a financial lifeline such that their existence hinged on the revenue source, which led to several institutions collapsing when their international student numbers fell (Altbach & Welch, 2011).
Australia’s response to environmental factors (i.e., responding to the Australian government’s imperative to internationalize, pursuing the opportunity to internationalize at the institutional level, attempting to subsidize dwindling state resources with international student fees, and dealing with the obstacles that such factors presented) clearly had a significant impact on shaping institutional internationalization processes. In this way, Australia’s response to environmental factors demonstrated important cautionary lessons to be learned by other countries, including Ireland. The Australia case served as an example for university leaders to continuously monitor and to remain vigilant to the impact their institutional responses to environmental factors may have so that their internationalization efforts do not veer in unintended, negative directions that lead to long-term consequences.

The Trinity case study extended existing international higher education literature by highlighting the significant role environmental factors can play in an institution’s approach to internationalize. Given the newness of the implementation of internationalization at Trinity, the outcomes or impact of their response to environmental factors have yet to be realized. As Ireland continues to respond to environmental factors in similar ways to Australia, the literature on international higher education in Australia signals a note of caution for Ireland and similar countries to remain attentive to the potential ill effect and long-term implications of their responses. As one of the ways the institution responded to environmental factors, Trinity adopted a corporate approach to internationalization, a somewhat controversial practice of its own that will be discussed in the following section.
Partnering with Faculty on Internationalization Efforts

Trinity’s dedication to and strong focus on including faculty in the internationalization process merits recognition as the third key conclusion and contribution to the literature. Engaging faculty in the various internationalization developments taking place at Trinity was noted by interviewees to be integral to the success of the Global Relations Strategy and to internationalizing the campus. The literature highlighted the importance and value of including faculty in the internationalization process. Numerous scholarly research studies indicated that the success of an institution’s internationalization efforts is dependent upon the level of faculty involvement and engagement within the institution (Brewer, 2010; Carter, 1992; Goodwin & Nacht, 1983; Green & Olson, 2003; Heely, 2005; James & Nef, 2002; Paus & Robinson, 2008; Rasch, 2001; Savishinsky, 2012; Schweitz, 2006; Viers, 2003). Given the direct influence and impact faculty wield on the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education institutions, they have long been recognized as central contributors and gatekeepers in the process of institutional change and the internationalization of knowledge (Bond, 2003; Cleveland-Jones et al., 2001; Festervand & Tillery, 2001; Welsh, 1997). Faculty, in their diverse roles and responsibilities, are tied to and hold authority over many of the activities that are intimately linked to those efforts that characterize the internationalization process (Savishinsky, 2012). These can include curriculum design and development (Bond, 2003; Harari, 1992; Mestenhauser & Ellingboe, 1998), scholarly collaboration and research (Green & Shoenberg, 2006), and many of the common service functions of their respective institutions (Mestenhauser, & Ellingboe, 2005;
Nilsson, 2000; Savishinsky, 2012). Given this level of broad and deep influence and involvement, faculty are often in a position to determine whether and how to integrate international content and activities into their teaching, research, and service and other work (Green & Olson, 2003). Their extensive influence and involvement make faculty engagement in internationalization efforts essential to making international experiences a successful reality on a university campus. Taken together, Trinity’s efforts to include faculty in their internationalization process are supported by the literature as essential to the process (Backman & American Council for Education, 1984, Bond, 2003; Brewer, 2010; Paus & Robinson, 2008, Savinshinsky, 2012; Stohl, 2007).

A question raised in the literature is how administrators can engage faculty and involve them in the institution’s internationalization process (Hawawini, 2011). The scholarly literature in response to this question was often downplayed and little researched (Savinshinsky, 2012). The Trinity case study adds to the minimal amount of literature that existed on faculty engagement in internationalization by illustrating why and how they included faculty in their internationalization process and why faculty chose to be involved in the process. The findings for this study indicated multifaceted reasons why Trinity included faculty in the internationalization process. By including academics in the internationalization process, Trinity sought to portray to potential institutional partners abroad the university’s level of dedication to internationalization and the high level of academic focus that Trinity sought to maintain in the process. Additionally, Trinity academics were noted as integral to building links with industries abroad, with their expertise being utilized in the process of
establishing potential research endeavors. Finally, Trinity also sought to gain buy-in from Trinity academics by including them in the internationalization process, as the hope and intent was for academics to return from trips abroad with the Global Relations Office as advocates for international efforts on campus.

The Trinity case study also contributes to the literature the actual methods used to integrate faculty into the process, including assigning an academic to lead Trinity’s internationalization process and ensuring academics were included in the Global Relations international trips. While institutions commonly include faculty internally in on campus internationalization activities, Trinity’s heavy emphasis on engaging faculty on a more global level in international relationship building extended the literature on the various ways institutions can engage faculty in the internationalization process.

Also a significant finding from interviews with Trinity faculty was their insight into why they became involved in internationalization. The literature highlighted the majority of faculty are rather indifferent to becoming involved in their university’s international initiatives (Hawawini, 2011). The attitude is, “as long as the institutional investment is not significant and I don’t have to actively participate, it is fine with me.” The Trinity case study aligned with the literature in this way, as Trinity academics noted their focus was on teaching and research not on university initiatives, such as internationalization. At the same time, the literature pointed to a smaller segment of faculty who become involved in internationalization out of a genuine interest in contributing to international development (Hawawini, 2011), which was also the case at Trinity. Additionally, the Trinity case study
extended the literature by illustrating another example as to why academics chose to join in internationalization initiatives. More specifically, interviewees noted that some Trinity faculty chose to participate in internationalization when their teaching or research could potentially be impacted, either negatively or positively, by internationalization efforts. The findings indicated that some Trinity academics recognized the value of international research collaborations that stemmed from internationalization efforts. Others academics were said to become involved because they wanted to ensure Trinity’s international students were of high quality and chose to engage in international efforts as a result. In these ways, Trinity academics were inclined to participate in the university’s internationalization process when it affected their teaching and research. This point can be reassuring to scholars and practitioners who are concerned that internationalization is losing its focus on improving the quality of education and research (Altbach, 2011; de Wit, 2011; Jaschik, 2012; Knight, 2009). The Trinity case study indicated that faculty involvement in the internationalization process could be integral to maintaining an important level of quality and oversight to the process and to the changes that develop because of it.

A final note regarding faculty engagement with internationalization concerns Trinity’s inclusion of faculty in building academic-industry links and relationships, which often manifested during trips abroad with the Global Relations Office. National and institutional leaders and some interviewees for this study discussed university collaborations with industry as a means to subsidize increasingly dwindling higher education funding and as an activity to protect Trinity from further economic hardships. This new relationship and
research collaboration was recently described in the literature as a “triple helix” (universities and public and private partners working together) (Simpson, 2011) and as the “knowledge triangle” (integrating education, research, and innovation) (Simpson, 2011). The literature noted these new research associations have had great influence on university policies and have resulted in additional funding streams to higher education and greater diversity of institutional profiles (EUA, 2010; OECD, 2010; Reichert, 2006). Interviewees noted the large efforts devoted to global industry links as part of Trinity’s internationalization process, and subsequently, the increasing impact that such collaborations were gradually producing at Trinity (research developments, establishment of industry-academic business pursuits, etc.).

Critics of the “commercialization of higher education” (Bok, 2003) or the proactive push towards the commercialization of ideas was viewed by some as a threat to the universities’ central and more traditional focus, namely knowledge for knowledge. The commercialization of higher education is referred to by the same critics as a means for financial gain and an intellectual tragedy for universities (Catropa & Andrews, 2013; Clay, 2008). Finally, some of the interviewees expressed a level of concern for a possible loss of focus on university ideals in the pursuit of industry collaborations. At the same time, other interviewees noted that including academics in developing industry links could help to ensure that Trinity’s internationalization efforts remained focused on teaching and research for the sake of intellectual development and not for the sole purpose of the financial gain that could be garnered in the process. Trinity, for its part, responded to the call to internationalize by inviting faculty to be integral in the process of developing industry links abroad. In this way,
Trinity attempted to utilize the research and scholarship taking place on campus by expanding those efforts to include international industry collaboration and links. While the potential for research to be conducted for its monetary value still exists, interviewees expressed a level of hope that by including Trinity faculty in the development of industry links, the potential for the research to be conducted for the sake of knowledge and research advancement could still exist.

In conclusion, some interviewees noted that by heavily integrating Trinity faculty into the internationalization process in the various ways discussed in this section, the focus on education and research would remain a central to the process. Given the newness of Trinity’s approach to internationalization, the long-term implications of integrating faculty into the internationalization process will not be clear for some time. For the time being, Trinity’s approach to internationalization demonstrated a high degree of dedication to integrating academics into the process and consequently, an attempt to maintain a focus on education and research.

**A Corporate Approach to Internationalization: Beneficial, Detrimental, or Both?**

The final major conclusion and contribution to the literature from this study highlighted the lessons to be learned from Trinity’s experience in adopting a business approach to the internationalization of the institution. In the evaluation of institutions’ formal commitment to internationalization, the literature distinguished between institutional strategies as “implicit” and “explicit” (de Wit, 2002). The interviewees’ description of the systematic, purposeful, and clearly outlined business plan outlined by Trinity’s Global
Relations Strategy arguably could be considered as an explicit institutional strategy to internationalize. Explicitly designed as a business plan, Trinity’s Global Relations Strategy was illustrative of the relatively new market-based approach to internationalization. Research notes that elements of a business approach to internationalization are gradually being adopted by universities worldwide in response to deep cuts in higher education budgets, which have forced institutions to be innovative in their efforts to find alternative funding sources (Bok, 2003; Catropa & Andrews, 2013; Clay, 2008; de Wit, 2011; Egron-Polak, 2012; Knight, 2007). Trinity, however, moved beyond simply adopting various business practices into their approach to internationalization. The Trinity case study was an example of an explicitly designed institutional business approach to internationalization. Perhaps more importantly, as a prototype in the field of international higher education, Trinity’s business approach to internationalization can offer valuable insight into the possible implications of the approach, with a particular focus on the students the plan is ultimately intended to benefit.

Trinity took a different approach to the more traditional in their internationalization strategy. Universities worldwide have traditionally approached their international endeavors by centralizing their international activities through an international office. The international office was traditionally housed on campus and included a director and various levels of administrators and staff who worked on the details involved in sending and receiving students and faculty abroad. In many cases, the international office also contributed to the design of university internationalization plans (EUA, 2010). In contrast, Trinity’s Global
Relations Strategy was an aggressive business plan, with a Global Relations Office (GRO) appointed to implement the strategy. To support the implementation of the Global Relations Strategy, Trinity dissolved the institution’s former international office and replaced it with the Global Relations Office, a Trinity-funded and staffed 32-person business office that was charged with the design and implementation a full-scale business operation led by a senior academic, as part of its formal and explicit approach to internationalization. More traditional and arguably more implicit objectives of a university’s international office may include goals to increase the number of international students, internationalize the university curriculum, and develop foreign language options (Afonso, 1991; Ellingboe, 1998; Hudzik, 2011; Krane, 1994; Petronis, 2000). In contrast to the more traditional motivations and ultimate objectives of a university’s international office, the Global Relations Office focused on financial goals and motivations aimed at meeting a bottom-line and KPIs. At the same time, the Global Relations Strategy included the placement of Global Relations Officers within various Trinity academic departments in an effort to embed internationalization into the campus structure and to avoid siloing of the internationalization process into a central international office. As noted, the literature did not (yet) appear to include many case studies of higher education institutions that have established a formal business plan and office dedicated to internationalization. This study contributes to the literature lessons that can be learned from an explicit institutional business approach to internationalization, particularly in light of the impact a market-based approach to an academic endeavor can have on the university’s core objective: education and research. In order to understand the implications of Trinity’s
business approach to internationalization a discussion on the topic is important, specifically the corporatization of higher education.

As this study already discussed, higher education institutions worldwide are increasingly being asked to do more while operating in an environment of diminished funding sources. More and more tertiary institutions are responding by applying corporate management models to the operation of their colleges and universities, sometimes referred to as the corporatization of higher education (Bok, 2003; Catropa & Andrews, 2013; Clay, 2008), academic capitalism (Cantwell & Kauppinen, 2014; Slaughter & Rhodes, 2004), or the commercialization of higher education (Jaschik, 2012). Higher education institutions are increasingly adopting a corporate approach to university functioning (Catropa & Andrews, 2013; Clay, 2008) and, in doing so, are shifting from creating scholarship and learning as a public good to generating knowledge as a commodity, to be monetized in global market activities (Cantwell & Kaupinen, 2014).

For the most part, colleges and universities are non-profit institutions; their purpose is to educate students. Non-profit does not mean non-revenue, however; institutions still must generate revenues to fund their operations and fulfill their goal of educating students (Caudill, 2008). Profitable operations are still valuable to higher education, as funds are needed for the institution to survive and to invest in new facilities, new programs, and to fulfill their role of educating students (Bok, 2003; Caudill, 2008; Clay, 2008). In this way, the adoption of practices that can generate revenue for tertiary institutions can be beneficial.

The challenge therein lies in distinguishing when the application of a certain level of
corporatization to tertiary services and functions can be advantageous from when they can be potentially detrimental (Caudill, 2008; Clay, 2008). The literature suggested corporate practices are best applied to university functions that most closely parallel those of corporations (Bok, 2003; Caudill, 2008). Functions such as facilities maintenance, information technology, financial management, and overall operating efficiencies are all things that the business world does well and that educational institutions could manage in similar ways (Caudill, 2008). The literature and the findings for this study further suggested that many of the functional areas of an institution could be workable under a corporate model.

Conversely, the literature and the findings for this study also highlighted that many of the core functions of a higher education institution would be greatly damaged (if not destroyed) by the application of a corporate model. Some of the things that are unique to education as a discipline are simply incompatible with a corporate model of operation (Caudill, 2008). For example, the primary purpose of research in business is to develop a new product or process that will help the company generate profits, whereas the primary concern of academic research is to generate new knowledge in the field. Simply the knowledge itself is of value, without the need for productive or profitable use of it (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). A corporate model would likely not support this type of research and inquiry. In these instances, the benefits of a traditional educational process outweigh the value of operating efficiencies. Some aspects of education should not, perhaps cannot, be optimized for efficiency without damaging their purpose (Caudill, 2008).
The point of this discussion is to highlight that positive and negative aspects exist in a corporate approach to internationalization (Caudill, 2008; Green, 2012; Jaschik, 2012). The findings for this case study indicated that in some ways Trinity’s corporate approach to internationalization could be beneficial and in other ways potentially damaging.

**Potential Benefits of a Corporate Approach to Internationalization**

**Improved levels of efficiency and accountability.** Based on the findings for this study, business practices employed by the Global Relations Office were arguably beneficial in some ways, including improved levels of efficiency and accountability. The literature noted, “There’s a perception by the public that there has been waste in higher education and that there needs to be more accountability for the dollars spent” (Clay, 2008, p. 50). The new attention to efficiency that corporatization brought to Trinity was demonstrated by the Global Relations Office in their strict financial oversight and financial management practices of Trinity’s internationalization activities, all of which were certainly financially beneficial to the institution. Likewise, interviewees highlighted a level of accountability practices that were outlined in detail in the Global Relations Strategy.

Additionally, several interviewees described the Global Relations Strategy as “rapid” in its approach to internationalize. Trinity’s use of a corporate-style approach to achieve internationalization goals included developing a detailed strategy, policies, and practices and then following them systematically and efficiently. In contrast, universities are known to be slow to change and often resist any notion of the process (Kirschner, 2012). Trinity’s
corporate approach made the swift changes included in the institution’s internationalization strategy possible.

**Academia is no longer an ivory tower.** Academia has often been referred to as existing in an ivory tower, a term that has been used to designate a world or atmosphere where academics engage in pursuits that are disconnected from the practical concerns of everyday life. "Many faculty members felt like the ivory tower was insulation against corporate life and view the behaviors of corporations with some degree of suspicion,” (Clay, 2008, p. 50). Particularly due to increasing academic-industry links that are promoted through the corporatization of higher education, institutions are no longer entirely insulated, but rather are involved in collaborations between faculty and students and all sectors of society - the nonprofit sector, the government, industries, and corporations - to address such issues as environmental sustainability, urban education, and other pressing issues (Clay, 2008; Hankel, 2014; Holton, 1998). In the same way, Trinity’s institutional approach to internationalization included the creation of strong collaborative research links with industries and corporations abroad.

**Potential for revenue generation.** Achieving optimal efficiency with a limited set of resources is one of the leading strengths of the application of business models to higher education operations (Caudill, 2008). Also of appeal in adopting business practices is the knowledge that successful business organizations are highly skilled at generating profits, because in the business world, profitability is the primary goal. In the face of severely reduced government funding and limited resources for higher education, Trinity and Ireland’s
other institutions turned to internationalization as a means for revenue production. Based on the institution’s revenue-focused needs and objectives, Trinity chose a corporate approach to internationalize to address those needs. Interviewees were forthright in the noting both the dire financial status of Trinity and Irish institutions and the national decision to view internationalization efforts as a revenue producing initiative.

**Potential Drawbacks to a Corporate Approach to Internationalization**

**Lack of focus on academic objectives.** At the same time, the literature increasingly highlighted growing concerns about the impact of the commercialization of higher education and the potential disadvantages to incorporating a business approach to internationalization (Caudill, 2008; Green, 2012; Jaschik, 2012). In Trinity’s case, by focusing on the economic objectives set forth by a business approach to internationalization, some of the more vital goals of internationalization were noted by interviewees to be lost. With economic gain being a primary motivator and objective of Trinity’s internationalization strategy, interviewees expressed concern over how economic goals could, at the same time, meet the main goals of internationalization, namely to enhance education and research and to integrate international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education. The findings for this study did not largely indicate how the objectives for internationalization would be addressed through a corporate approach to internationalization.

The Global Relations Strategy did outline more quantifiable goals such as the ideal number of international students to recruit to study at Trinity and the number of Trinity
students who studied abroad. Less focus and detail was included, however, on how the academic objectives of internationalization would be addressed. More specifically, details were missing on how Trinity’s corporate approach to internationalization would incorporate an international dimension into, for example, the curriculum, co-curriculum, learning outcomes and faculty policies and practices. For instance, although interviewees and Global Relations Office brochures both noted the importance of an internationalized curriculum, actual details on how the curriculum was more international in focus were not addressed. In these ways, a corporate approach to internationalization at Trinity highlighted the potential for academic objectives to be potentially misplaced, the implications of which could be damaging to both academics and to the main objective of internationalization, namely to prepare students to become global citizens and professionals in today’s diverse world.

**Potential impact on international students.** With a business approach to internationalization and objectives focused on revenue generation, the Trinity case study highlighted the potential for a university to lose sight of international student needs in the process. Interviewees noted that Trinity’s business approach to internationalization was focused on increasing the number of fee-paying international students, without ample consideration paid to students’ needs upon arrival or to individualized support services for them. Indeed, the greatest concern and challenge expressed by interviewees was the lack of capacity and available international student services for the additional 1,000 international students that the Global Relations Strategy aimed to recruit. Several of the interviewees expressed a grave level of concern for the already-stretched and under-resourced Trinity
student service offices and the expectations placed on them to serve a large number of additional international students. Interviewees also detailed the lack of on-campus student accommodation for international students as an additional capacity concern.

Interviewees and university documents highlighted multiple international student support options that were available to international students, including the Global Room, Academic Tutors, Global Officers, and Study2Student Mentors. However, interviewees still expressed a general level of concern as to whether the new, decentralized approach to international student service options would be effective. They questioned whether, for instance, an international student felt intimidated or at all comfortable going to an Academic Tutor (a Trinity professor assigned to counsel students should they ask for such assistance). The findings further indicated the university community was largely unclear on which student services to contact when international students were in need of assistance (particularly in an emergency). The multiple options to contact for international student support were confusing for many of the interviewees.

Addressing international student needs was recognized as essential to the internationalization process, by both the interviewees and in the literature. Indeed, research noted that in many institutions, “International students feel marginalized socially and academically” and “tend to band together…without having deep engagement with the host country culture” (Knight, 2011, p. 2). Furthermore, included in Trinity’s (and many other institutions’) list of motivations and primary reasons to recruit international students was the potential to help internationalize their campus (Rhodes, 2014). Research noted that this
unquestioned claim puts international students at risk of feeling isolated and having to face increased “tensions” (Knight, 2011; Montgomery, 2010; Rhodes, 2014; Sherrif, 2013) while studying outside their home country. Also noted in the literature was the warning that while programs and support systems to address the needs of international students can be found, they are often lacking in support and resources (Andrade & Evans, 2009). As institutions worldwide increase their number of visiting international students, suggestions for addressing international students needs are also increasingly addressed in the literature. Suggestions include dedicating campus resources to strengthening campus student support systems to address the substantial educational and cultural adjustment needs of international students (Andrade & Evans, 2009; Marginson et al., 2010; Montgomery, 2010). Recommendation also include developing programs that foster relationship building between home students and overseas students (such as study and learning community groups) to address adjustment issues as well as offering professional programs that train university staff on how to address international student needs (Marginson et al., 2010).

As an additional indication of the potential lack of foresight to students needs that can develop in a corporate approach to internationalization, interviewees noted that after an international students had ‘signed on the dotted line’ and committed to study at Trinity with the Global Relations Office, they were then mainstreamed with all other Trinity students in all other administrative and admissions processing. The Academic Registry was described by interviewees as a “one-stop-shop” for all Trinity students’ admissions and administrative needs. The concept of mainstreaming international students’ services was explained by
interviewees to prevent the often-challenging process of international students needing to visit multiple different university offices across campus in order to complete the various admissions and administrative steps involved in attending university. The mainstreaming of student services is an element adopted from business practices that streamline services in an effort to increase efficiency. Mainstreaming student services is a relatively new concept to the international higher education literature, but the literature that does exist was critical of the process and noted the “approach was formulated and imposed by University’s senior managers, most of whom had little or no direct knowledge of or experience with international student issues” (Forbes-Mewett, 2010, p. 5). The literature suggested international students need some sort of specialized services to help them cope (Forbes-Mewett, 2010; Harryba & Knight, 2013, Sherriff, 2013), as specialized services allow for individual attention and at the very least, provide students with a first point of call for their unique needs. Mainstreaming, in contrast, assumes the problems of international and domestic students are largely homogenous, that neither group requires the assistance of professionals with specific skills, and that both groups can be provided for in the same manner (Harryba & Knight, 2013). The critique of the mainstreaming of international students notes they are too often viewed as “cash cows,” with money not being put back into providing the services that international students need during their term of study (Harryba & Knight, 2013; Sherriff, 2013). Furthermore, the literature indicated the process of mainstreaming international students was “short-sighted” (Harryba & Knight, 2013, p. 7), with university management focused “on the bottom line and managerial efficiencies, rather than student welfare” (p.8).
Given the newness of the Global Relations Strategy, evident from the findings was the need for Trinity to evaluate whether its new approach to managing international student support was effective and did indeed meet international visiting students’ individual and unique needs. Also important to note is that the incentivization plan outlined in the Global Relations Strategy was due to be implemented soon after data were collected for this study. The plan was designed to compensate Trinity student service departments for the additional international students they served. As a result, the department would then have funding to expand capacity and services to accommodate the additional international student needs. In this way, interviewees were aware of the importance of addressing international students’ needs and acknowledged some of the intended ways Trinity planned to address them.

Trinity’s corporate approach to internationalization demonstrated some advantages and disadvantages that can be realized by incorporating different aspects of business practice into the internationalization process. The Trinity case study demonstrated that university services most aligned with business practices (i.e., accounting) could successfully employ aspects of a business model to their functions. At the same time, the Trinity case study illustrated the potential loss of focus on academic goals and the lack of foresight for international student needs that can result when internationalization is pursued with a corporate revenue generating approach and objective.

**A Balanced Approach to a Corporate Internationalization Strategy**

Given the potential benefits and drawbacks of a corporate approach to internationalization, the literature suggested that Irish institutions assume a balanced
approach in their efforts to build a healthy international education environment (High Level Group, 2010). The Irish government recognized that in order to be successful, internationalization will need “to be developed as a long-term and sustainable process, based on high-quality and balanced engagement…” (High Level Group, 2010). A balanced approach in the literature suggests institutions become forward-thinking universities and assume a more attentive, reflective, iterative, and balanced approach to internationalization (Altbach, 2008; Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; Egron-Polak, 2012; Knight, 2008, 2009, 2011). Particularly given the newness of Trinity’s internationalization strategy, the literature’s emphasis on the timely nature of developing a more balanced approach was applicable: “Now is the time to look at what actions are sustainable and what are not, what policies will serve the interests of students and the academic community, and what actions constitute mistaken policy or simply greed” (Altbach, 2008, p.1).

The Trinity case study demonstrates the importance for monitoring and evaluating internationalization initiatives to ensure they are focused on the core objective of internationalization: prepare students to become global citizens in today’s diverse world. Ensuring that all of Trinity’s articulated internationalization objectives (economic and academic) are included in such monitoring and evaluation processes will help to track the progress and quality of the different goals and will ensure ample attention is paid to each of them. Without a balanced approach to internationalization, the Irish government acknowledged Irish higher education institutions could be at risk for a largely detrimental decline in academic quality and for relying too heavily on international student funds to
sustain the higher education sector. While revenue generation is essential to Trinity functioning, a balanced approach to internationalization will help to achieve both the monetary and academic goals of internationalization and could help to avoid many of the pitfalls that could result in the long-term.

**Theoretical Implications: Examination of the Delta Cycle to the Trinity Case Study**

This section examines the second research question, namely, “In what ways is Rumbley’s (2007) Delta Cycle for Internationalization an applicable conceptual framework for the internationalization process at Trinity College Dublin?” The Delta Cycle (2010) originated from Rumbley’s (2010) examination of four Spanish universities’ experiences with internationalization, as understood principally by the conceptual model of Jane Knight’s (1994) Internationalization Cycle. Rumbley’s (2010) findings revealed that while Knight’s (1994) model was applicable to the Spanish context on a number of different levels, the model was missing some critical features. The Delta Cycle represented a revised and expanded graphic representation of Knight’s (1994) original interpretation of the internationalization process, and attempted to address those missing features. This research study extended the work of Knight (1994) (see Appendix A) and Rumbley (2010) (see Appendix B) in their case study examinations of the internationalization of Canadian and Spanish universities by examining the applicability of Rumbley’s (2007) Delta Cycle for Internationalization to the Trinity College Dublin context.
Applicability of the Delta Cycle’s (2010) Six Steps to Internationalization

The Delta Cycle for Internationalization (2010) (see Appendix B) is an enhanced framework for understanding and analyzing internationalization at the institutional level. Similar to Knight’s (1994) model, the Delta Cycle (2007) considered the internationalization process as a continuous cycle and identified the six steps or phases that an institution proceeds through to develop and implement an internationalization strategy ((a) awareness, (b) commitment, (c) planning, (d) operationalization, (e) review, and (f) reinforcement) (Knight, 1994). When applied against the Trinity case study, some of the same phases were applicable, with others less dynamic and applicable. To elaborate, Trinity demonstrated high levels of awareness in discovering the need to internationalize and acted on that new insight. At the campus level, the Global Relations Office made concerted efforts to spread awareness about global developments and activities through the implementation of the Global Relations Strategy and through various methods for communicating Trinity’s international initiatives. Although the findings for this study indicated some lack of awareness and levels of confusion in the Trinity community regarding the international endeavors taking place on campus, some interviewees noted that time would likely address this issue, with levels of awareness gradually expected to increase as the internationalization process grew older and soaked deeper into the university fabric. Trinity demonstrated a high level of commitment from administration in support of internationalization, particularly through the multiple steps and levels of investment made in the internationalization process. Examples of Trinity’s high level of commitment included the significant investment of university funds to sponsor the
internationalization initiative. The creation of the first-ever title and position of Vice Provost for Global Relations and the appointment of a senior-level academic to the position to lead the internationalization process also demonstrated university commitment to internationalization. Interestingly, although some of the interviewed administrators, academics, and staff expressed varying levels of commitment to internationalization, they all acknowledged some level of understanding for pursuing internationalization for revenue generating purposes, based on Ireland’s dire economic climate and Trinity’s need for an additional source of revenue.

Also apparent in the Trinity case study was the considerable amount of time dedicated to planning their internationalization strategy through the eventual creation of the Global Relations Office and the very detailed and comprehensive Global Relations Strategy. At the same time, interviewees acknowledged that more planning and attention was needed that focused on the long-term needs of the international students and the Trinity services they would need. These issues were noted to be on the agenda for discussion and change at the time data was collected for this study. Additionally, the Trinity case study exemplified aggressive and systematic efforts towards the operationalization of internationalization through the creation of a 32-person business office and the creation and implementation of the Global Relations Strategy.

Less applicable to Trinity were the Delta Cycle’s (2010) review and reinforcement stages, arguably attributable to Trinity still being in the implementation stage of its internationalization process when data were collected for this study. Interviewees
acknowledged the Global Relations Office was reviewed, assessed, and monitored to determine quantitative outcomes of their weekly and monthly processes and to determine such objectives as to whether the financial goals and KPIs outlined in the Global Relations Strategy had been met. International student surveys were also being distributed and assessed by Trinity, so consideration was being made for the international students’ experience in the review process. At the same time, however, although a quantitative aspect of Trinity’s internationalization process was heavily reviewed and assessed (i.e., assessing the financial goals and KPIs of the Global Relations Strategy), the findings for this study did not indicate that consideration for the valuable but less easily measurable qualitative aspects of internationalization (i.e., assessing such important elements as levels of awareness and buy in across the university community or reviewing internationalization’s impact on the quality of education and research) were being reviewed. Finally, given the rapid and aggressive pace of the Global Relations Strategy, interviewees noted the review stage should also include an element of reflection on the internationalization process - reflection on what has been done, the impact of what has been done, and based on those findings, what should be done in the future. Hence, the Delta Cycle’s (2010) review stage appeared to be less dynamic and as a result, only partially applicable to the Trinity case study.

Also less applicable to the Trinity case study at the time of data collection for this study was the Delta Cycle’s (2010) reinforcement phase. Given the economic challenges Trinity faced and the very limited resources available, rewarding those individuals integral to the successful implementation of the Global Relations Strategy was not possible.
Interviewees expressed regret and concern over the lack of reinforcements or rewards for the exceptional efforts so many individuals dedicated to the internationalization process. Such a deficiency was noted by interviewees to possibly lead to the loss of valuable Trinity staff.

Meanwhile, Trinity’s incentivization plan, designed to compensate student services offices (who interviewees described as being “resource-starved”) for their work in serving additional international students, was due to be dispersed sometime after the data for this study was collected. Trinity’s incentivization plan outlined a formula for compensating student services offices based on the number of additional international students they served. The same plan was due to compensate those Trinity departments for recruiting additional international students. The plan was not yet implemented at the time of this study; consequently, Rumbley’s (2010) reinforcement phase was determined to be less applicable to the Trinity case study.

The applicability of the Delta Cycle’s (2010) six phases to the Trinity case study demonstrate those stages considered at the primary stage of implementation (i.e., awareness, commitment, planning, and operationalization) were more active and applicable to the Trinity case study. Whereas those stages considered more towards the middle to final stages of the internationalization cycle (i.e., review and reinforcement) were less dynamic and therefore, less applicable to the Trinity case study. These conclusions indicate Rumbley’s (2010) initial stages were most applicable. Additionally, the Trinity case study appeared to be on course to follow the sequential direction and final phases that were illustrated in the Delta Cycle (2010). Interviewees often noted the Global Relations Strategy was in the
primary stage of implementation; therefore, it is understandable that, for now, the
applicability of the Delta Cycle (2010) was most dynamic and applicable to the early phases
of commitment, planning, and operationalization with less applicability to the review,
reinforcement, and awareness stages.

As a final note, the Trinity case study demonstrated no particular order in sequence
between the phases outlined in the Delta Cycle (2010). Contrary to Knight (1994) and
Rumbley (2010), the current study did not demonstrate the six steps to be in consecutive
sequence. Rather, there did not appear to be any form of noticeable pattern or order between
the steps outlined in the Delta Cycle (2010), with the internationalization process moving
from, for instance, the more dynamic stage of commitment to the less dynamic phase of
review. In this way, the current study supported Childress (2009) in determining that no
distinct order or sequence exists between the phases outlined in Knight’s (1994) and now
Rumbley’s (2010) models.

Environmental Factors

Another component to Rumbley’s (2010) model acknowledged that four key
environmental factors - opportunities, imperatives, obstacles, and resources - shaped the
process and defined the boundaries of the internationalization cycle. The current study was
among the first in the literature to analyze the impact of environmental factors on the
internationalization process at the institutional level. Interestingly, the findings for this study
concluded that environmental factors were highly significant to the internationalization
process at Trinity College Dublin.
Trinity created the *opportunity* to internationalize arguably more so than the opportunity presenting itself to Trinity. To explain, Trinity’s financial investment in the Global Relations Office provided the opportunity for the university to hire staff who, in turn, worked to design and implement a university internationalization strategy, the Global Relations Strategy. By investing their own university funds (as opposed to government funding) into the creation of the Global Relations Office, the Global Relations Staff could remain immune from the harsh austerity measures being placed upon all other university departments by the Irish government. As a result, the Global Relations Office was less curtailed in their work to implement the Global Relations Strategy.

The Global Relations Office trips abroad also provided the *opportunity* to develop global relationships with key university and industry partners and served as an opportunity to engage Trinity academics in the internationalization process by including them on the trips. Hence, the decision for Trinity to fund these global initiatives opened the door to many opportunities for the university to internationalize. In this way, Trinity did not naturally progress in a direction that led to the opportunity to internationalize; rather, Trinity created opportunities necessary to internationalize through the dedication of time and financial investment.

The second environmental factor illustrated in Rumbley’s (2010) model was the *imperatives* placed upon institutions to internationalize. Trinity was faced with the imperative to internationalize due to factors that included globalization and the need for institutions to respond and adapt to the changing needs of a more interconnected world.
Perhaps most significant and a main conclusion for this study was the Irish government’s clearly defined imperative for Irish institutions to internationalize. Trinity was guided and bound by the imperative outlined by the Irish government in its internationalization efforts.

The third environmental factor acknowledged by Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle was the obstacles institutions faced in the process of pursuing their internationalization strategy. The findings for this study describe the many challenges (also known as obstacles) that bound Trinity’s efforts to internationalize. Challenges such as limited resources and capacity issues for serving increasing numbers of international students were some of the noted obstacles Trinity faced in their efforts. While some of the obstacles could be addressed over time and with dedicated efforts to the issue (i.e., ambiguity over aspects of the internationalization process at Trinity), other challenges appeared to be more ingrained in the university structure and would likely take more time to address (i.e., antiquated university systems and functions).

Finally, a key environmental factor noted by Rumbley (2010) as vital to an institution’s practice of internationalization were resources. As exemplified in Appendix B, Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle illustrates resources as a core factor that bounds the internationalization process. Resources were, without a doubt, a significant environmental factor that impacted all aspects of Trinity’s efforts to internationalize. Although the Global Relations Office was less impacted by limited resources, the entire Trinity university community was limited in their efforts to internationalize because of the economically challenged environment in Ireland and within the institution.
Also described by Rumbley (2010) as part of the Delta Cycle (2010) was the point that context matters in an institution’s plans to internationalize. More specifically, Rumbley (2010) noted the following factors to consider in the internationalization planning process: “the era of the universities’ foundation and maturation, their geographic location, and their unique institutional characteristics” (Rumbley, 2010). Trinity’s contextual characteristics (as a 400 year old institution that had experienced relatively little change, its urban setting, and its role as a leading institution in Ireland), did indeed shape and largely influence Trinity’s internationalization strategy. Taken together, the findings of this study indicate the Delta Cycle’s (2010) four key environmental factors - opportunities, imperatives, obstacles, and resources - shaped Trinity’s internationalization process as the factors that bounded and formed the core of the process.

**Delta Cycle: Rationales, Strategies, and Outcomes**

The Delta Cycle (2010) asserted rationales, strategies, and outcomes must be incorporated into any analysis of internationalization, and that change - both in terms of the continuously fluid nature of the external environment and the transformational impact of the change on institutions - is a defining feature of internationalization (Rumbley, 2010). Rumbley’s (2010) model included the question “Why [internationalize]?” and highlighted rationales/motivations as vital components to any analysis of internationalization. The findings for this study indicated that Trinity’s motivations to internationalize were vital to understanding the internationalization process. Trinity’s motivations to internationalize were distilled down to the following: the necessity to catch up with Trinity’s peer institutions
internationalization efforts, revenue generation, government imperative, enhanced reputation and increased visibility, and holistic rationales, including the preparation of globally minded graduates. The thorough review of the rationales included in this study demonstrated the breadth of factors involved when Trinity sought to articulate their most important reasons for internationalizing their institution. In this way, Rumbley’s (2010) consideration of institutional rationales to internationalize was highly applicable to the Trinity case.

The Delta Cycle (2010) also illustrated strategies for internationalization by asking “How” institutions internationalize and considered this question essential to any examination of the phenomenon, which in turn, was also an integral consideration in Trinity’s internationalization process. In response to growing rationales and imperatives to internationalize, Trinity College Dublin pursued an aggressive and strategic approach to internationalization that included the design and implementation of the university-funded Global Relations Strategy (GRS). In this way, Rumbley’s (2010) theoretical model demonstrated a level of versatility by recognizing a wide array of internationalization approaches taken by institutions. In Trinity’s case, the institution chose a business approach to internationalization. Asking “How” the institution has internationalized was essential to the process, as it highlighted the approach taken and provided further depth to understanding the process of internationalization at the case study.

Finally, Rumbley’s (2010) Delta Cycle pointed to the importance in considering “To What End?” or the outcomes of an institution’s internationalization efforts. This research study was conducted in the initial stages of Trinity implementing their internationalization
strategy. As such, actual outcomes were not addressed in the research findings. Outcomes were, however, recognized by interviewees as important (i.e., doubling the number of international students, increasing alumni donations, etc.), and over time, consideration for outcomes and for asking “To What End?” would be applicable and integral to understanding the full internationalization process at Trinity. As Trinity’s internationalization process advances and matures, understanding the outcomes from the process will be important. However, due to the timeframe in which this study was conducted, a discussion on outcomes was not applicable to the current study. As such, consideration for the rationales that motivated Trinity to internationalize and the actual strategy contributed to describing and understanding the development of Trinity’s initial stages of internationalization.

Consideration for outcomes would not be applicable to the current research study. However, as time elapses and outcomes develop, the same case study will likely continue to align with the Delta Cycle (2010) and outcomes can then be included in a discussion on Trinity’s internationalization process.

In summary, this section addressed the second research question, “In what ways is Rumbley’s (2007) Delta Cycle for Internationalization an applicable conceptual framework for the internationalization process at TCD?” When applied against the Trinity case study, the Delta Cycle (2010) was applicable on many levels. The Delta Cycle (2010) was most applicable to those stages and processes considered in the initial stage of the internationalization cycle, which reflects Trinity being in the primary stage of implementation when the data for this study was collected. In addition, with a lack of
attention focused in the literature to the impact of environmental factors on an institution’s internationalization process, this study was particularly illuminating in considering such factors. Rumbley’s four key environmental factors - opportunities, imperatives, obstacles, and resources - were determined to be instrumental in shaping Trinity’s internationalization experience up to the point the data was collected for this study. In this way, the Delta Cycle was determined as a highly serviceable theoretical model for understanding the important and often overlooked influence environmental factors play in the internationalization process. Institutions seeking to internationalize would be wise to consider environmental factors in their decisions to internationalize.

**New Dimensions: Extending the Rumbley Cycle (2010)**

Although the Delta Cycle (2010) was applicable to the Trinity case study in many ways, the application of the conceptual model to the Trinity case study revealed missing components. The development of internal relationships was central to Trinity’s efforts to internationalize, notably relationship building with Trinity academics. For instance, the Global Relations Office consistently included Trinity faculty in the internationalization process so they had the opportunity to become more invested in the process and at the same time, could become advocates for internationalization on campus. The literature highlighted that faculty, in their diverse roles and responsibilities are tied to and hold authority over many of the activities that are intimately linked to those efforts that characterize the internationalization process (Savishinsky, 2012). Given this level of broad and deep influence and involvement, faculty are often in a position to determine whether and how to
integrate international content and activities into their teaching, research, and service and other work (Green & Olson, 2003). Their extensive influence and involvement make faculty engagement in internationalization efforts essential to making international experiences a successful reality on a university campus (Green & Olson, 2003; Savishinsky, 2012). In this way, building strong relationships between the university office overseeing internationalization efforts and faculty form an important university foundation for future internationalization developments.

At the same time, integral to Trinity’s approach to internationalization was a focus and pursuit to strategically build external relationships, particularly with institutions and industries abroad. No longer insular in nature or focus, institutions are increasingly looking outward and are involved in collaborations between faculty and students and all sectors of society - the nonprofit sector, the government, industries, and corporations (Clay, 2008; Hankel, 2014; Holton, 1998). The Trinity case study demonstrated an internationalization process that was open and receptive to developing external partnerships and relationship building. As Trinity and institutions worldwide continue to engage and collaborate with institutions and industries abroad, recognition of internal and external relationship building is important to consider in the description of institutional internationalization.

Taken together, the Trinity case study demonstrated the importance of developing a strong institutional foundation that is receptive and engaged in internationalization and suggested this can be achieved through internal relationship building with key stakeholders, such as faculty. At the same time, the Trinity case study highlighted that institutions must
have a global *scope and reach* that extends outward in order to incorporate a more international dimension into the teaching, research, and services functions. A global scope or reach was demonstrated to be achieved through external relationship building. A strong internationally focused campus *foundation* and global *scope and reach* are important dimensions and factors to consider in theoretical approaches to internationalization. The Delta Cycle (2010) does not include an internal or external frame of reference or focus on relationship building. As internationalization has evolved since the Delta Cycle (2010) originated, it makes sense that the model would be updated to reflect developments in the field, such as increased attention placed on building partnerships and relationships, both internal and external to the university.

A second theoretical contribution points to the highly significant role environmental factors played in the internationalization process at Trinity College Dublin. The Delta Cycle’s (2010) four key environmental factors - opportunities, imperatives, obstacles, and resources - largely shaped and influenced Trinity’s internationalization pursuits. Particularly given the ever-changing global economic climate and the increasing impact that social and political forces can have on higher education institutions, the current study highlighted the importance of recognizing environmental factors in theoretical approaches to institutional internationalization. Consideration of how environmental factors can shape institutional internationalization processes helped to focus attention on the current context of institutional initiatives so that the direction of internationalization does not lead to unplanned or unwelcomed consequences. The Trinity case study served as an example to the value in
critically examining how such environmental factors as financial opportunities, government imperatives, limited resources, and obstacles can lead to internationalization decisions that may be more focused on revenue production than on the more altruistic objectives of internationalization. This study points to the importance of understanding the internationalization of a higher education institution through a theoretical lens that considers and monitors how environmental factors can influence internationalization processes. In this way, institutions can remain aware and active in steering internationalization initiatives in a direction that meets the intended and ultimate objective of internationalization, namely to help prepare students to successfully contribute to the increasingly globalized world.

A third and final theoretical implication stemming from this study considered future theoretical directions for Trinity and other institutions pursuing internationalization. The findings for this study indicated that the Delta Cycle (2010) was applicable to the Trinity case study in many ways. However, as internationalization rapidly expands in breadth and depth at the institutional level (as it currently is doing at Trinity), the phenomenon is no longer contained to a unit within academia that is specifically focused on international initiatives, such as an international office. Rather, internationalization efforts at Trinity are taking place across campus within diverse university units, each at their own pace and at their own stage in the process. For instance, many of Trinity’s academic colleges have their own internationalization agendas and approaches. In this way, future theoretical frameworks for internationalization will need to take a more multidimensional approach to consider the various internationalization cycles taking place across campus. For example, consideration
for internationalization efforts within individual units, such as university academic
departments or student services will be increasingly important. As comprehensive
internationalization continues to unfold, trying to capture internationalization in a centralized
manner will likely be increasingly difficult. Because of the increasingly comprehensive
approaches to internationalization, future theoretical considerations for internationalization
will need to move in a direction that is no longer one-dimensional in nature and will no
longer be easily captured in sequential steps or phases, as the Delta Cycle (2010) illustrated.
Although comprehensive internationalization as a term and approach has been increasingly
discussed in the literature (Hudzik, 2011) and by practitioners in the field of international
education (Simon, 2014), current theoretical considerations for comprehensive
internationalization are limited. The Trinity case study contributed to the literature valuable
foundational points to reference in future considerations for theoretical models and
approaches to comprehensive approaches to institutional internationalization.

Implications for Policy and Practice

The findings of this study have implications for policy and practice, which will be
discussed in this section. Based on what was learned from the Trinity case study, specific
recommendations and practical strategies will be made to address the findings and to counter
some of the greatest challenges found in this study.

Addressing the Lack of Communication and Awareness

Many interviewees expressed a general lack of awareness about the international
developments taking place on campus. Trinity, academics, staff, and administrators noted
varying levels of confusion and a lack of awareness about the events taking place in the Global Relations Office. The lack of awareness was often attributed to a long-standing issue at Trinity, notably poor lines of communication across the university and to a lack of clear lines for communication between the Trinity community and the Global Relations Office. The findings for this study noted the Global Relations Office did create opportunities to spread awareness about the internationalization developments taking place at Trinity and to create lines of communication between the Trinity community and the Global Relations Office itself. In addition to publishing monthly newsletters to update the university community on internationalization developments taking place, the GRO held town hall meetings to inform the Trinity community of the work conducted by the GRO. The town hall meetings also functioned as a forum for the Trinity community to volunteer the international work they were pursuing and as a forum to open up dialogue between the Trinity community and the GRO, whose representatives were available for questions.

As they develop and more and more of the Trinity community becomes informed of them, Town Hall Meetings could be increasingly helpful to increasing levels of awareness across campus and to gaining positive feedback on the international endeavors taking place on campus. However, increasing lines of communication may require a different forum for voicing concerns from Town Hall Meetings. With anonymity being highly coveted by the interviewees for this study in terms of any type of critical feedback on the internationalization process, a less public forum for addressing concerns and for voicing critical feedback of the internationalization process is needed at Trinity. In this way,
suggestions for Trinity and institutions similar to Trinity to consider include dedicating a section on university’s international office homepage (in Trinity’s case, that would be the Global Relations Office home page) where feedback on the internationalization process could be submitted in an anonymous manner. Hard copy feedback forms could be made available in various spots across campus, including the main international office, so that members of the university community could anonymously send the form to the Global Relations Office via campus mail. In this way, a university’s international office could be informed on some of the challenges being faced across campus that are related to university internationalization initiatives. This feedback could be provided without the fear or hesitation that may be felt in expressing concerns a large forum such as a Town Hall Meeting.

Additionally, the Global Relations Office met with individual departments to discuss the expectations for them to increase their number of international students and to increase links with institutions abroad, among other things. At the same time, interviewees noted a lack of awareness on how to actually do such things. For instance, interviewees were not aware of how a Trinity Department Head could actually create a link or exchange with a potential institutional partner abroad. Beyond that lack of knowledge, interviewees noted the lack of awareness on who to contact in the Global Relations Office for such details. Trinity and campuses pursuing internationalization initiatives could consider addressing such issues of confusion by including a step-by-step listing on the university international website (for Trinity, the Global Relations Office website) that details specifically how departments can
establish institutional links and exchanges with partners abroad and the specific contact
details for the individual(s) in the international office who handles those issues.

Organizing International Staff Job Responsibilities

Trinity’s former international office staff was reassigned to manage administrative
components of international student admissions in the Academic Registry. Within the
Academic Registry, a level of ambiguity was noted regarding the reporting structures and job
responsibilities of the international admissions staff. For example, one Academic Registry
staff manages admissions for incoming international students from Country “A,” whereas a
completely different Academic Registry staff member manages admissions for Trinity
students planning to study abroad in Country “A.” In addition, the same two Academic
Registry staff members referenced above reported to different managers within the Academic
Registry and as a result, sat in entirely different offices. Such a disjoint and division of
responsibilities was an additional cause for concern and confusion.

In an effort to make international admissions less cumbersome a process for
university staff, international students, and partner institutions, Trinity and institutions
similar to it could consider assigning international office staff to manage the same region of
the world for both incoming international students and outgoing university-based study
abroad students. The consistency in world regions would simplify the process and would add
a level of consistency to university international admissions processes. Assigning regions of
the world to international admissions staff could eliminate confusion within the office and
could provide an opportunity for responsibilities that are more streamlined, and in the
process, could create more of a team atmosphere. More specifically, assigning international staff to world regions could create a level of commonality across staff responsibilities that could assist in collaborative efforts such as designing incoming and outgoing student orientation programs. These same international staff would ideally sit in the same office area as each other in an effort to encourage collaborative efforts between them and subsequently to enhance teamwork.

**Clarifying International Student Support Services**

The findings for this study indicated that Trinity’s international visiting students had multiple student support service options available to them, including Student2Student peer supporters (a peer mentor group for whom students can contact with questions about all aspects of college life at Trinity); Global Relations Officer (GRO staff who are housed within various Trinity departments and were noted to be available for international student questions and concerns); Academic Tutors (a unique arrangement at Trinity whereby every Trinity student is assigned to an academic professor as a resource for academic and personal support during their term of study); the Global Room (a dedicated room with one GRO staff member at the front desk to answer international student questions); and Career Advisory Services (a division of this office is set up to work directly with international student questions regarding potential employment opportunities). While the plethora of international student support options appears to be commendable, the multiple options were actually confusing for the interviewees. The decentralized nature of the support services available to international students had several of the interviewed Trinity academics and staff confused as to whom
exactly they should contact when an international student was in need of assistance, particularly in the case of an emergency.

Trinity and all higher education institutions that host international students need to inform both their international students and the university community as a whole on who exactly they need to contact for individual student needs. Having representatives speak at the international student orientation when the students arrive at the institution could help give the students a clear understanding on what each support service does and when it would be most appropriate to turn to them with a given question or need. In the case of an emergency, specific names and contact numbers for the university representative in charge of handling international student emergencies must be made clear to the entire university community.

In Trinity’s case, these very important safety details were not clear at the time data was collected for this study. In the past, Trinity’s international office was the central office that international students, their parents, and their home international office staff would contact in the event of an emergency. Without a centralized international office, Trinity must designate a university office or specific list of individuals who can be contacted 24 hours a day in the event of an international student emergency.

Making Room for International Opportunities in Degree Requirements

The relatively low number of Trinity students who studied abroad was noted to be rather shocking for some of the interviewees. The low number was attributed to Trinity’s rigid degree requirements that did not accommodate for a study abroad term. Trinity and institutions similar to it must be aware that in order to increase the number of domestic
students who study abroad, degree requirements must be able to accommodate a term abroad in such a way that students are not largely delayed in their degree programs and must extend their time in school. Institutions can inform themselves by referring to peer institutions with more flexible degree requirements that accommodate students who choose to study abroad.

**Monitoring and Balancing Internationalization**

Although the Global Relations Office was held to rigorous levels of accountability and reporting structures, the outlined objectives of the Global Relations Strategy were also stringently monitored. The findings for this study indicated that not all of the necessary aspects of internationalization were being evaluated or monitored at Trinity. Indeed, while aspects of internationalization such as the number of international students recruited were monitored, less focus was placed on determining how education and research were directly being impacted by internationalization initiatives.

In addition to concentrated efforts to monitor the more quantifiable aspects of internationalization at Trinity and similar higher education institutions, efforts to monitor the impact internationalization has had on education and scholarship levels, for instance, would be helpful in ensuring the process is balanced and not too heavily focused on numbers and revenue production. For example, institutions can monitor if university trips abroad generate increased international and collaborate publications from the academics attending the trips. Likewise, monitoring whether academics’ participation in international trips abroad resulted in them teaching courses with a more international dimension would be one way to monitor if internationalization efforts are influencing teaching and have led to a more
internationalized curriculum. Additionally, understanding the academic impact international students make on campus would help explain how internationalization is affecting learning at institutions. In general, institutions would be wise to move beyond the mere numbers that are assumed to indicate internationalization is being monitored and seek to understand how internationalization is impacting teaching and learning on campus. Without such assessment, the risk increases of veering in a direction that is more focused on numbers and quantifiable outcomes and less focused on the core objective of internationalization, namely to educate students to be global citizens and to enhance education and research. This point highlights the need for Trinity and institutions worldwide pursuing internationalization efforts to continually assess the impacts (intended and unintended, positive and negative) of internationalization so that a focus can be maintained on the pure and real objectives of internationalization, to increase the quality of teaching and learning. At the same time, the findings for this research also signal the need for institutions to place academic goals, such as student learning and the advancement of research, at the center of all institutional efforts to internationalize. By continually monitoring and confirming that internationalization efforts are focused on the real objectives of internationalization, the current growing discomfort with internationalization veering in a more commercial direction can be mitigated and redirected so that internationalization is, once again, a means to an end and not an end in itself (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; de Wit, 2011; Qiang, 2003; van der Wende, 1997).

Finally, the results of the international students’ survey conducted at Trinity were noted to be poor for the last few years. Interviewees did not elaborate on this survey in
depth, but the results from the survey need to be assessed and addressed so that the international student experience at Trinity does not continue to produce dismal results. Interviewees were aware that students are often the best marketers of study abroad programs, so the potential impact from continued negative study abroad experiences at Trinity could greatly impact the number and quality of students who apply to study abroad at Trinity in the future. At the same time, poor results on international student surveys could indicate Trinity is failing in one of the key objectives of internationalization efforts at the institution, notably that international students will have a high quality academic experience while studying at Trinity. While it is encouraging that Trinity is monitoring the international student experience with a survey, the results need to be analyzed so that the major issues facing international students can be addressed and the international student experience at Trinity can greatly improve. Most importantly, this study points to the need for ongoing and continuous examination and evaluation of the impact of internationalization on international students so they are treated with the care and respect they need in all aspects of their relationship with the institution.

**Voicing Concerns over Institutional-level Expectations**

The Irish government issued a national mandate, which clearly outlined expectations for Irish institutions to internationalize their institutions. The mandate was used as a blueprint for Irish institutions to integrate an international focus into the teaching, research, and service functions of their institutions. In Ireland’s case and for countries similar to it with a top-down policy process and with the national government dictating many of the main
drivers of internationalization, the policies and financial support for internationalization need to be focused on enhancing the quality of education and research and on the preparation of global graduates so that the institutions impacted by those policies can be led in a direction more in tune with the pure and real goals of academia and internationalization. The findings for this study highlighted the increasing focus on economic drivers for internationalization, with less attention paid to the more altruistic internationalization goals. In this way, higher education institutions must advocate for policy change at the governmental level if the policies driving internationalization are in directions that might not serve long-term academic purposes, such as the growing commercial drivers of internationalization. In order to this to take place, Irish higher education leaders must remain aware and active in communicating with Ireland’s national government about possible adverse impacts internationalization is having at their respective institutions and remain open to constructive dialogue on how to address those issues.

**Sustaining Internationalization**

Since its launch in 2011, the pace of the implementation of the Global Relations Strategy has been extraordinarily quick and aggressive and the strategy has been implemented very broadly, with numerous initiatives launched at the same time. Sustaining the quick momentum and the broad approach to internationalization was expressed as a concern by several interviewees. In order to sustain the process over time, Trinity and institutions pursuing an equally rapid and wide-ranging internationalization approach may consider narrowing the scope to concentrate on those initiatives that are directly in line with
enhancing the quality of education and research at the same time. Many interviewees noted being exhausted from the rapid and sometimes relentless pace of the implementation of the Global Relations Strategy. Trinity and all institutions pursuing internationalization would be wise to take the time to step back and to reflect on what has been done thus far, and then determine the direction the university wants to take in the future so that internationalization stays on course and aligns with the main objectives of the university.

As with any major university initiative, internationalization brings with it benefits as well as the potential for great risk. This section provided specific recommendations for policy and practice based on what was learned from the Trinity case study. Based on what was not going well at Trinity, recommendations to counter some of the pitfalls of internationalization were addressed. The following section will discuss future research to consider based on what was learned from the Trinity case study.

**Future Research**

I approached this study with an interest in learning and then describing how and why Trinity College Dublin pursued internationalization. In addition, I hoped to understand the ways Rumbley’s Delta Cycle (2010) was applicable to the Trinity case study. The themes that emerged from this study helped to develop an understanding of Trinity’s experience with internationalization and in the process, added to the existing international higher education literature. While this research study provided a great deal of insight into the process of internationalization at the case study institution, a number of issues raised by the analysis
could not be addressed within the context of this study. This section addresses areas for further research consideration.

Particularly distinct to the current study was the adoption of a formal business approach to internationalization. Continued research on business approaches to internationalization could provide government and institutional leaders’ insight on the benefits and drawbacks of establishing a business office and a business plan on campus. In light of the varying degrees of expressed opposition to an academic endeavor with the main objective focused on the bottom line, research dedicated to understanding how to garner university buy in for a business approach to internationalization would be helpful for any future institutional business approaches to internationalization. Additionally, a business office working within and for a university campus could be challenged in tangling corporate goals and expectations with a university culture that traditionally functions and operates with objectives focused on enhancing the value of education and research. In this way, the literature could be enhanced by gaining an understanding of how expectations and objectives of a business office are balanced with those of the university community in which it is situated. Additionally, educational institutions are increasingly adopting business models to engage in the competitive, global battle for international student numbers and in the process, are operating in a quasi-market manner, with students who are increasingly assuming the role of a customer. In this climate, studies on the implications of a marketing approach to internationalization (for instance, the impact that a marketing approach to internationalization can have on students) would be an additional enlightening scholarly study. Finally, future
research could include a comparative case study with institutions similar to Trinity who assumed a corporate approach to the internationalization of higher education (for example, an Australian higher education institution) and the benefits and risks experienced in the process.

Trinity used university funds to sponsor its entire internationalization strategy. Particularly in light of dwindling state funding for higher education, a deeper understanding on the details of how institutions can fund their own internationalization initiatives will be useful and insightful research for institutions seeking to learn more about how to approach a university-funded internationalization strategy. Research dedicated to the necessary and important financial considerations involved in internationalization could include a study on how much capital is needed to self-fund an institutional internationalization initiative, and where the funds for internationalization come from. Gaining a greater understanding on how funding for university internationalization is sustained over time would be helpful to ensuring the process is sustainable. Finally, research dedicated to understanding how the internationalization balance is calculated and if institutions actually produce a net gain or loss from internationalization would be insightful. Given that a business approach to internationalization is focused on meeting the bottom line, understanding if and how those objectives are met would be helpful, particularly for institutions considering a business approach to internationalization.

The literature highlighted the common trend of institutions worldwide increasing their number of international visiting students. As this trend continues to grow, it is immensely important that institutional leaders, international higher education practitioners, and
internationalization scholars pay close attention to monitoring the international student experience. Should the quality of the international student experience suffer, the field of study abroad and international education will be negatively impacted too. Taken a step further, it is in institutions’ best financial interests to pay attention to this topic, particularly due to the large-scale financial investment many institutions make in the recruitment of international students and to the fact that institutional budgets are increasingly relying on international student revenue. Giving a voice to the international student experience through an increased focus on this research topic could ultimately help to prevent the increase in student numbers and subsequent decrease in the quality of the international student experience and related international student services and support networks. Important areas for research consideration and exploration on this topic could include a study on institutional methods for monitoring the international student experience and a study specifically dedicated to hearing international student voices and their experiences while studying abroad.

Finally, Trinity’s decision to mainstream international student services with domestic services points to the need for further research focused on exploring whether the mainstreaming of international students best serves the student or the institution.

The Irish government issued a national mandate for the country’s universities to internationalize. This study described the process of internationalization at one of Ireland’s universities, Trinity College Dublin. A comprehensive research study focused on how Ireland’s institutions responded to the national mandate to internationalize would be most insightful. The lessons learned from such a study could help to inform Ireland’s institutions
on the various approaches taken in their internationalization efforts. In the process, best practices could be learned and adopted while, at the same time, pitfalls to avoid could also be addressed. Additional research on institutional-level approaches to internationalization at Ireland’s universities could also assist the Irish government in understanding where the internationalization process is headed and possible interventions or support systems that may be needed to address long-term complications or negative impacts that may result from the internationalization process. In time, as internationalization efforts develop at Ireland’s higher education institutions, a comprehensive research study on how Ireland’s institutions responded to the national mandate to internationalize could lead the specific research focus to include whether such a national mandate is a worthwhile and productive government pursuit. At the same time, research dedicated to the outcomes (qualitative and quantitative outcomes) of the national mandate for Irish institutions to internationalize could provide further depth on how Irish institutions were impacted, either positively or negatively.

Finally, a clear trend noted in the findings for this study was the engagement and integration of faculty in the internationalization process and the increasing expectation for faculty to participate in the internationalization process. While faculty were interviewed for this study and their voices were included as part of this research study, research dedicated specifically to understanding faculty perspectives on internationalization would be a worthwhile addition to the literature. As faculty are increasingly being relied upon to participate in internationalization efforts, research dedicated to understanding how much faculty know about the internationalization of higher education would be insightful, as would
studies on if faculty genuinely would like to participate in pursuing the internationalization endeavors and, if so, why? Also, a helpful addition to the literature would be research dedicated to the impact of faculty participation in internationalization has on their work, specifically addressing whether faculty efforts dedicated to internationalization actually enhance their teaching and research. As a final point, research dedicated to the various ways in which faculty internationalize their curriculum could serve as a practical and much needed contribution to the literature. While the internationalization of the curriculum is often included in the university’s internationalization goals, it is less often demonstrated in the university’s internationalization outcomes.

**Conclusion**

This descriptive qualitative study, dedicated to understanding the internationalization process at Trinity College Dublin, could inform government and university leaders, scholars, and practitioners in the international higher education field on how and why the phenomenon developed at Ireland’s leading tertiary institution. Trinity was driven by political, social/cultural, academic, and predominately economic motivations to internationalize. Directed by the objectives outlined in an Irish government mandate to internationalize, Trinity designed and implemented a business office and business strategy as its approach to internationalize the institution. Trinity’s internationalization strategy is illustrative of the growing trend in higher education to merge business and academia for economic means, or the commercialization of higher education. Trinity’s business approach to internationalization demonstrated the potential benefits of applying business practices to
academic processes while, at the same time, highlighted potential downsides that can result from an academic pursuit with economic goals. Among others, the potential for a business approach and revenue-focused internationalization strategy to lose sight of the pure and real meaning of internationalization (to prepare students as national and global citizens and productive members of the global workforce) and the potential loss of attention to the diverse needs of international students were two notable downsides.

As the second main objective of this study, the Delta Cycle for Internationalization (2010), the theoretical framework for this study, aligned most directly with the implementation stages of Trinity’s experience with internationalization, with potential for the entire cycle to be applicable over time. Also demonstrated was the particularly strong influence environmental factors played in Trinity experience with internationalization.

Perhaps the most noticeable issue presented in the findings for this study was the need for Trinity to find and maintain a balance between the economic and the academic drivers of internationalization. While the intent to enhance the quality of education and research through internationalization was conveyed in the findings, the implementation stage of Trinity’s internationalization strategy demonstrated it was more in line with meeting the economic objectives set forth in the institutional strategy. The pressure to generate revenue and to meet the bottom line was demonstrated as potentially becoming paramount to the ultimate goals of academia.

The mounting considerations and pressures that confront higher education leaders and staff as they struggle to pursue their multiple objectives and to make ends meet in times of
severely diminished finances was recognized to make balancing academic rationales with commercial interests a tremendous challenge. As the internationalization phenomenon continues to grow at a rapid pace, the current study highlighted the importance for higher education leaders to discuss and address this need for balance so the internationalization field is not led astray from its original goals. Higher education leaders are encouraged to be cognizant and vocal about the expectations placed on them and the objectives and rationales being filtered down to them from the national level. More specifically, higher education leaders and scholars must be advocates for policy change at the governmental level if national policies drive internationalization in directions that might not serve long-term academic purposes. The important and ongoing task for higher education stakeholders to continuously examine and evaluate the effects of internationalization at the institutional level was determined in this study to be of central importance. This study further determined that consistent monitoring and concerted efforts to balance the growing economic pressures to internationalize with the important academic rationales could help to redirect internationalization so that it aligns with its pure and real objective - to prepare students to be global graduates and contributing members of the global workforce.
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Appendix A - Internationalization Cycle (Knight, 1994)

- **Awareness**
  - of need, purpose, and benefits of internationalization for students, staff, faculty, and society.

- **2. Commitment**
  - by senior administration, Board of Governors, faculty, staff, and students

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

- **4. Operationalize**
  - academic activities and services
  - organizational factors
  - use guiding principles

- **5. Reinforcement**
  - develop incentives, recognition, and rewards for faculty, staff, and student participation

- **5. Review**
  - access and enhance quality and impact of initiatives and progress of strategy

- ○ Supportive culture to integrate internationalization
Appendix B - Delta Cycle for Internationalization (Rumbley, 2010)

- Organizational culture sensitized and receptive to internationalization
- Fluid external environment and institutional willingness and ability to change
Appendix C - Interview Protocol for Faculty

**Background:**
1. How long have you been at Trinity/in your current role?

**Interview Questions:**
1. How would you define the internationalization of higher education?
2. What role do faculty members play in formulating the broader goals for internationalization at Trinity?
3. Has your work changed over time in relation to the Trinity’s international endeavors? If so, in what ways?
4. How widely understood is Trinity’s international mission among the faculty and how widely supported is it? What accounts for these levels of awareness and support?
5. What is the main motivation for Trinity’s internationalization efforts?
6. How satisfied are faculty with Trinity’s current internationalization activities?
7. What, would you say, are the intended outcomes of Trinity’s mission to internationalize?
8. Has there been any resistance to Trinity’s internationalization activities or its rationales for internationalizing? If so, from what quarters and why?
9. How is interest in internationalization sustained among faculty at Trinity?
10. From a faculty perspective, what does the future hold for internationalization at Trinity?
11. What are the greatest obstacles or challenges facing Trinity as it works towards its goals to internationalize?
Appendix D - Interview Protocol for Administrators

**Background:**

1. How long have you been at Trinity/in your current role?

**Interview Questions:**

2. How does Trinity define the internationalization of higher education?
3. What is the main motivation for Trinity’s internationalization efforts?
4. Has there been a change in motivation for internationalization over time?
5. How important is internationalization - or, ‘the international dimension’ – to Trinity?
6. What would you say is the best evidence of Trinity’s commitment to internationalization?
7. How would you describe the level of commitment across the university community?
8. How would you describe the university’s internationalization strategy(ies)?
9. How are decisions about internationalization made at Trinity?
10. What have been the primary ways in which the university has chosen to internationalize?
11. What are the reasons for taking such an approach to internationalization?
12. How does Trinity measure its own internationalization?
13. How does Trinity review and assess it internationalization efforts?
14. How satisfied are you with Trinity’s current internationalization activities?
15. How is resistance to Trinity’s internationalization activities expressed?
16. How is interest in and support for internationalization sustained at Trinity?
17. What does the future hold for internationalization at Trinity?
18. What are the greatest challenges or obstacles facing Trinity as it works towards its goals to internationalize?
Appendix E - Interview Protocol for Directors and Staff of International Program Offices

**Background:**
1. How long have you been at Trinity / in your current role?

**Interview Questions:**
2. How do you define the internationalization of higher education?
3. What is the mission of this office?
4. How does the mission of this office fit into the broader goals for internationalization at Trinity?
5. How does this office work to achieve the internationalization strategy(ies) of Trinity?
6. What are the primary activities of this office?
7. Has there been a change in this office’s mission and/or activities over time? [Please explain]
8. How committed is Trinity to the success of this office?
9. What would you say is the best evidence or demonstration of its level of commitment to the success of this office?
10. How does this office define and measure ‘success’?
11. How are the activities of this office reviewed and assessed?
12. How is resistance to Trinity’s internationalization activities expressed?
13. How is interest in internationalization sustained at Trinity?
14. What does the future hold for internationalization at Trinity?
15. What are the greatest challenges or obstacles facing Trinity as it works towards its goals to internationalize?
Appendix F - Field Observation Protocol

This guide is an outline for data collected through the field observations component of this research study. I plan to record my observational data though written notes and, possibly, sketches and audio recordings. Ultimately, the guide will consist of a written account derived from the data I collect during field observations and interviews conducted in this study. Additional observations will be based on the opportunities that are available during the field work portion of this study, but could consist of observing staff meetings in the Trinity International Office; observing meetings between colleagues working on various aspects of internationalization at TCD; observing events associated with international delegations visiting Trinity; observing larger campus events on internationalization (i.e., International Student Coffee Hour hosted by the TCD International Office, orientation for new international students, etc…).

The guide will focus on two components:

1.) descriptive component in which the I (the observer) will attempt to capture a description of the setting, actions and conversations during my interviews with the participants; and,

2.) reflective component in which the I (the observer) will record thoughts, ideas, questions and concerns based on my observations throughout my interviews with the participants.

I will record my observational notes as soon as possible after the observation and/or interviews, as important details may be forgotten. I will keep in mind that observational field notes are used to "broaden my range of vision" and produce data that will be of use in later stages of this research study.

What I will look for when doing observations?
1. Physical setting.
2. Activities.
3. Human, social environment. The way in which human beings interact within the environment. This includes patterns of interactions, frequency of interactions, direction of communication patterns, decision-making patterns.
5. Informal interactions and unplanned activities.
7. Observing what does not happen.
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GUIDELINES FOR A CASE STUDY PROPOSAL

In your narrative, address each of the topics outlined below. Every application for IRB review must contain a proposal narrative, and failure to follow these directions will result in delays in reviewing/processing the protocol.

A. INTRODUCTION
   1. Briefly describe in lay language the purpose of the proposed research and why it is important.

   The purpose of this descriptive qualitative case study is to describe the experience of a single Irish higher education institution in its efforts to become a more international university. A qualitative study of this type allows for an in-depth and descriptive examination of the internationalization developments taking place at the case study institution. Internationalization is defined as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education” (Knight, 2004, p. 11). A second objective of this study is to assess the applicability of Rumbley’s (2010) theoretical framework, the Delta Cycle for Internationalization, in the Irish context. This research has the potential to both inform institutional leaders and policymakers on how internationalization has developed at the case study institution, relative to Rumbley’s (2010) theoretical model, and to provide practical strategies to further internationalize the institution.


   2. If student research, indicate whether for a course, thesis, dissertation, or independent research.

      This IRB submission is for my PhD dissertation.

B. SUBJECT POPULATION
   1. How many subjects will be involved in the research?
Participants will be recruited through targeted personal communication including email, phone, and skype. The researcher will specifically recruit faculty and administrators in the international peace studies department; higher level administrators in the international office; staff in the international office; staff in study abroad; administrators of research; administrators in the Trinity foundation office; the Trinity Registrar; and, the director and staff in the institute for international integration studies department. Participants will also be asked to pass on information about the research study to individuals they know who meet the criteria of the study. The researcher will give participants a copy of the recruitment letter (see pg. 7) and the researcher’s contact information to give to others who they think may be interested in participating in the study.

To participate in this study, participants must be employed at Trinity College Dublin. The participants for this study will consist of university administrators, staff, and professors who are involved in the internationalization process, specifically, the Vice Provost for Global Relations, Trinity Registrar; Director of Research for the Humanities; Assistant Professors of International Peace Studies; Director of Research for International Peace Studies; Director of International Programs Office; Study Abroad Executive Officers/Staff; Director of Institute for International Integration Studies; Executive Assistant for Institute for International Integration Studies; Dean of the Faculty; Head of the Trinity College Dublin Foundation Office.

This sampling procedure will exclude Trinity College Dublin students. It will not exclude specific populations otherwise.

The researcher is an alumnus of the case study institution. Participants could include teachers who previously taught the participant.

[ ] minors (under age 18) - if so, have you included a line on the consent form for the parent/guardian signature
[ ] fetuses
[ ] pregnant women
[ ] persons with mental, psychiatric or emotional disabilities
[ ] persons with physical disabilities
[ ] economically or educationally disadvantaged
[ ] prisoners
[ ] elderly
[ ] students from a class taught by principal investigator
[ ] other vulnerable population.
7. If any of the above are used, state the necessity for doing so. Please indicate the approximate age range of the minors to be involved.

n/a

C. PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED

1. In lay language, describe completely all procedures to be followed during the course of the experimentation. Provide sufficient detail so that the Committee is able to assess potential risks to human subjects. In order for the IRB to completely understand the experience of the subjects in your project, please provide a detailed outline of everything subjects will experience as a result of participating in your project. Please be specific and include information on all aspects of the research, through subject recruitment and ending when the subject's role in the project is complete. All descriptions should include the informed consent process, interactions between the subjects and the researcher, and any tasks, tests, etc. that involve subjects. If the project involves more than one group of subjects (e.g. teachers and students, employees and supervisors), please make sure to provide descriptions for each subject group.

**Interviews:**

1.) The researcher will conduct two pilot studies, prior to the recruitment of interviewees, with a Director of a study abroad office in the United States and the second with a native Irish university administrator, both of whom will not be interviewees in this study.

2.) Participants will be recruited through targeted personal communication including email, phone, and skype. Participants will also be asked to pass on information about the study to individuals they know who meet the criteria of the study. The researcher will give participants a copy of the recruitment letter (pg. 7) and the researcher’s contact information to give to others who they think may be interested in participating in the study.

3.) Individuals that are interested in participating will reply to emails sent to them by the researcher and/or will contact the researcher via email or phone directly to discuss the study, learn about consent and confidentiality and the study format, and to review interview details (including date, time, and location specifics, which will be decided by the participant).

4.) Prior to the interview, the researcher will review the informed consent form (pg. 12) with the participant. Each person who contacts the researcher to be a participant will be provided information about confidentiality and informed consent. The consent form will indicate that by participating in the study, the participant is agreeing to the terms of the study.

5.) The face-to-face interviews will take place in Ireland. The one-on-one interviews will be audio recorded and will last no longer than 90 minutes. The interview protocol is attached (pg. 8, 9, 10). There will be an opportunity for a second interview as a way of further follow-up, if needed.

6.) The interviews will be transcribed by a professional transcription service. Once the interviews have been transcribed, the researcher will prepare to email a copy of the transcript to the participant. Prior to sending the transcription to the participant, the researcher will strip the transcript of all identifying data and will email it to the
participant with a generic message that does not indicate that the participant is the person in the transcript. After the participant reviews the transcript for accuracy, the researcher will make any changes requested by the participant. Following the member check, the participant’s involvement in the study will be complete.

Field Observations:
1.) Field observations will be based on the opportunities that are available during the field work portion of this study and the consent of those involved, but could consist of observing staff meetings in the Trinity International Office; observing meetings between colleagues working on various aspects of internationalization at Trinity College Dublin; observing events associated with international delegations visiting Trinity; observing larger campus events on internationalization (i.e., International Student Coffee Hour hosted by the TCD International Office, orientation for new international students, etc…).

2.) The researcher will take field notes in accordance with the field observation protocol (pg. 11). These notes will serve as supplemental and contextual data to substantiate other data sources.

Document Analysis:
1.) The document analysis portion of this study could include the researcher’s review of university websites, promotional brochures, and international education program materials. Other possible data sources could include syllabi from courses that faculty who are interviewed may provide to the researcher.

2.) These notes will also serve as supplemental and contextual data to substantiate other data sources.

2. How much time will be required of each subject?
   2 hours

D. POTENTIAL RISKS
1. State the potential risks (physical, psychological, financial, social, legal or other) connected with the proposed procedures and explain the steps taken to minimize these risks.
   There are minimal risks associated with participation in this study.

2. Will there be a request for information that subjects might consider to be personal or sensitive (e.g. private behavior, economic status, sexual issues, religious beliefs, or other matters that if made public might impair their self-esteem or reputation or could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability)?
   No.

   a. If yes, please describe and explain the steps taken to minimize these risks.
   n/a
b. Could any of the study procedures produce stress or anxiety, or be considered offensive, threatening, or degrading? If yes, please describe why they are important and what arrangements have been made for handling an emotional reaction from the subject.

No.

3. How will data be recorded and stored?

Data will be recorded on a digital voice recorder and stored in a password protected file on my computer, which will remain locked in a secure location when not in use. Once the interviews have been transcribed, the transcriptions will also be stored in a password protected file on my computer, which will remain locked in a secure location when not in use.

a. How will identifiers be used in study notes and other materials?

The researcher will select a pseudonym for each participant (rather than their actual name) which will be used as an identifier for the entire study. A spreadsheet with participant’s real names and corresponding pseudonyms will be recorded on an excel spreadsheet that will be stored in a file, separate from the file containing the interview recordings and transcripts. Participants will be referred to by their pseudonym or by a generic category (for example, central administrator, academic unit administrator, program staff, or faculty) in all study-related materials including field notes, researcher journal, data analysis, and final write-up.

b. How will reports will be written, in aggregate terms, or will individual responses be described?

Reports will be written in both aggregate terms and individual responses.

4. If audio or videotaping is done how will the tapes be stored and how/when will the tapes be destroyed at the conclusion of the study.

Audio files will be stored in a password protected file on my computer, which will remain locked in a secure location when not in use. Audio files will be deleted within one year of the completion of the dissertation.

5. Is there any deception of the human subjects involved in this study? If yes, please describe why it is necessary and describe the debriefing procedures that have been arranged.

No.

E. POTENTIAL BENEFITS

This does not include any form of compensation for participation.

1. What, if any, direct benefit is to be gained by the subject? If no direct benefit is expected, but indirect benefit may be expected (knowledge may be gained that could help others), please explain.

The findings for this study could have positive implications on the case study institution for the information it could provide on institutional perspectives on internationalization efforts taking place and practical strategies that could be suggested for further developing international efforts at the case study institution. The field of international higher education could benefit from the contribution this study could make to the literature on the internationalization efforts taking place in a European university context. Additionally, university leaders and educational policymakers could benefit from the insight gained on the international education developments taking place at a research-based European higher
F. COMPENSATION

Please keep in mind that the logistics of providing compensation to your subjects (e.g., if your business office requires names of subjects who received compensation) may compromise anonymity or complicate confidentiality protections. If, while arranging for subject compensation, you must make changes to the anonymity or confidentiality provisions for your research, you must contact the IRB office prior to implementing those changes.

1. Explain compensation provisions if the subject withdraws prior to completion of the study.
   
   No compensation will be offered to participate in this study.

2. If class credit will be given, list the amount and alternative ways to earn the same amount of credit.

   n/a

G. COLLABORATORS

1. If you anticipate that additional investigators (other than those named on Cover Page) may be involved in this research, list them here indicating their institution, department and phone number.

   n/a

2. Will anyone besides the PI or the research team have access to the data (including completed surveys) from the moment they are collected until they are destroyed.

   No.

H. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

1. Do you have a significant financial interest or other conflict of interest in the sponsor of this project?
   
   No.

2. Does your current conflicts of interest management plan include this relationship and is it being properly followed? n/a

I. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1. If a questionnaire, survey or interview instrument is to be used, attach a copy to this proposal.
   
   

2. Attach a copy of the informed consent form to this proposal.
   
   

3. Please provide any additional materials that may aid the IRB in making its decision.
   
   

J. HUMAN SUBJECT ETHICS TRAINING

*Please consider taking the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI), a free, comprehensive ethics training program for researchers conducting research with human subjects. Just click on the underlined link.
Recruitment Information/Letter (1)

Dear [name of Trinity administrator, faculty, or staff],

My name is Deirdre O’Malley. I am currently pursuing my PhD in Educational Research and Policy Analysis with a concentration in higher education at North Carolina State University in Raleigh, North Carolina, USA. I am a graduate of Trinity College Dublin and have been a university administrator in international education for over 10 years at Harvard University, Boston College, and, most recently, North Carolina State University. The purpose of my dissertation is to describe the experience of Trinity College Dublin in its efforts to become a more international university. Your participation in this study will add value and understanding to the international efforts taking place at Trinity College Dublin. Greater understanding of international efforts taking place at Trinity will be of primary use to faculty and administrators as they work to highlight the progress already made in global engagement endeavors and as they explore future avenues to enhance Trinity’s standing as a global institution.

I am seeking to recruit 12-15 administrators, faculty, and staff who play a role in the international efforts taking place at Trinity. If you chose to participate in this study, you will be asked to meet in person for one interview that will last for no longer than 90 minutes.

I hope you will consider participating in this study. To sign up as a study participant, please contact me directly via email or phone (listed below). Please also feel free to forward this letter to others in the field who meet the study requirements.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to working with you in the near future.

Kindest regards,

Deirdre O’Malley
Email address – actual listed on letter sent
Phone number – actual listed on letter sent
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North Carolina State University
Institutional Review Board For The Use of Human Subjects in Research

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF INFORMED CONSENT FORM

PLEASE READ ALL OF THIS INFORMATION CAREFULLY PRIOR TO COMPLETING THE CONSENT FORM

An Informed Consent Statement has two purposes: (1) to provide adequate information to potential research subjects to make an informed choice as to their participation in a study, and (2) to document their decision to participate. In order to make an informed choice, potential subjects must understand the study, how they are involved in the study, what sort of risks it poses to them and who they can contact if a problem arises (see informed consent checklist for a full listing of required elements of consent). Please note that the language used to describe these factors must be understandable to all potential subjects, which typically means an eighth grade reading level. The informed consent form is to be read and signed by each subject who participates in the study before they begin participation in the study. A duplicate copy is to be provided to each subject.

If subjects are minors (i.e., any subject under the age of 18) use the following guidelines for obtaining consent:

- **0-5 years old** – requires signature of parent(s)/guardian/legal representative
- **6 – 10 years old** - requires signature of parent(s)/guardian/legal representative and verbal assent from the minor. In this case a minor assent script should be prepared and submitted along with a parental consent form.
- **11 - 17 years old** - requires signature of both minor and parent/guardian/legal representative

If the subject or legal representative is unable to read and/or understand the written consent form, it must be verbally presented in an understandable manner and witnessed (with signature of witness). If there is a good chance that your intended subjects will not be able to read and/or understand a written consent form, please contact the IRB office 919-515-4514 for further instructions.

*For your convenience, attached find a sample consent form template that contains necessary information. In generating a form for a specific project, the principal investigator should complete the underlined areas of the form and replicate all of the
text that is not underlined, except for the compensation section where you should select the appropriate text to be used out of several different scenarios.

*This consent form template can also be adapted and used as an information sheet for subjects when signed informed consent is waived by the IRB. An information sheet is usually required even when signed informed consent is waived. The information sheet should typically include all of the elements included below minus the subject signature line; however it may be modified in consultation with the IRB.

North Carolina State University
INFORMED CONSENT FORM for RESEARCH
Title of Study: Internationalization of Higher Education: A Case Study of an Irish Research University

Principal Investigator: Deirdre O’Malley
Faculty Sponsor (if applicable): Alyssa Rochenbach

---

**What are some general things you should know about research studies?**
You are being asked to take part in a research study. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You have the right to be a part of this study, to choose not to participate or to stop participating at any time without penalty. The purpose of research studies is to gain a better understanding of a certain topic or issue. You are not guaranteed any personal benefits from being in a study. Research studies also may pose risks to those that participate. In this consent form you will find specific details about the research in which you are being asked to participate. If you do not understand something in this form it is your right to ask the researcher for clarification or more information. A copy of this consent form will be provided to you. If at any time you have questions about your participation, do not hesitate to contact the researcher(s) named above.

**What is the purpose of this study?**
The purpose of this descriptive qualitative case study is to describe the experience of a single Irish higher education institution in its efforts to become a more international university. A qualitative study of this type allows for an in-depth and descriptive examination of the internationalization developments taking place at the case study institution. Internationalization is defined as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education” (Knight, 2004, p. 11). A second objective of this study is to assess the applicability of Rumbley’s (2010) theoretical framework, the Delta Cycle for Internationalization, in the Irish context. This research has the potential to both inform institutional leaders and policymakers on how internationalization has developed at the case study institution, relative to Rumbley’s (2010) theoretical model, and to provide practical strategies to further internationalize the institution.

**What will happen if you take part in the study?**
If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to provide consent to participate and participate in a one-on-one interview with the researcher that will last for no longer than 90 minutes and will take place in a mutually agreed upon location. Once the interview is transcribed, you will be asked to review the transcript from the interview.

**Risks**
I do not anticipate any foreseeable risks or discomforts as a result of participating in this study.

**Benefits**
The findings for this study could have positive implications on the case study institution for the information it could provide on institutional perspectives on internationalization efforts taking place and practical strategies
that could be suggested for further developing international efforts at the case study institution. The field of international higher education could benefit from the contribution this study could make to the literature on the internationalization efforts taking place in a European university context. Additionally, university leaders and educational policymakers could benefit from the insight gained on the international education developments taking place at a research-based European higher education institution.

Confidentiality
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