International Journal of Educational Research and Reviews (IJERR)
https://www.mospbs.com/journal/ijerr

• *Review* •

Research on the Implementation Path of Higher Education Internationalization Strategy from the Perspective of International Education

Xiaolong Yang*

Aston Business School, Aston University, Birmingham B4 7ET, UK.

***Corresponding Author: Xiaolong Yang** **Affiliation:** Aston Business School, Aston University, Birmingham B4 7ET, UK.

Received: 05 December 2026 **Accepted:** 16 January 2026

Abstract: The internationalization of higher education has evolved from a single topic of cooperation and exchange to an important strategic variable that affects the overall governance and core competitiveness of universities. In the context of the continuous reorganization of the international education ecosystem, the key of the internationalization strategy no longer remains at the level of goal setting, but rather points deeper towards the systematic construction of implementation mechanisms and paths transformation. The practical aspect shows that some universities, in the process of promoting internationalization, face common dilemmas such as loose institutional support, fragmented resource allocation, and delayed execution feedback, which restrict the continuous release of strategic effectiveness. Systematically sorting out the structural logic and operational mechanism of the internationalization strategy of higher education from the perspective of international education helps clarify the internal pivots of strategy implementation. Based on this, path design is carried out from dimensions such as curriculum system, collaborative network, and technical platform, emphasizing the linkage relationship among organizational collaboration, capability generation, and spatial extension in the strategy implementation, providing an operational-oriented reference framework for the sustainable promotion of the internationalization strategy of higher education.

Keywords: Internationalization of higher education; International education; Strategy implementation; Collaborative mechanism

In the dynamic evolution of the global higher education landscape, internationalization has gradually embedded itself in the core agenda of university development, becoming an important indicator for measuring the openness and adaptability of the education system. With the acceleration of cross-border talent mobility, the reconfiguration of academic production networks, and the update of educational technology forms, internationalization is no longer limited to the expansion of project-level cooperation, but deeply related to university governance methods,

DOI: https://doi.org/10.58244/ijerr.263902

resource organization logic, and ability cultivation structure. However, in the real situation, the internationalization strategy often presents a state of clear goals but ambiguous paths during its implementation, and there is a risk of disconnection between institutional support and execution mechanisms, resulting in the strategy operation often being limited to phased progress. The international education perspective emphasizes structural collaboration and long-term adaptation, and its value lies in guiding universities to examine the key conditions for strategy implementation from the overall system level, thereby providing a more continuous and stable action basis for the internationalization process.

1 The Structural Logic and Evolution Mechanism of the Internationalization Strategy in Higher Education

1.1 The Strategic Logic of "Goal - Path - Feedback"

In the context of the continuous evolution of the international education landscape, the internationalization strategy of higher education often presents a tension between clear goal statements and unstable operational effectiveness[1]. The root cause does not lie in the vision setting itself, but in the lack of structural linkage among the goal, the execution path, and the feedback mechanism, which prevents the strategic operation from advancing beyond the planning level and failing to transform into organizational behavior. An effective internationalization strategy should be carried out based on the closed-loop structure of "goal - path - feedback". The goal not only serves as a direction guide but also embeds implicit requirements for organizational capability adjustment. The path needs to be embedded in the governance process and resource allocation system to ensure that the strategic intention is gradually implemented in specific actions. The feedback link is not an appendage of outcome evaluation but an important node for continuously calibrating strategic deviations. Through the reflux of process indicators and stage signals, strategic execution can maintain stability and adaptability in dynamic correction.

1.2 The Evolution Trend from Cooperative Orientation to Competitive Synergy

In the early stage of internationalization of higher education, it mainly relied on exchange programs and cooperation agreements to maintain, and its operational logic focused on resource exchange and opportunity supplementation. However, in the context of highly mobile global educational resources and intensified competition, this cooperative model gradually revealed structural limitations that could not support the generation of long-term capabilities. The internationalization strategy is shifting from loose functional cooperation to embedded competitive synergy logic. Universities need to form a sustainable collaborative structure in terms of curriculum systems, research networks, and technical platforms while competing for academic influence and talent resources. This shift means that internationalization is no longer a simple expansion of external relationships but an overall response by the organization to the external competitive environment. The core lies in enhancing the continuous participation ability of universities in the global education ecosystem through structural reorganization.

2 Analysis of Core Mechanisms for the Implementation of the Internationalization Strategy in Higher Education from the Perspective of International Education

2.1 The Institutional Embedding Mechanism: Linking Strategic Goals with Governance System

For the internationalization strategy to enter an executable state, it is crucial to translate the "goal semantics" into identifiable, accountable, and traceable operational units within the governance system[2]. The translation chain typically falls at three points: decision-making agenda setting, process node configuration, and responsibility boundary division. At the governance level, a clear issue entry point needs to be formed to ensure that the internationalization goals have a stable priority and discussion rules in the administrative decision-making process; at the execution level, the goals should be decomposed into task packages that can be taken over by the processes, embedded in existing processes such as admissions and training, curriculum approval, faculty appointment, and research cooperation, to avoid remaining at the declaration level; at the supervision level, the responsibility chain closure is relied upon to link performance attribution and resource allocation to clear organizational units and job roles, forming a linkage structure between "decision - execution - review", thereby enhancing the governance system's ability to identify and respond to strategic deviations.

2.2 Resource Integration Mechanism: Coordinated Configuration of Key Elements

Resource integration is not a matter of simply aggregating individual elements, but of structuring configurations with high degrees of coupling around strategic tasks. Its operational logic hinges on three interlocking dimensions: attribute alignment, functional complementarity, and regulation of resource flow. Curriculum resources must align with the targeted competency framework, preventing misalignments where globally oriented content is still evaluated using locally anchored criteria. Faculty resources require coherence between international experience, academic networks, and specific teaching modules—without such alignment, institutional presence may exist without corresponding functional output. Platform resources serve as the infrastructure for cross-border collaboration and resource circulation; if platform capacity does not match project rhythms, collaboration risks reverting to inefficient, offline coordination. Financial and institutional resources, together forming the basis for dispatch logic, govern the prioritization and transfer conditions of resources across tasks. This coordination builds a sustainable support structure, rather than a patchwork of ad hoc configurations[3].

2.3 Feedback Adjustment Mechanism: Dynamic Evaluation of Implementation Performance

The core of the feedback adjustment mechanism lies in transforming strategic execution into a “trackable process,” with observational outcomes reintegrated into governance systems to support continuous calibration. Its key components include signal activation, evaluation objects, and reinjection pathways. Activation signals must span process stages and interim outputs, avoiding evaluations triggered only at project completion. Evaluation targets should address both behavioral quality and structural functionality—for instance, the stability of cooperation networks, consistency of learning outcomes across modules, and sustainability of faculty engagement in transnational

teaching. The reinjection pathway determines whether feedback can influence resource dispatch and procedural revision. If feedback remains isolated within reporting layers, it loses corrective capacity. Only when evaluation outcomes feed back into decision-making agendas, procedural rules, and accountability chains can the strategic system retain its self-corrective and dynamically adaptive capabilities.

3 Design of Implementation Pathways for Higher Education Internationalization Strategy from an International Education Perspective

3.1 Reconstructing the Curriculum System to Support the Logic of Global Competence Development

The construction of an internationalized curriculum system should be designed as a whole based on the logic of capabilities[4]. It should no longer organize teaching content based on traditional knowledge classification, but rather focus on modular reconfiguration around the framework of global competence. The course content should focus on three core capability dimensions: cross-cultural understanding and expression, identification and criticism of global issues, and task-based collaboration and generation. These three aspects form a mutually supportive structural chain. In terms of course structure design, a "module chain" logic should be established, where multiple course units are nested and combined according to the development path of capabilities, replacing the previous single-point course stacking structure. For example, the cross-cultural communication module can be set as a Class A general education course, providing training tasks such as language expression, cultural comparison, and context adaptation for all students; the B module focuses on the construction of international professional knowledge, such as international regulations, global economic operation, and sustainable issues; the C module guides students into the project-based practice process of "problem-oriented - task deconstruction - action expression", strengthening the generation of practical competence. At the level of course governance, it is necessary to set standards for course levels, module classification, and ability mapping, and establish a unified course metadata table to support cross-disciplinary course invocation and credit logic conversion.

Specific teaching links need to clearly define the matching mechanism of teachers, resources, and process assessment to ensure the real implementation of course functions. The course responsible person should have cross-cultural teaching experience or international project cooperation experience, and the course goals and ability framework should be mapped in the teaching syllabus one by one. The process outcomes should include multi-dimensional indicators such as language output, case analysis, and team creation achievements. The supporting resources should not be limited to textbooks and courseware, but should also include real-context task materials, industry background data, and case libraries of cooperating institutions, to support students in completing structural expression tasks during the teaching process. In the operation mechanism, the educational management system should provide a three-in-one setting channel of "module-level courses - ability indicators - credit mapping" and have the function of tracking the degree of ability achievement, using data-driven diagnosis to identify the performance deviations of students in each module. Regarding the adaptability of course design, a structural diagnosis mechanism should

be established to periodically review the ability benchmark scale and task completion degree of teaching content, and link the course library and teacher resource library for automatic matching recommendations, forming the dynamic repair ability of the course system.

3.2 Establish a collaborative mechanism to promote the deep integration of cross-border resources

The implementation of an international strategy relies on stable resource flow and multi-party collaboration. The core of the collaborative mechanism lies not in the accumulation of cooperation numbers, but in the structural connection of responsibilities and the logic of task sharing. Within universities, an "international task coordination mechanism" should be established, with a dedicated team coordinating with various departments within the university and external partners, uniformly managing goal setting, resource allocation, and process tracking, ensuring that collaborative tasks have clear ownership and operational interfaces within the internal process. External partners need to clearly define functional boundaries and roles of participation, through agreements to set the frequency of collaboration, resource provision methods, and data openness levels, to avoid overlapping organizational responsibilities or information flow disorientation. At the project operation level, a "responsibility list + functional matrix" dual-table structure should be established, breaking down each cross-institutional cooperation task into specific operational modules, and matching responsible persons, input items, output items, and evaluation nodes, constructing a closed-loop advancement path. For example, when jointly launching academic projects, it should be clearly defined that the teaching organization is led by the university, the course script is reviewed by the cooperating universities, and the evaluation system is developed collaboratively by a third party, and set up stage feedback nodes to conduct rolling reviews of the project operation status[5].

The stability of the collaborative mechanism depends on the close coupling between task-driven and process management systems. At the operational level, three key tools need to be embedded to support: collaboration structure map, process control panel, and data interface template. The collaboration map is used to visually present the resource chain relationships, data exchange logic, and dependency paths among the participants, enabling each participant to clearly understand the operation nodes and responsibility interfaces, avoiding resource mismatches or task gaps due to unclear structure. The process control panel embeds the phased goals, process signals, and warning triggers within the project execution cycle, ensuring real-time monitoring of collaborative efficiency deviations and triggering adjustment behaviors during the advancement process. The data interface template serves as the "language intermediary" for cross-platform and cross-organizational data transfer formats, synchronization rhythms, and verification methods, supporting the stable placement of resource collaboration at the structural level. Additionally, a "collaborative task window" can be set up in the university's educational administration, research, and finance systems to achieve automatic aggregation of project data within the internal systems and permission sharing, reducing multi-head coordination and redundant operations caused by information silos.

3.3 Leveraging Technology Platforms to Expand the Flexibility of Instructional Space

The expansion of instructional space does not

rely on the extension of physical environments, but rather hinges on three core attributes: asynchronous access, multi-point collaboration, and data-driven coordination. Platform functionalities must encompass module delivery, task deployment, resource archiving, process tracking, and outcome evaluation, forming a closed-loop structure for instructional interaction. At the structural level, the platform should be equipped with modular task zones, multi-role collaboration hubs, and inter-campus communication interfaces to enable geographically distributed learners and instructors to participate asynchronously. Task zones carry course objectives, procedural steps, reference materials, and output requirements. Collaboration hubs support team-based co-creation, real-time instructor feedback, and shared resource access, while communication interfaces bridge data silos between institutions, platforms, and partner organizations. To ensure operational stability, a role-based permission matrix should be embedded, clarifying differentiated access rights for instructors, learners, system administrators, and external collaborators. Additionally, a real-time performance dashboard should be integrated to identify content delivery bottlenecks and system stress points, enabling precise handoffs across dynamic instructional nodes.

Functionally, the platform must enable an operational loop of "task generation—process nesting—outcome archiving" tailored to internationalized teaching scenarios. For example, in global issue-based courses, a designated task initiation node may trigger structured assignments, with instructors authoring multilingual task prompts, contextual materials, and staged objectives. Students then divide responsibilities and conduct data analysis using integrated literature databases, visualization tools, and curated case repositories. Throughout the task cycle, the platform logs interactional traces, team activity timelines, and interim deliverables, automatically generating structured process records. During the outcome presentation phase, the platform should support automated archiving of deliverables, peer review modules, and centralized instructor feedback interfaces, integrating instructional processes, outputs, and evaluations into a unified structure. In inter-institutional teaching settings, interface protocol modules must be embedded to synchronize academic records, course schedules, and assessment standards, ensuring both technical operability and pedagogical consistency across sites. Platform architecture must also account for global deployment needs, including latency thresholds, multilingual interface compatibility, and data encryption standards, to prevent infrastructural constraints from undermining the scalability of internationalized teaching environments.

4 Conclusion

The advancement of the internationalization strategy in higher education hinges on breaking away from the inertia of fragmented structures and suspended paths, and establishing an organic linkage between the system logic and operational mechanisms. The reconfiguration of the curriculum system, the embedding of collaborative mechanisms, and the support of technological platforms serve as the core paths. These should not be understood in isolation but should work together as an integrated strategy chain to influence the teaching structure, organizational logic, and resource system. Only by embedding the strategic intentions into executable processes and connecting task nodes, responsibility structures, and platform interfaces can the internationalization process maintain resilience, adaptability, and