

Dimensions of Organizational Effectiveness as Predictors of Internationalization Efforts: Basis for a Proposed Enhancement Program of One State University

John Vincent C. Aliazas¹ and Joseph Christian P. Gesmundo²

¹Laguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City, Laguna, Philippines

^{1,2}Graduate School, San Pablo Colleges, San Pablo City, Laguna, Philippines

Abstract— This study examined the extent to which dimensions of organizational effectiveness, as conceptualized through the McKinsey 7S Design Model, predict the internationalization efforts of a state university system in the Philippines, and proposed an enhancement program to address identified gaps. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, all designated deans, associate deans, and program coordinators across the four campuses were surveyed through census sampling. A researcher-made instrument with established content validity and good-to-excellent internal consistency was employed. Findings revealed that all seven organizational effectiveness dimensions were rated Highly Evident, with Skills as the strongest dimension and Shared Values as the lowest, exhibiting the highest variability across campuses. All nine internationalization dimensions were rated Consistently Observed, with Research Collaboration as the highest-performing domain and International and Intercultural Understanding and Networking as the lowest. Pearson correlation confirmed significant positive relationships between all organizational effectiveness dimensions and all internationalization domains. The Style dimension registered the highest average correlation across internationalization efforts, while Shared Values yielded an exceptional correlation with International and Intercultural Understanding and Networking. Multiple regression analysis revealed that the McKinsey 7S framework collectively explained a substantial proportion of the variance in internationalization efforts, with Soft S elements — encompassing Skills, Staff, Style, and Shared Values — emerging as stronger predictors than Hard S elements, though both were statistically significant contributors. These findings informed the development of a five-year, three-phase Proposed Enhancement Program anchored on the 7S framework, prioritizing human capital development alongside structural and strategic foundations.

Keywords— organizational effectiveness, McKinsey 7S model, internationalization, higher education, state university, enhancement program, Philippines.

I. INTRODUCTION

The internationalization of higher education has emerged as a defining institutional imperative in an increasingly interconnected global academic environment. State universities and colleges (SUCs) in the Philippines are expected to integrate international and intercultural dimensions into their instruction, research, and community service functions while simultaneously addressing local development mandates and resource constraints. For institutions such as Laguna State Polytechnic University (LSPU), which has been designated as a Center of



Development by the Commission on Higher Education, international engagement represents both a strategic necessity and a complex organizational challenge.

Despite growing recognition of the importance of internationalization, the organizational preconditions that enable or constrain meaningful global engagement remain underexplored in the Philippine SUC context. The literature consistently identifies weak governance, limited shared vision, inadequate human capital, and fragmented institutional culture as the primary internal barriers to internationalization in developing-country universities -- barriers that are organizational in nature rather than merely financial or policy-based (De Wit, 2019; Knight, 2013; Altbach et al., 2019). This study addresses this gap by examining the extent to which the seven dimensions of organizational effectiveness, as conceptualized through McKinsey's 7S Design Model (Channon and Caldart, 2015), predict the internationalization efforts of the LSPU System, and by proposing an enhancement program anchored on these empirical findings.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Organizational Effectiveness and the McKinsey 7S Framework

McKinsey's 7S Design Model provides a comprehensive lens for diagnosing organizational effectiveness by examining seven interdependent dimensions: Strategy, Structure, Systems (Hard S elements) and Skills, Staff, Style, and Shared Values (Soft S elements). The model's strength lies in its recognition that sustainable institutional performance requires alignment across all seven elements, not merely structural or strategic redesign (Waterman et al., 1980; Cameron and Whetten, 1983). In educational contexts, this holistic alignment has been shown to be a prerequisite for implementing complex initiatives such as internationalization (Morphew et al., 2018; Forman et al., 2021).

Research in Philippine higher education identifies consistent patterns: Skills and structural dimensions tend to outperform cultural and values-based dimensions in state university settings, reflecting the technical education heritage of polytechnic institutions (Gepila, 2020; Aliazas and Chua, 2021). The Style and Shared Values dimensions, meanwhile, are identified as the most consequential for long-term institutional transformation and the hardest to develop in geographically distributed multi-campus systems (Fernandez-Batanero et al., 2022; Morris et al., 2020).

B. Internationalization in Philippine Higher Education

Internationalization in Philippine SUCs is organized around four primary domains: Knowledge Creation and Application (curriculum and instruction, research collaboration), Quality and Excellence (academic standards), Culture of Sharing and Service (mobility, intercultural networking, cooperation), and Growth, Efficiency, and Accountability (student recruitment, facilities, income diversification) (Vasquez-Rivera, 2019; Balagtas et al., 2012; Padama et al., 2010). Research consistently identifies research-intensive activities as the primary entry point for internationalization in developing HEIs, while intercultural competency and international networking represent the most resource-intensive and structurally complex areas to develop (Altbach et al., 2019; Waham et al., 2023).



The synthesis of organizational effectiveness and internationalization literatures converges on a central proposition: the most common barriers to internationalization are organizational and internal rather than external. Strengthening organizational effectiveness -- particularly its human and cultural dimensions -- represents the most reliable pathway through which Philippine SUCs can expand and sustain international engagement (De Wit, 2019; Garwe and Thondhlana, 2022).

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design and Locale

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationship between organizational effectiveness dimensions and internationalization efforts, and to identify predictors of international engagement at LSPU. The study was conducted at LSPU, a premier state university in the CALABARZON region of the Philippines, operating through main campuses at Sta. Cruz (Main), Siniloan (Host), San Pablo City, and Los Banos, and satellite campuses at Nagcarlan, Sta. Maria, Liliw, and Lopez, Quezon. LSPU has been recognized by CHED for excellence in instruction, research, and extension, with several programs achieving Centers of Excellence and Development status.

B. Respondents and Instruments

Census sampling was employed, targeting all 77 designated deans, associate deans, and program coordinators at LSPU -- the academic leaders with specialized knowledge of both institutional operations and internationalization initiatives. A researcher-made questionnaire was used as the primary data collection tool, structured into three parts: respondent demographics and institutional profile, extent of organizational effectiveness across the 7S dimensions, and extent of internationalization efforts across four domains and nine dimensions. Content validity was established using Polit and Beck's (2006) Content Validity Index (CVI), with assessment by three experts in higher education and two in internationalization. Internal consistency was confirmed through Cronbach's alpha, yielding values of 0.8 to 0.9 (good-to-excellent). Data were collected via Google Forms with informed consent protocols, ensuring confidentiality and anonymity.

C. Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) were used to characterize the extent of organizational effectiveness and internationalization efforts. Pearson product-moment correlation examined the significance and direction of relationships between all 7S dimensions and all internationalization domains. Multiple regression analysis identified the organizational effectiveness dimensions that significantly predict internationalization efforts, with Hard S (Strategy, Structure, Systems) and Soft S (Skills, Staff, Style, Shared Values) entered as composite predictors.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Institutional Profile of LSPU

Table I presents the demographic profile of LSPU across its four campuses. The system serves a total of 35,323 students, 435 faculty members (permanent/plantilla), and 257 non-teaching staff, with a combined operational history spanning 72 years. Sta. Cruz Main Campus hosts the largest proportions of students (34%), faculty (30%),



and non-teaching staff (52%), the latter reflecting its role as the central administrative hub. The Siniloan Campus is the oldest at 72 years, while San Pablo City Campus is the youngest at 64 years. Satellite campuses remain under the operational oversight of their designated regular campuses and have not yet achieved fiscal autonomy.

Table I. Demographic Profile of Laguna State Polytechnic University System

Demographics	Sta. Cruz f %	Siniloan f %	San Pablo f %	Los Banos f %
Students	12,009 (34%)	8,478 (24%)	9,184 (26%)	5,652 (16%)
Faculty*	132 (30%)	93 (21%)	112 (26%)	98 (23%)
Non-teaching*	134 (52%)	44 (17%)	36 (14%)	43 (17%)
Years of existence	67 years	72 years	64 years	67 years
Total	35,323 students / 435 faculty / 257 non-teaching staff			

*Permanent/Plantilla positions only, excluding Job Order (JO) and Contract of Service (COS).

The uneven distribution of administrative personnel -- with 52% of non-teaching staff concentrated at the main campus -- reflects the hub-and-spoke administrative model characteristic of Philippine state university systems and has direct implications for internationalization implementation consistency across campuses (Batugal, 2019; Gabriel, 2023).

B. Extent of Organizational Effectiveness

Table II presents the summary of organizational effectiveness across all seven McKinsey 7S dimensions. All dimensions were rated Highly Evident (overall means ranging from 3.32 to 3.54), indicating that LSPU has established broadly effective organizational systems, processes, and practices. Skills emerged as the strongest dimension (M = 3.54, SD = 0.514), reflecting LSPU's technical education heritage and emphasis on competency development.

Shared Values registered the lowest score (M = 3.32, SD = 0.628), with the highest cross-dimensional variability, signaling deep-seated challenges in establishing a pervasive culture of continuous improvement and institutional excellence -- particularly critical given Shared Values' role as the cultural foundation for international engagement.

Table II. Summary of Organizational Effectiveness Across the McKinsey 7S Dimensions

Dimension	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Strategy	3.48	0.488	Highly Evident
Structure	3.45	0.484	Highly Evident
Systems	3.49	0.468	Highly Evident
Skills	3.54	0.514	Highly Evident
Staff	3.40	0.439	Highly Evident
Style	3.40	0.553	Highly Evident
Shared Values	3.32	0.628	Highly Evident

Legend: 1.0-1.75 = Not Evident; 1.76-2.50 = Slightly Evident; 2.51-3.25 = Moderately Evident; 3.26-4.0 = Highly Evident



The notably low indicator for promotion of a culture of continuous improvement and organizational excellence within the Shared Values dimension ($M = 3.09$, $SD = 0.891$) -- the only item approaching Moderately Evident -- signals an urgent priority for the proposed enhancement program.

The equivalent scores for Staff and Style (both $M = 3.40$) further indicate that while technical capacities are strong, the human and cultural dimensions of organizational life require deliberate and sustained development.

C. Extent of Internationalization Efforts

Table III presents the summary of internationalization efforts across nine dimensions organized within four domains. All nine dimensions were rated Consistently Observed (means ranging from 3.26 to 3.56), reflecting a broadly institutionalized internationalization agenda.

Research Collaboration led all dimensions ($M = 3.56$, $SD = 0.500$), affirming Altbach et al.'s (2019) observation that research-intensive activities serve as the primary gateway to internationalization in developing HEIs.

International and Intercultural Understanding/Networking recorded the lowest score ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.628$) -- the dimension requiring the deepest cultural integration and the most resource-intensive development.

Table III. Summary of Internationalization Efforts at the LSPU System

Dimension	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Curriculum and Instruction	3.52	0.486	Consistently Observed
Research Collaboration	3.56	0.500	Consistently Observed
Academic Standards and Quality	3.47	0.525	Consistently Observed
Mobility and Exchanges	3.39	0.590	Consistently Observed
International and Intercultural Understanding/Networking	3.26	0.628	Consistently Observed
Cooperation and Development Assistance	3.47	0.529	Consistently Observed
International Students Recruitment	3.48	0.514	Consistently Observed
Facilities and Support System	3.42	0.532	Consistently Observed
Diversity Income Generation	3.39	0.596	Consistently Observed

Legend: 1.0-1.75 = Not Observed; 1.76-2.50 = Rarely Observed; 2.51-3.25 = Frequently Observed; 3.26-4.0 = Consistently Observed

The strength of Research Collaboration alongside the relative weakness in intercultural networking reflects a pattern documented by Balderama et al. (2021): Philippine HEIs tend to develop activity-based and research-oriented internationalization more readily than the deeper cultural integration and global network development that characterizes comprehensive international engagement.

D. Correlation Between Organizational Effectiveness and Internationalization Efforts

Pearson correlation analysis confirmed statistically significant positive relationships between all seven organizational effectiveness dimensions and all nine internationalization domains ($p < .001$ for most pairs; $p < .01$ for select lower-coefficient pairs). Table IV highlights the most notable correlation coefficients.



Among the Hard S dimensions, System exhibited the strongest overall pattern, with particularly high correlations with Cooperation and Development Assistance ($r = 0.718$) and Facilities and Support System ($r = 0.711$). Among the Soft S dimensions, Style registered the highest average correlation across internationalization domains, with its strongest associations in Cooperation and Development Assistance ($r = 0.740$) and Facilities and Support System ($r = 0.713$).

The most exceptional finding in the entire study was the extraordinary correlation between Shared Values and International and Intercultural Understanding/Networking ($r = 0.917$) -- the single strongest coefficient recorded.

This association illuminates a fundamental institutional truth: when faculty and administrative leaders genuinely share commitments to inclusivity, global citizenship, and cross-cultural respect, the institution becomes profoundly more capable of cultivating authentic international networks and intercultural understanding (Kim and Yeom, 2020; Marinoni and de Wit, 2019).

Table IV. Selected Notable Correlations Between Organizational Effectiveness and Internationalization

Predictor Dimension	Domains		r	p	Remarks
	Internationalization Domain				
Style (Soft S)	Cooperation and Development Assistance		0.740	$p < .001$	Highly Significant
Style (Soft S)	Facilities and Support System		0.713	$p < .001$	Highly Significant
Style (Soft S)	Academic Standards and Quality		0.706	$p < .001$	Highly Significant
Shared Values (Soft S)	Intl. and Intercultural Understanding/Networking		0.917	$p < .001$	Highly Significant
System (Hard S)	Cooperation and Development Assistance		0.718	$p < .001$	Highly Significant
System (Hard S)	Facilities and Support System		0.711	$p < .001$	Highly Significant
System (Hard S)	Academic Standards and Quality		0.698	$p < .001$	Highly Significant

Note: All correlations significant at $p < .01$ or $p < .001$.

E. Regression Analysis: Predictors of Internationalization Efforts

Multiple regression analysis examined the predictive relationship between the two composite organizational effectiveness constructs (Hard S and Soft S) and internationalization efforts. Table V presents the model fit and coefficient estimates.



Table V. Regression Analysis: Organizational Effectiveness as Predictors of Internationalization Efforts

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	df1	df2	p
1	0.812	0.660	0.650	71.7	2	74	< .001
Predictor	Estimate (b)	SE	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	t	p	
Intercept	0.198	0.274	-0.349	0.744	0.720	0.473	
Soft S (Skills, Staff, Style, Shared Values)	0.546	0.132	0.284	0.808	4.153	< .001	
Hard S (Strategy, Structure, Systems)	0.396	0.134	0.129	0.662	2.956	0.004	

Note: R² = 0.660; Adjusted R² = 0.650; F(2, 74) = 71.7, p < .001

The regression model demonstrated strong explanatory power (R = 0.812, R² = 0.660), indicating that the McKinsey 7S framework explains 66% of the variance in internationalization efforts at LSPU. The overall model was highly significant (F = 71.7, p < .001). Soft S elements emerged as the stronger predictor (b = 0.546, SE = 0.132, t = 4.153, p < .001) compared to Hard S elements (b = 0.396, SE = 0.134, t = 2.956, p = 0.004), though both were statistically significant contributors. The primacy of Soft S elements -- encompassing Skills, Staff, Style, and Shared Values -- empirically confirms that people-centered and culture-driven organizational factors exert greater influence on internationalization success than structural and strategic components alone (Escrig-Tena et al., 2018; de Wit and Altbach, 2021).

These findings challenge traditional organizational development approaches that prioritize structural reorganization and suggest that budget allocation for internationalization should prioritize professional development for international competencies, leadership development with a global orientation, shared values cultivation, and recruitment of internationally minded staff.

The unexplained 34% of variance points to additional factors beyond the 7S framework -- including government policy environments, geographic location, institutional history, and resource availability -- that merit further investigation (Matsumoto and Viczko, 2023; Singh et al., 2024).

F. Proposed Enhancement Program

Based on the empirical findings, a five-year, three-phase Proposed Enhancement Program was developed for the LSPU System. Phase 1 (Foundation Building, Years 1-2) prioritizes shared values development through cross-campus cultural transformation initiatives, leadership development programs anchored on Style dimension findings, and systematic documentation of internationalization best practices.

Phase 2 (Capacity Development, Years 2-4) focuses on faculty international competency development, inter-campus coordination structures for international initiatives, and expansion of research collaboration and intercultural programming.

Phase 3 (Excellence and Innovation, Years 4-5) targets comprehensive internationalization across all nine domains, establishment of measurable KPIs for international engagement, and integration of global citizenship



into institutional values and curricula. The program allocates 45% of resources to human resources development, 30% to operational resources, and 25% to strategic investment -- directly reflecting the empirical finding that Soft S elements are stronger predictors of internationalization success.

V. CONCLUSIONS

This study investigated organizational effectiveness as a predictor of internationalization efforts at LSPU using the McKinsey 7S framework. The following conclusions are drawn:

1. LSPU's uneven campus resource distribution -- with administrative staff concentrated at the main campus -- presents a systemic challenge to consistent system-wide internationalization implementation that must be structurally addressed.
2. While all seven organizational effectiveness dimensions are Highly Evident, the relative weakness in Shared Values (the lowest-scoring dimension with the highest variability) and the moderate performance in Staff and Style represent the most critical areas for advancement within an otherwise strong organizational profile.
3. All nine internationalization dimensions are Consistently Observed, with Research Collaboration as the strongest and International and Intercultural Understanding/Networking as the weakest, indicating that LSPU has achieved greater success in academic and research-oriented international engagement than in deeper cultural integration.
4. All organizational effectiveness dimensions positively and significantly correlate with internationalization efforts, with Style demonstrating the highest average correlation across domains and Shared Values yielding the exceptional $r = .917$ relationship with International and Intercultural Understanding/Networking -- the strongest coefficient in the study.
5. Soft S elements are stronger predictors of internationalization success than Hard S elements ($b = 0.546$ vs. $b = 0.396$, both $p < .01$), empirically affirming that people-centered and culture-driven organizational factors are more critical than structural and strategic components in driving international engagement.
6. The proposed five-year Enhancement Program, anchored on these empirical findings and the McKinsey 7S framework, provides a structured, evidence-based, and resource-calibrated roadmap for LSPU to advance from foundational internationalization adequacy toward comprehensive, culturally integrated global engagement.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are offered: (1) LSPU should implement a structured leadership development initiative across all campuses anchored on the Style dimension's identification as the highest average correlate of internationalization, establishing cross-campus leadership summits and standardized competency frameworks for globally oriented institutional leadership. (2) A deliberate and sustained shared values cultivation program should be developed to address the lowest-scoring and most variable organizational effectiveness dimension, targeting the promotion of a culture of continuous improvement and global citizenship across all campuses and units. (3) The Proposed Enhancement Program should be formally adopted and institutionalized, with the 45-30-25 resource allocation ratio (human resources, operations, strategic investment)

maintained as the foundational budget architecture. (4) System-wide internationalization monitoring mechanisms with campus-disaggregated KPIs should be established to track the consistency of implementation across Sta. Cruz, Siniloan, San Pablo City, and Los Banos campuses. (5) Future research should examine the additional 34% of unexplained variance in internationalization efforts by investigating external factors such as government policy environments, geographic location, institutional history, and inter-institutional network effects that the McKinsey 7S framework does not fully capture.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher extends profound gratitude to Dr. Bernardo C. Lunar, Director of the Graduate School, and to Dr. Joseph Christian P. Gesmundo, dissertation adviser, for their intellectual guidance and steadfast mentorship throughout this research. Sincere appreciation is offered to Dr. Mario R. Briones, University President of LSPU, for granting institutional access and support. The researcher likewise thanks the 77 deans, associate deans, and program coordinators across the LSPU System whose responses constitute the empirical foundation of this study, and to the dissertation committee and panel of examiners for their scholarly rigor in strengthening this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alexiadou, N., and Ronnberg, L. (2022). People-centered organizational effectiveness in educational institutions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 60(3), 285-302.
- [2] Aliazas, J. V. C., and Chua, R. T. (2021). Organizational effectiveness in Philippine polytechnic universities. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 99(2), 45-61.
- [3] Aliazas, J. V. C., et al. (2021). Administrative patterns in Philippine state university systems. *Asian Journal of Higher Education*, 7(1), 12-28.
- [4] Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., and de Wit, H. (2019). *Responding to massification: Differentiation in postsecondary education worldwide*. Sense Publishers.
- [5] Balagtas, M., Magno, C., and Panti, L. (2012). Internationalization of higher education in the Philippines: Policies and practices. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 21(3), 467-480.
- [6] Balderama, C., Santos, J., and Reyes, M. (2021). Sustainable internationalization in Philippine higher education. *Philippine Journal of Higher Education*, 9(1), 33-50.
- [7] Batugal, M. L. C. (2019). Administrative governance in Philippine state universities: A hub-and-spoke analysis. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 33(5), 906-920.
- [8] Beelen, J., and Jones, E. (2022). Support systems and infrastructures for internationalization at home. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 26(4), 399-414.
- [9] Bilecen, B., and Van Mol, C. (2017). Introduction: International academic mobility and inequalities. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 43(8), 1241-1255.
- [10] Brandenburg, U., de Wit, H., Jones, E., and Leask, B. (2019). Internationalization in higher education for society. *University World News*.
- [11] Cameron, K. S., and Whetten, D. A. (1983). *Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models*. Academic Press.
- [12] Channon, D. F., and Caldart, A. A. (2015). McKinsey 7S model. *Wiley Encyclopedia of Management*.



- [13] Chen, X., Liu, Y., and Wang, Z. (2024). Post-pandemic internationalization strategies: Human-centered approaches in higher education. *Higher Education Policy*, 37(1), 1-18.
- [14] De Wit, H. (2019). Internationalization of higher education: A critical review. *Journal of International and Comparative Education*, 8(2), 71-83.
- [15] De Wit, H., and Altbach, P. G. (2021). Internationalization in higher education: Global trends and recommendations for its future. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, 5(1), 28-46.
- [16] Diano, R., et al. (2023). International competence development in Philippine higher education. *Philippine Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 10(1), 22-38.
- [17] Escrig-Tena, A. B., Garcia-Juan, B., and Segarra-Cipres, M. (2018). Drivers and internalisation of the EFQM excellence model. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 35(2), 228-240.
- [18] Fernandez-Batanero, J. M., Hernandez-Sanchez, A., and Marin-Diaz, V. (2022). Institutional culture in distributed educational systems: Challenges for cohesion. *Sustainability*, 14(3), 1312.
- [19] Filippi, G., Bonfiglio, S., and Ruiz-Morales, J. (2023). Structural vs. cultural factors in organizational internationalization. *European Management Journal*, 41(2), 245-257.
- [20] Forman, J., et al. (2021). Interdependence in McKinsey 7S implementation: Evidence from higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 43(3), 245-260.
- [21] Gabriel, A. G. (2023). Quality assurance and internationalization in Philippine SUCs. *Journal of Philippine Educational Development*, 55(1), 1-18.
- [22] Garwe, E. C., and Thondhlana, J. (2022). Leadership commitment and institutional culture as enablers of internationalization. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 52(4), 601-618.
- [23] Gepila, E. C. (2020). Assessing teachers using the Philippine professional standards for teachers. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(3), 739-746.
- [24] Hunter, B. (2023). Strategic coherence and revenue diversification in higher education internationalization. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(4), 789-805.
- [25] Jones, E., and de Wit, H. (2018). Comprehensive internationalization: From concept to practice. NAFSA.
- [26] Kim, J., and Yeom, M. (2020). Shared values and cross-cultural engagement in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 9(6), 100-112.
- [27] Kiran, R., et al. (2022). Human capital and organizational effectiveness: Implications for higher education internationalization. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 30(1), 44-60.
- [28] Knight, J. (2013). The changing landscape of higher education internationalisation. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(3), 250-263.
- [29] Leithwood, K., Harris, A., and Hopkins, D. (2021). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership and Management*, 40(1), 5-22.
- [30] Liang, X., and Jia, L. (2022). Organizational culture and internationalization performance in higher education. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 41(5), 1558-1573.
- [31] Lorenzo, R. (2022). International partnerships and research collaboration in Philippine universities. *Philippine Journal of Higher Education Research*, 5(1), 1-20.
- [32] Lunag, G., et al. (2024). Multi-campus coordination in Philippine state university systems. *Journal of Philippine Education*, 103(1), 11-25.



- [33] Marginson, S. (2020). Limitations of human capital theory in higher education internationalization. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(3), 454-472.
- [34] Marinoni, G., and de Wit, H. (2019). Internationalisation of higher education for all: The value of institutional values. *Journal of International Education*, 23(3), 218-231.
- [35] Matsumoto, K., and Viczko, M. (2023). External environmental factors and internationalization outcomes in higher education. *Higher Education*, 86(1), 55-72.
- [36] Montgomery, C., and Trahar, S. (2023). Structural foundations and internationalization in higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 21(2), 133-148.
- [37] Morris, T. H., et al. (2020). Cohesive institutional cultures in geographically distributed universities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(7), 1465-1479.
- [38] Morphew, C. C., Fumasoli, T., and Stensaker, B. (2018). Changing missions? How the strategic plans of research-intensive universities in Northern Europe and North America balance competing identities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(6), 1074-1088.
- [39] Padama, M., et al. (2010). Domains and dimensions of internationalization in Philippine higher education. CHED Technical Report.
- [40] Rogayan, D. V., and Mendoza, R. V. (2023). Resource dependency and institutional capacity in Philippine SUCs. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 4, 100224.
- [41] Schildkamp, K. (2019). Data-based decision-making for school improvement: Research insights and gaps. *Educational Research*, 61(3), 257-273.
- [42] Seeber, M., et al. (2020). Strategically oriented organizational effectiveness and internationalization for financial sustainability. *Higher Education Policy*, 33(4), 601-620.
- [43] Singh, J. K. N., et al. (2024). External factors in higher education internationalization: A multi-country analysis. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 28(1), 44-62.
- [44] Skinner, A., et al. (2024). Shared values and internationalization goals: Building institutional commitment. *Internationalisation of Higher Education*, 12(1), 1-18.
- [45] Steinert, Y., et al. (2019). Faculty development initiatives designed to promote leadership in medical education. BEME Guide No. 19. *Medical Teacher*, 34(6), 483-503.
- [46] Vasquez-Rivera, M. (2019). Internationalization in Philippine higher education: Domains, dimensions and institutional responses. CHED Policy Research Paper.
- [47] Vanblaere, B., and Devos, G. (2018). Relating school leadership to perceived professional learning community characteristics: A multilevel analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 75, 139-149.
- [48] Waham, J. J. N., et al. (2023). Intercultural competency development as a resource-intensive undertaking in HEI internationalization. *Journal of International Education*, 27(4), 355-370.
- [49] Waterman, R. H., Peters, T. J., and Phillips, J. R. (1980). Structure is not organization. *Business Horizons*, 23(3), 14-26.
- [50] Webber, K. L., and Zheng, H. Y. (2020). Systems alignment and organizational effectiveness in higher education. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, 35, 1-50.