

УДК 33

DOI 10.21661/r-472710

*П.В. Малыженков, М. Мазу*

## КЛАССИФИКАЦИОННЫЙ ПОДХОД К АНАЛИЗУ ФАКТОРОВ УСПЕХА СТРАТЕГИИ ИНТЕРНАЦИОНАЛИЗАЦИИ УНИВЕРСИТЕТОВ

*Аннотация:* в настоящей работе анализируется современное положение стратегий интернационализации университетов и представлена классификация основных факторов ее успешной реализации.

*Ключевые слова:* интернационализация, ранжирование, мобильность, стратегия, конкурентоспособность университетов.

*P.V. Malyzhenkov, M. Masi*

## CLASSIFICATION APPROACH TO THE ANALYSIS OF THE FACTORS OF UNIVERSITIES' INTERNATIONALIZATION STRATEGY SUCCESS

*Abstract:* the present work analyses the state-of-the art of internationalization strategies of the universities and delivers the classification of the main factors of its successful realization.

*Keywords:* internationalization, ranking, mobility, strategy, universities' competitiveness.

### *1. The international strategies in the universities: the state-of-the-art*

For above thirty years universities and research bodies have got many incentives especially from the European funds for the activation of exchange programs for professors, researchers and students, in order to implement integrated study programs that provide for the awarding of joint degrees. Internationalization was mainly seen as a function of student mobility, in line with the settings of the European Union.

Formal international relationships have traditionally focused more on student and faculty exchange. Modern trends include the necessity to enlarge the scope of the

university's international development to include collaborative research, joint academic programme design and delivery, innovation and entrepreneurship, and more close relationship with business.

(Among the most recent programs aimed to support the development of the internationalization of the universities the Erasmus Plus Program was introduced. The Erasmus International Credit Mobility is one of the great innovations introduced by the Erasmus + Program and it started since the 2015/2016 a.y. In the frame of the new Erasmus + International Credit Mobility (ICM) action, European higher education institutions can apply to the respective National Agencies to establish mobility agreements with their counterparts in Partner Countries all over the world, in order to send and receive students, teachers and technical-administrative staff. International mobility projects aim to help individual participants to acquire skills to support their professional development and deepen their understanding of cultures, as well as to increase the capacity, attractiveness and international dimension of the participating organizations. Participation in the ICM will develop international links between higher education institutions and will increase their visibility locally and globally. The Erasmus + International Credit Mobility offers teachers the opportunity to carry out a teaching and training experience in a non-EU country. The period abroad may provide for the association of teaching and training activities. The technical-administrative staff can take advantage of the Erasmus + ICM grants for training activities in a non-EU country).

Having no support from the top university management even the best strategies may fail. International strategy must be incarnated by the president or provost. A vice-president and / or director of international affairs must build a team that will drive the strategy, set activities in motion with various departments across the university, and communicate with international partners.

The general frame of international higher education is changing, and universities try to capture more international space. But very often the universities lack in the

very existence of a formal international strategy. Below the attempt of the classification of international strategy success factors is made.

## *2. Key factors of universities' strategy success*

The problem of successful internationalization strategy is being discussed in the literature very actively [1; 2; 6; 8; 10; 15; 16]. Combining it with the analysis of different university cases the following groups of parameters can be distinguished.

### *2.1. Formalisation of the strategic process*

The first key to success for an international strategy is the existence of the formalized document where, exactly as in business organizations, the environment, the stakeholders, the main areas of action, the partners, the main types of activities and other strategic factors are described.

The analysis of both the university's strengths in education and research and its existing relationship represents the powerful means at its disposal to achieve strategic objectives within a set time frame. If the university is ranked internationally, it is important to make use of that ranking. Otherwise it is necessary to study the different rankings' internationalisation criteria to formalize the strategy. The experience shows [7; 12; 15; 16; 21; 22] that in the modern rapidly changing globalised environment a three-year international development plan is a most common practice.

This document must also include the parameters measuring the quality of research and scientific publications, joint academic programme design and delivery, innovation and entrepreneurship and joint activities with companies.

To realize it, different representatives from the academic community must be involved in the strategic process formation. It will help to establish a framework and ask for input from faculty, staff, local and international students, alumni, corporate partners, ministries, diplomats, and international partners. At the end a real-world perspective allowing to tune the scope and prioritise actions will be obtained.

### *2.2. Selection of key projects, partnerships and programs*

While establishing the new international partnerships it is important to list the university's foreground projects and programmes. Comparing strategic research initi-

atives with a potential partner is always an effective way to start exploring avenues for cooperation.

In doing this a right combination between a bottom-up and top-down approaches is useful. The input from stakeholders as well as reliable analysis of the university's existing academic and research collaborations level to see in which countries the university already has an impact, is of the main importance.

Further, a closer look at countries in which the university is not still active but perhaps should be must be done. The criteria of such choice are usually constituted by:

- economic growth;
- students' quality;
- research output;
- number of major companies from university's home country doing business there [2–4, 15].

Universities often count numerous of partnerships, but only few of them are really active and operative. The most successful academic realities focus their partnerships on a small number of key institutional relationships for more intensive cooperation, often based on co-financed collaborative research projects, faculty and student mobility, joint programmes.

Select strategic partners by capitalising on current successful relationships is another key factor of internationalisation success. The partners must be chosen on the base of the quality, research output, reputation and level of international activities intensity. Determine the number of strategic partners by evaluating the university's capacity to sustain the relationships.

### *2.3. Competence and communication*

International development must be considered not as a cost, but as an investment, which is particularly important for the defining of international activities quota in the overall university budget. High-level international development *a priori* presumes a certain price tag to gather a highly qualified team, finance partnership activi-

ties, cover travel expenses, host international delegations and so on. From this point of view a valid and sustainable funding process represents one of the key factors to ensure the success. The competent personnel engaged in searching for sources of such funding on both institutional and private level becomes of great importance for internationalization strategy.

After the new international strategy approval by the university's board and top managers the communication and public relation activity must be intensified both internally and externally. Inside the university the personnel engaged in framing the strategy should be involved in spreading it internally. The mission statement that opens your strategy document must be known and shared by all.

For the external strategy promotion, a non-confidential version of the international strategy to inform partners and peers, the press and public about the plans must be published. From this point of view all external sources (website, visiting international conferences and other events, participation in associations ecc.) become particularly suitable.

International strategies shouldn't be modified quickly, but in the same time it must be flexible without ignoring new opportunities and being coherent. Once meeting initial targets, one can legitimately scale up the institution's international outreach – aim for more prestigious partners, explore new countries, and tackle more ambitious projects.

Internationalization strategy very often means a good project work and the project leaders are often met with scepticism, incomprehension, and tough questions along the way, but all this will help to focus the strategy to align with the university's core values and competences. The high-quality strategic framework provides better comprehension to colleagues as it helps them to set their objectives and make decisions that are coherent with the overall international mission.

### *3. Conclusions*

The directions of future research in the field of internationalization could concern:

- a rigorous and well-founded identification of the key parameters of the internationalization process;
- the development of a quantitative model of competitiveness of universities highlighting international activities;
- application of the model to the different classes of universities (small – medium – large).

### *References*

1. Arnaboldi M., Azzone G. (2010), «Constructing performance measurement in the public sector», *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 21 (4), pp. 266–282.
2. Borgonovi E., Giordano F. (2007), «La valutazione dell'università: aspetti sistematici ed operativi», in Cugini A. (a cura di), *La misurazione della performance negli atenei. Logiche, metodi, esperienze*, Milano: FrancoAngeli.
3. Bronzetti G., Mazzotta R., Nardo M.T. (2011), «Le dimensioni della pianificazione strategica nelle università», *Economia aziendale online*, 2 (2), pp. 141–155.
4. Cugini A., Michelon G. (2009), «La misurazione della performance nei dipartimenti universitari», *Economia e management*, 4, pp. 91–109.
5. Cugini A., Pilonato S. (2007), «La misurazione della performance negli atenei: evidenze dalle pubblicazioni italiane dell'ultimo decennio», *Azienda pubblica*, 20 (2), pp. 217–241.
6. Fici L., Malyzhenkov P.V., Piccarozzi M., Meleshina E.S. (2016) Spin-off design as an organizational practice: A methodological approach. *Business Informatics*, no. 3 (37), pp. 7–14. DOI: 10.17323/1998–0663.2016.3.7.14.
7. Fici L., Piccarozzi M. (2010) Create value at the university: Financial and management problems in USOs. *History of Accounting, Business Administration Doctrines and Development of New Methods of Management in Italy and in Russia*.

III International Workshop (Viterbo, Florence, Italy, 21–23 September 2009). Milano: RIREA, pp. 234–249.

8. Fontana G., «Che lingua parla l'Università italiana?" Osservatorio dell'Associazione Italiana dei Costituzionalisti, giugno 2013.

9. Hazelkorn, E. How Rankings are Reshaping Higher Education in Climent, V., Michavila, F. and Ripolles, M. (eds) *Los Rankings Univeritarios. Mitos y Realidades*, Dublin Institute of Technology, 2013.

10. Hicks D. (2012), «Performance-based university research funding systems», *Research policy*, 41 (2), pp. 251–261.

11. «Indicatori di internazionalizzazione del sistema universitario italiano», Gruppo di lavoro CRUI sull'internazionalizzazione, 2015.

12. Masi M., Rossi F., Malyzhenkov P., Technical and management innovation in the process of treatment of special and hazardous waste in a perspective of circular economy, Atti del XVII Congresso AISME «Qualità & Innovazione per una economia circolare ed un futuro sostenibile», Università degli Studi della Tuscia, 2–4 marzo 2016, pp. 103–107.

13. Morgan, J., Germany and Malaysia «top performers' for internationalization, *Times Higher Education*, 4 maggio 2016.

14. «Prospettive europee per la mobilità e l'internazionalizzazione dell'istruzione superiore», Bruxelles, 2016.

15. Riccaboni A. (2003), «La valutazione integrata della didattica e della ricerca: il progetto VAI nell'Università di Siena», *Azienda pubblica*, 16 (5/6), pp. 463–493.

16. Sav G.T. (2013), «Four-stage DEA efficiency evaluations: financial reforms in public university funding», *International journal of economics and finance*, 5 (1), pp. 24–33.

17. Stergiou K., Athanassios C. «Global university reputation and rankings: insights from culturomics», *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics*; vol. 13, 2013.

18. Ter Bogt H.J., Scapens R.W. (2012), «Performance management in universities: effects of the transition to more quantitative measurement systems», *European accounting review*, 21 (3), pp. 451–497.

19. Tochkov K., Nenovsky N., Tochkov K. (2012), «University efficiency and public funding for higher education in Bulgaria», *Post-Communist economies*, 24 (4), pp. 517–534.

20. [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <http://www.arwu.org/>

21. [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <http://www.shanghairanking.com/>

22. [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/>

23. [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <http://www.leidenranking.com/>

24. [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <http://www.webometrics.info/>

25. [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <http://www.umultirank.org/>

---

**Малыженков Павел Валерьевич** – научный сотрудник Университета Тушии, Италия, Витербо.

**Malyzhenkov Pavel Valerevich** – research officer at the University of Tuscia, Italy, Viterbo.

**Маззи Маурицио** – доцент Университета Тушии, Италия, Витербо.

**Masi Maurizio** – associate professor at the University of Tuscia, Italy, Viterbo.

---