Possible FUTURES

THE NEXT 25 YEARS OF THE INTERNATIONALISATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Edited by Hans de Wit, Fiona Hunter, Linda Johnson and Hans-Georg van Liempd

EAIE
European Association for International Education

A publication to mark the 25th anniversary of the European Association for International Education (EAIE)

Possible FUTURES

The next 25 years of the internationalisation of higher education

Edited by Hans de Wit, Fiona Hunter, Linda Johnson and Hans-Georg van Liempd

Possible futures: the next 25 years of the internationalisation of higher education

Edited by
Hans de Wit, Fiona Hunter, Linda Johnson and Hans-Georg van Liempd

Published by
the European Association for International Education (EAIE)

ISBN 978-90-74721-34-9

Printed by
Drukkerij Raddraaier, Amsterdam.
Printed on FSC certified paper.

Photo credits
Henk Thomas (09, 10)
Paul Mellaart (17)
Roberto Roca Hurtuna, Dick Gillberg, Rui Farinha, Jas Sansi (21)
Pascal Kyriazis (24)

European Association for International Education
PO Box 11189, 1001 GD Amsterdam
The Netherlands
tel +31-20-344 51 00
fax +31-20-344 51 19
e-mail info@eaie.org, www.eaie.org

The European Association for International Education (EAIE) is the European centre for expertise, networking and resources in the internationalisation of higher education. We are a non-profit, member-led organisation serving individuals actively involved in the internationalisation of their institutions.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

European higher education institutions are increasingly international in their outlook. They have a rich experience in offering international curricula and in exchanging students, researchers, staff and knowledge.

I am proud of the role played in this regard by EU programmes, starting with the contribution of the Erasmus programme, which has, since 1987, funded the learning mobility of almost three million students and 300 000 academics. Erasmus has transformed the way in which higher education institutions relate to and cooperate with one another. It paved the way for the structural convergence introduced through the Bologna process, in particular the shift to learning outcomes, the transferability of credits, and the creation of EU-wide transparency and recognition tools, all of which have contributed to better understanding and mutual trust between institutions and national systems. From 2005, Erasmus Mundus, building on the successes of Erasmus, has further enhanced internationalisation by funding excellent joint Master's and Doctoral programmes between higher education institutions in Europe and further afield, stimulating the process of accreditation of international joint degrees.

The purpose of internationalisation is to improve the quality of higher education and ultimately to better prepare learners in Europe and worldwide to live and thrive in the global economy. The European Association of International Education (EAIE) has been instrumental in mainstreaming internationalisation into the institutional strategies of most universities in Europe. The annual EAIE conference is the most important meeting point for international education professionals in Europe and many successful international partnerships have been conceived there.

This publication demonstrates that there is no single approach to internationalisation, that it involves all levels of university life and has to be adapted to each institution's specific profile. Higher education institutions need to develop internationalisation strategies that encompass all their competitive and cooperative activities and which reflect their specific missions and strengths. Mobility is one component, but strategies need to

go further and prioritise internationalisation of curricula and the teaching process, thus providing an education to the majority of learners who are not internationally mobile, preparing them for life in a globalised world.

If Europe is to remain a highly attractive destination for mobile students and a valued partner for academic cooperation, European higher education institutions must become more international. Europe must reinforce awareness of the high quality and rich cultural and linguistic diversity of its universities. It should build on the joint- and double degrees, the international research projects and industrial doctorates pioneered with the support of EU programmes. It should extend the reach of the cooperation tools such as common qualification framework and quality assessment tools, which Member States have built together.

The European Commission's proposals for the 2014–2020 EU budget includes a new single programme for mobility and cooperation in education and training, entitled 'Erasmus for All'. This will offer European higher education institutions and their academic staff even greater opportunities to engage with their counterparts in non-EU countries. It is our hope that all stakeholders will seize the opportunities in Erasmus for All to reinforce Europe's place in an internationalised higher education world.

Best wishes to the EAIE on the occasion of its 25th anniversary.

— European Commissioner Androulla Vassiliou
Responsible for Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth.
June 2013, Brussels.

PREFACE

A reflection on a sustainable EAIE for a sustainable future: governance, Europe and beyond

— Bjørn Einar Aas, Gudrun Paulsdottir and Hans-Georg van Liempd

The European Association for International Education (EAIE) starts celebrating its 25th year of existence at its 25th Annual EAIE Conference in Istanbul, Turkey. While Europe still seems to be in an economic crisis, internationalisation does not appear to be affected as much as was feared when it became apparent how deeply the crisis had hit the higher education sector. It is the same year in which the European Union will expand from 27 to 28 countries, as well as launch the new Internationalisation Strategy, new education programmes and research programmes as an investment in the future of Europe. These programmes reflect both internal European and external global support for higher education and research, and will have a positive impact on the lives and careers of millions of students and scholars.

Internationalisation has changed over the last 25 years and will change again in the next 25 years, as you can read in this anniversary publication. It is predicted that internationalisation will change its form; social media, Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) and technology will continue to change the learning and teaching styles at higher education institutions and networks of institutions will increase and expand. Future developments tend never to be simple extrapolations of past incidents and experiences, so it is difficult to imagine what the impact will be of all these exogenous developments on the internationalisation of higher education in general, and on the EAIE more specifically.

As an association, we need to be pro-active in our approach, and our members might urge us to focus more on advocacy towards European stakeholders and governments. Nevertheless, we can say that the EAIE has grown in many ways in the last 10 years. Growing implies change. The question is how adaptable the EAIE is, and has been, to change.

This preface is also a short reflection on three aspects of change: the governance structure of the EAIE, the organisation in the light of the changing landscape in Europe, and the EAIE in competition and in cooperation around the globe.

THE EAIE AND GOVERNANCE

The EAIE is a child of changing times. Historic events and trends such as the fall of the Berlin Wall and the Bologna Declaration have been both an inspiration and a challenge that brought changes to international higher education and to the EAIE.

However, for the EAIE as an association, changes brought about by the efforts to organise and manage the Association's affairs are much closer to home. The founding fathers were busy giving the Association a sound footing, and we hear of lively discussions and rapid shifts of the early days. Since then there has hardly been a time when the Association has not been at work, adjusting itself to both external challenges and internal demands.

The EAIE was faced with a changing landscape of international higher education, which by the late 1990s was marked by a widespread professionalisation of

internationalisation at universities and colleges in Europe. This lead to record numbers of delegates attending the annual conferences. The EAIE was a definite success. At this stage the EAIE was firmly established as a globally visible and attractive venue for international educators, particularly reflected by the high quality of the conference, the exhibition and the Association's position as a major player in the field of internationalisation. However, success always comes at a price, and at the beginning of the new millennium, the Association faced financial difficulties. Spending had to be strictly controlled, even reduced.

With the aim of taking the Association to its next phase, priorities were considered essential. Four issues emerged. First of all, there was a need for a new comprehensive strategy, which could carry a vision and provide guidelines that would enable the EAIE to respond efficiently and effectively to the fast and dramatic changes in higher education. The new strategy looked ahead to 2020 and formulated ambitious goals to give the EAIE greater visibility and a stronger voice. This strategy was named 'Blueprint for the future'.

Secondly, the annual conference and exhibition had to be moved from a university to a conference centre. This was necessary in order to meet the increase in participants and exhibitors flocking to the EAIE. The move was a success, but added new complexities to the management and governance of the Association.

Thirdly, the EAIE's business had developed considerably on all scores, and led to a re-structuring and professionalising of the EAIE Secretariat, transforming it into what it now is: an efficient and effective EAIE Office.

Fourthly, it became clear that the EAIE would benefit from a "differentiation of governance and management, reflected in an increasing importance of the Presidency–Director axis and a further development of the governance structure". It should be noted that the introduction of a two-year term for the President and Vice President (known as Presidency) in 2002 created the foundation for a leadership that could see ideas conceived, initiated and implemented during their tenure at the helm of the Association. In sum, the statutory two-year term made the Association stronger.

When the process leading to new statutes started in 2008, the EAIE had three governing bodies: the General Meeting (GM), the Executive Board (EB) and the Steering Committee (SC). The General Meeting had the powers of a General Assembly, deciding on budgets, approving accounts and elections. Every member of the Association had the right to be present at the GM with full voting rights, but the GM was poorly attended and over the years had acquired the characteristics of a mandatory ritual for the interested few, instead of being a powerhouse full of ideas and initiatives.

In the old setup, the Executive Board managed the affairs of the Association. Members of the EB were the Professional Section (PS) Chairs, the Presidency and three directly elected members who, together with the Presidency, composed the Steering Committee.

The SC carried out the business of the Association in the interims between the meetings of the Executive Board. This setup blurred the lines of governing since the EB consisted of the executive parties of the Association and at the same time was supposed to have the overall responsibility and control over the same executive parties.

Deliberations and discussions for changing the governance structure took place over a period of 12 months, from the first draft to the final approval in September 2009. Proposals were discussed, re-drafted and debated over again. In short, the powers of Executive Board and Steering Committee were combined in the new Board, composed of the Presidency and three directly elected members. To replace the General Meeting, a General Council was established composed of the Professional Section Chairs *ex officio*, members elected of and among the affiliates of each Professional Section, and the Immediate Past President.

The Joint Leadership of the Association recognised that the General Meeting was not fulfilling its purpose and agreed that it "had to go". Likewise, the democratic renovation that would not allow anyone to have voting rights in more than one governing body was generally accepted.

The governance structure of the decision making bodies of the EAIE was changed to represent that times have changed, answering a need for an effective and efficient division of power within the EAIE and providing a framework to support the continued and strong growth of the Association. This serves to illustrate that the EAIE no longer is only a child of its time, but an association that changes with the times. The future task is to ensure continuous adaptation of the Association to meet the challenges of tomorrow. We are certain that future leaders of the Association, at all levels, will be as adaptive as all the ones have been over the last 25 years.

THE EAIE AND EUROPE

The EAIE is a European association, founded in Europe by Europeans with the majority of its members being European. What does that mean? That question deserves some reflection. Even though Europe is the second smallest continent on our globe, its diversity is very large. Are we an association present in all of Europe? And what is Europe? When talking as a representative of Europe in different settings around the world, it is often important to start with that question: what is Europe? It is important to have the same point of departure when talking about Europe to make sure that we are talking about the same thing. Is it the Europe of 50 countries, six partially recognised states, six dependent territories and two special areas of internal sovereignty? Is it the European Union Europe with its 28 members, is it the Euro zone of 17 countries, the European countries included in the EU exchange programmes or is it the Bologna area of 47 countries? To make cooperation interesting, the European continent hosts at least 59 languages and almost as many dialects.

When we within the EAIE are talking about Europe, the focus is often on the EU area, which most of the time includes the European Economic Area (EEA) countries and candidate countries, and which relates to the Europe included in the European programmes. On other occasions we mean the Bologna area. This is a limitation that we need to be aware of. It derives from a pragmatic approach to internationalisation of higher education and is not done on purpose. However, this is something that needs to be addressed.

Looking at the role of the EAIE in the early years as described in the first chapter of this book, it is very clear that we have made a difference. The shift from internationalisation of higher education that was boosted by the exchange programmes offered by the European Union, to today's global environment of international higher education, which Europe now is an integral part of, has been an exciting journey. Looking back, we like to believe that without the EAIE, development would have taken longer.

We believe that the EAIE has become more visible both in Europe and beyond. The quality of our conferences and Professional Development Programme has largely contributed to the visibility of the Association, and opened up new types of cooperation and increased demand for our expertise and views on all important issues in internationalisation of higher education. The Association now has a substantial network of partners in Europe, such as the Academic Cooperation Association (ACA), European University Association (EUA) and the European Commission, resulting in a number of stimulating sessions, workshops, seminars and publications. There has also been a considerable increase in the number of offers to participate in different European cooperation programmes such as the Lifelong Learning Programme, Tempus, Erasmus Mundus and Marie Curie. Many of them have been accepted and are up and running. All these projects and cooperations increase our visibility and underline the success of the EAIE.

Coming back to the question whether the EAIE is really present in all of Europe, the clear answer unfortunately is 'no'. We have members from most countries in Europe but we are not as well-known as we are in the more western parts. The EAIE has a task here, and it's an important one.

There are big differences between the regions in Europe; they emanate from history, politics and lately economics, among others. Looking at the more eastern regions we have a number of countries that are re-designing their higher education and funding systems, while also trying to establish themselves as actors on the international arena. On the other hand, it is also fair to say that the Bologna reforms have been better implemented in the more eastern parts of Europe than in some of the more western countries. Regional differences are thus not limited only to geographical regions, but can also be identified through other characteristics.

In order for the EAIE to live up to its name – the European Association for International Education – we need to find ways to better connect the different regions within Europe. We need to identify the connecting dots and start building the bridges. A joint European Higher Education Area including all the European countries gives a much stronger presence on the global arena, which would be beneficiary for all countries and institutions of higher education. The capacity that we have developed in Europe to cooperate and to respect diversity should be a good platform and point of departure for getting that work started.

During the last four to six years, changes in the global environment of higher education have accelerated and some key developments have taken place. During this time we have seen how the EAIE, through its presence and contributions, has played an important role by providing an arena for dissemination for sharing knowledge and best practice.

The EAIE is a European association both by its foundation and in legal terms. However, its true nature is global. It is an association where international higher education professionals from all over the world meet and interact, united by their work in international higher education. The role of the EAIE will continue to be significant in Europe as well as further afield.

THE EAIE BEYOND EUROPE

If asked to look at the future, it is always interesting to see how others predicted our future many years ago. Hans de Wit states in the EAIE's 10th anniversary publication:[1]

> The expansion of international education in Western Europe as a separate entity is coming to an end. As such it is no longer the flavour of the month, and mainstreaming, prioritisation and efficiency are becoming key words, all having as a quantitative consequence that the number of persons involved in international education will, at best, level off, but will more likely decrease, in the coming years.

On the next page of that same publication, Peter Timmann recorded his notes from the future: from the EAIE's 25th anniversary at the 26th EAIE Annual Conference in December 2014, in Buenos Aires.[2] His vision is that we would have had our 2004 conference in Washington DC, the 2009 conference in Singapore, and that the 2019 conference would be held in Harare, suggesting that every five years the EAIE would have its conference outside Europe. Hans de Wit argued in April 2012 in University World News[3] that we suffer from an international education conference circus and suggested a rethinking of the conference circus and increased cooperation between our sister organisations. Unlike his predication in 1999, the number of professionals in internationalisation worldwide, including Western Europe, has increased enormously and the hunger and demand for conference attendance has grown and many believe it will continue to grow, despite the present economic crisis.

The EAIE is usually described as having four pillars. Our conference is the major event, professional development has become increasingly popular with the introduction of the EAIE Academy, and the publications have a very attractive portfolio. These core offerings of the Association are reinforced by a greater, overarching commitment: that we use our position in the field to create positive change and promote dynamic collaboration across Europe and beyond. This is what is usually described as 'in the field'. This fourth pillar has various aspects and has grown over the last couple of years and we believe it will continue to grow over the next 10 years. The EAIE is pro-actively present not only at European platforms, but worldwide to seek cooperation with other stakeholders in higher education, always with the mindset that such activities should be for the benefit of its members. It is of strategic importance to the EAIE and our members to cooperate with our sister organisations around the world. One might argue that our sister organisations are competitors, but in the long run, we all seek the same for our members: gaining new insights and knowledge, providing adequate professional development and building a platform to network and to meet each other. This cooperation strategy has led to several joint initiatives. We will name a few.

Following a joint seminar in Sydney which took place alongside the Australian International Education Conference (AIEC) in October 2009, the International Education Association of Australia (IEAA) and the EAIE developed a study on the leadership needs for higher education professionals. The broad question we were looking to answer is: What generic and specific leadership capabilities are needed by the future generation of international education leaders in Australia and Europe? Based on the outcomes, both the EAIE and IEAA were to develop a Leadership Development Programme for professionals and leaders in international higher education. The findings of Phase 1 of the study were released at the EAIE Conference in September 2012, and at IEAA's conference in October 2012.[4] By the time of printing of this publication, the second phase will have been released, so both organisations will have identified what kind of leadership programme is needed for our members and whether we will offer this separately or jointly.

Another example is the International Association of Universities (IAU) Global Survey. The EAIE should always be interested in the state of internationalisation policy and practice in Europe and around the world. If another association such as the IAU has already found a good platform to survey these issues amongst institutions and associations of higher education on a regular basis, we should join forces instead of re-inventing the wheel. So the EAIE joined the Advisory Committee of the IAU 4th Global Survey, which is planned to be launched in 2013 and the outcome published in 2014.[5]

A third example is the launch of the International Student Mobility Charter in September 2012.[6] In times when higher education institutions grapple with budget cuts, services provided to international students are in a danger zone. The need to assure that students are safe and protected during their time abroad becomes increasingly important. The EAIE and other international higher education associations recognised this need and have taken action by leading a working group that developed a charter

advocating international students' rights. The charter was then endorsed by many other organisations and associations. The EAIE could have worked on its own to put the charter together. Quintessential here is that we all believe in the welfare of our students and, for their sake, we should not compete but cooperate to help safeguard their well-being.

CONCLUSION

With 6000 European institutions and each one with an average of five people working in internationalisation or in a related field, there are at least 30 000 professionals that the EAIE could serve in Europe. There is a world to gain. The EAIE is a major player in international higher education in Europe and beyond, and we have many sister organisations to work with. We are a European organisation and we need to make sure that we do not forget that. Serving our members means serving a diverse and culturally rich Europe. We can offer more to our members and to the profession if we cooperate with like-minded organisations worldwide.

This book marks the start of our 25th year of existence. There is a world ahead of us in the next 25 years and this is reflected in these chapters and essays. We hope you enjoy reading the contributions from our colleagues, from Europe and beyond; colleagues with a vision, an opinion and with enormous dedication to internationalisation of higher education. Just like you.

Endnotes

1. EAIE (1999). *Europe in Association. The first ten years of the European Association for International Education 1989 to 1999* (pp. 42–43). Amsterdam, the Nethrlands: EAIE.
2. Ibid. page 44–45.
3. University World News, Number 218. Retrieved December 7, 2012 from http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20120418114736646
4. An executive summary can be downloaded from the EAIE website: http://www.eaie.org/dms/pdf/in-the-field/projects/EAIE_IEAA_Leadership-Needs-in-International-Higher-Education-in-Australia-and-Europe-Phase-1-Executive-Summary/
5. For more information on IAU and the Global Survey, see www.iau-aiu.net/content/global-surveys, retrieved 12 December 2012
6. For more information on the International Student Mobility Charter, see www.eaie.org/mobility-charter

CHAPTER 1

25 years of international education and the EAIE: a changing world

— Hans de Wit and Fiona Hunter

When the European Association for International Education (EAIE) was formally established on 9 December 1989 at the first General Meeting during the Founding Conference in Amsterdam, Europe and its higher education sector were quite different realities than they are now, 25 years later. The Cold War was coming to an end but still dominated the world view. The European Community had only 12 member countries compared to the current 28 in the European Union, and the Euro had not yet been introduced as a common currency. Although trade in education, cross-border delivery and branch campuses were present, they were not such a central part of the discourse and policies in higher education and society as they are now. And although new Asian economies were emerging in addition to Japan, the common view was that Asia, as well as Africa and Latin America, were seen more as Third World than as the New World challenging the Old Europe. (Inter)national rankings of universities were unheard of. Bologna was only a city and the oldest university in Italy – not a 'Process'. Cooperation prevailed, with commercialisation and competition considered to be obscure Anglo-Saxon phenomena that would never reach the continent. It was a different Europe indeed.

What were the main drivers that led to the emergence of the EAIE? What were the key topics addressed in its conferences and publications in the founding years? Looking back, how do we position the EAIE in the higher education community at that time? What has changed in higher education over the past 25 years and how have those changes influenced the development of the EAIE and its current identity? This chapter looks back over the first 25 years of the EAIE and will conclude with a brief forecast of what changes might lie ahead.

THE FOUNDING YEARS: 1987 TO 1989 – RESPONDING TO NEW NEEDS IN A CHANGING REALITY

First steps towards harmonisation, 'Europeanisation' and globalisation in higher education

The 1980s were a period of change for international education in Europe. Until then, higher education institutions in general had paid little attention to internationalisation. Individual mobility of students and scholarship schemes under the umbrella of bilateral scientific and cultural agreements, and technical assistance to developing countries were the principal international activities. A comprehensive approach to internationalisation was not part of the higher education mindset; institutions were only marginally reactive to external initiatives and did not develop proactive, strategic initiatives. Promoting mobility was considered part of foreign policy. Historical ties with former colonies, political and economic considerations, traditional mobility of the elites (both from former colonies to Europe and from Europe to Northern America) dominated the international education scene. A European policy for internationalisation was absent, as were national and institutional policies.

In the 1970s, a few national exchange programmes had been established in Sweden and Germany, followed by a European Community pilot programme 'Joint Study Programmes' launched in 1976, which built on these earlier initiatives. Short study visits and a programme for educational administrators were also developed. A gradual shift took place from South–North to North–North mobility as the importance of training and education for the process of European integration and cooperation was the main driving force behind the creation of these programmes. They laid the foundation for more substantive international education initiatives in the 1980s, in particular the 'European Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students' (Erasmus), which in turn created the impetus for the EAIE.

In the same period, the UK introduced full-cost fees for foreign students in 1979, which saw the start of higher education as an export commodity. This created a tension between participation in cooperative programmes with other European partners and the revenue-driven focus on export: a tension that would be reduced only 15 to 20 years later with the UK moving to a more balanced approach and the rest of Europe shifting towards the export model.

The creation of the EAIE, and its first 10 years, reflect the cooperative approach to international education, as can be read in its first public document released in early 1989:

> European universities have been international in character from the foundation of the first institutions in the Middle Ages. As the European countries are moving closer together in the last few decades, there is a growing need to professionalize and organize those on the university staffs who are involved in international affairs. European action programs like Erasmus and similar schemes being developed in non-EC countries make the foundation of a professional organization mandatory.

The aim of what in this leaflet was called the 'European Association of International Education Administrators' (EAIEA) was:

> […] the improvement of international exchanges – in the broadest sense of the term – of higher education institutions in Europe. This aim is to be reached through professional development and the promotion of cooperation among those responsible for international activities within the institutions.

The leaflet, which formed the first call for the Founding Conference of the Association, and which had as its central theme *International Relations of European Higher Education*, highlighted information sharing and direct member contact as the best way to realise the objectives of the Association. The leaflet was signed by the Provisional Executive Board, made up of 23 individuals from France (3), Denmark (2), Germany (2), Italy (3), the Netherlands (2), Spain (2), the UK (2), Belgium, Finland, Ireland, Norway,

Portugal, Sweden and Switzerland. In an updated leaflet, before the summer of 1989, the list increased to 25, adding two new members from the UK and from Germany; representatives from the University of Applied Sciences sector. The majority were international office directors and administrators, but there were also two pro-rectors and three academics.

The updated leaflet included a list of proposed professional sections, giving an idea of the issues identified as most relevant to the field: foreign student advisors, study abroad officers, directors of international education offices, foreign language instructors, admission officers and credential evaluators, European liaison officers for research and education, and higher education third world officers. The list is an interesting mix of influence from NAFSA (also noticeable in the use of American English in the first leaflets) and specific European issues. In the Planning Document for the General Meeting during the Founding Conference, the last section was deleted and the names of the third section changed to 'Persons responsible for international relations' and that of the fifth to 'Research Liaison Officers'. As we will see further on, this last group was to disappear and the Third World Officers came back as a Special Interest Group, while other names have changed and new groups have emerged over time, in line with the evolution of the EAIE and international education.

Founding fathers and mothers

How did the 23 and then 25 members of the Provisional Executive Board meet up and initiate the creation of the EAIE? It started back in 1987 at the University of Amsterdam when the Office of Foreign Relations decided that it was important for its staff and the university to become part of a community of similar administrators, to exchange information, to network and to cooperate. 1987 was the year the Erasmus programme had been adopted to stimulate student mobility and inter-university cooperation. This would require new information, contacts and skills in managing such programmes. As in many universities in the Netherlands and elsewhere, there was little such experience since international offices were primarily involved in development cooperation and limited national scholarship schemes. Earlier attempts to create an association for international education in the UK, France and Germany had not been successful, and yet there appeared to be a growing need for such an organisation.

So a small group of six individuals met in Aix-en-Provence on 5 November 1988, after the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) Conference in Cannes, and decided to create an association. Each person was asked to provide names of colleagues who might be interested in taking part in a second meeting in January 1989 in Brussels, in order to create a group of 25 people to establish the Association as well as organise and advertise the Founding Conference.

The meeting in Brussels was attended by 12 people from the first group of 23 who accepted the statement prepared in Aix-en-Provence and agreed to a Founding Conference in Amsterdam in December 1989, the establishment of its Secretariat in Amsterdam, and the appointment of Hans van Dijk as its first Executive Director.

The meeting also discussed several important issues at length, which were not only extremely relevant for the success of the Association, but also illustrative of the context of Europe and its higher education at that time.

Membership

The first issue concerned the membership of the Association, as stated in the minutes:

> The participants agree that the Association has to be open to both individual and institutional members, with the emphasis on individual members, certainly in the first phase of the Association. The participants agree that the Association has to have a clear distinction from other organisations and institutions dealing with international education and that the main objective is professional development. A reasonably priced individual membership, open to all those related to international educational exchange, will be the basis for further development of the Association in which a supporting institutional membership can become acceptable and even desirable.

In this paragraph, fundamental aspects were expressed – some of which are still at the core of the EAIE today. Others, such as the issue of institutional and/or individual membership, are still being debated 25 years later. The Association has always maintained individual membership as its guiding principle, but on several occasions the option of institutional membership has been brought to the table on the grounds that it would facilitate membership and conference participation. However, the debates have always ended in the decision to focus on individual membership as a means to professional development and to distinguish the EAIE from other organisations.

Another issue that has been repeatedly raised over the past 25 years is the principle of 'a reasonably priced individual membership'. While the membership fee has been generally considered as reasonably priced over the years, the conference and training fees are often perceived to be too high although opinions vary considerably as members draw on comparative costs in different countries. Whatever the perceptions of the cost might be, the focus on professional development continues to be one of the core principles of the EAIE.

Geographical scope of the Association

As the first President of the EAIE, Axel Markert, recalls in the publication *From Pioneers to Professionals, 1989–2009, 20 years of EAIE:*

> In retrospect this will be hard to understand, but during the founding phase we had a very lively discussion about whether the EAIE should be restricted to universities within the European Community countries or whether we should be wide open from the start.

Originally, the geographical focus of the Association was thought to be the European Community, but already before the meeting in Aix-en-Provence this was extended to include Switzerland, Austria and all the Scandinavian countries. However, the

question of the other European countries, in particular Central and Eastern Europe, remained, as noted in the minutes of the Brussels meeting:

> Most of the participants feel that an exclusion of Eastern Europeans or even a special observer's status would be seen as a strange move. […] Interested persons from Eastern European institutions of tertiary education […] will be accepted as normal participants.

During the Amsterdam General Meeting, it was agreed that the geographical scope of the Association would cover the whole of Europe, which was a clear welcome to members from Central and Eastern Europe, Turkey, Cyprus and Iceland.

During the Brussels meeting there was no discussion on membership from outside Europe. The Planning Document for the Founding Conference simply states, "Any individual interested in the aim of the Association may apply for membership." At the conference in Amsterdam some participants suggested excluding non-Europeans from membership in the fear that the Association might become a copy of NAFSA, but this was rejected. The EAIE has always attracted non-European conference participants and members in increasing numbers.

As for the geographical structure of the Association, the first leaflet made reference to regional meetings and conferences, and there had also been some discussion on possible national sections, but in the Planning Document approved at the Founding Conference, the decision was taken not to organise the Association in national sections or multi-country groups.

There was also discussion on the location of the annual conferences. Some provisional executive board members advocated having the conference every other year in Amsterdam, while others suggested the NAFSA model, with the conference in Amsterdam every five years. In the end, the board adopted the idea of the two Dutch members to hold the conference in different locations to emphasise the Association's European character, which is the model still in place today.

Finding a name for the Association

It was agreed that the working title 'European Association of International Education Administrators' (EAIEA) was not ideal. Attempts to come up with an alternative, as the minutes say, "were not crowned by success". The greatest problem was posed by the term 'Administrators', and there was also the feeling that the name was too similar to the recently established 'Association of International Education Administrators' (AIEA) in the US. By the time of the Founding Conference, the provisional executive board proposed the 'European International Education Association' (EIEA), which was then altered at the General Meeting to the name it is still known by today: the European Association for International Education (EAIE). Most of the discussion at the meeting revolved around the use of the word 'of' or 'for', with the latter winning in the end. However, there is nothing in the minutes that record how 'EAIE' should

be pronounced, hence the great linguistic variety that can be heard around the world when people say "E-A-I-E"!

Resolving the issue of language

The issue of a working language or working languages had been raised in several discussions among the founding members, but after hotly debating the issue at the Brussels meeting, the participants expressed the view that:

> Although accepting the importance of the cultural identity of the different countries and their languages for practical reasons, there is no alternative than using one working language for the Association and the conference, and that English is the only possible choice for a working language.

This position was adopted at the General Meeting in Amsterdam. The early conferences experimented with some sessions in French, as well as in German and Spanish (partly to facilitate conference participation with national funding), but this custom has since disappeared and does not appear to be an issue. However, language itself has always been important in the Association, with a dedicated professional section organising sessions on the theme of 'Teaching in English' as well as the role of language and language learning in international education.

Identifying the purpose and founding principles

In the course of 1989, in preparation for the Founding Conference, the description of the purpose and founding principles of the Association were further refined. The Planning Document and Draft Status of the Association described them as follows:

> The aim of this Association is the internationalisation of higher education in Europe through international exchanges. This aim is to be reached by professional development and the promotion of cooperation among those responsible for international activities within the institutions of higher education and related organisation.

The text encompassed the key characteristics for the Association: professional development, networking, public policy, information and dissemination, as well as a broad European scope.

It is also interesting to note some additional underlying principles described in the Planning Document, that it would "not in any way impinge on the prerogatives of the heads of European institutions of higher education to set the course of international cooperation in this field"; that the Association is "practically oriented" and a "network of professionals", that professional development is the main idea of the Association; that it sets out to promote international education and enhance and defend its quality; that it can perform services for other organisations or agencies; and that it will be guided "by a spirit of openness with regard to geographical scope of its membership".

Some of these underlying principles read as repetition of what has been described in its aim and purposes above, but the first two underlying principles in particular were meant to remove fears of other organisations, in particular the European Rectors Conference (CRE) – predecessor of the European Universities Association (EUA) – that the Association would challenge their leading role in Europe, the rectors' role in different European countries and the institutions themselves. Since the success of the new Association was dependent on the support its future members would receive from their rectors, it was considered crucial to set clear boundaries and ensure good relations.

Partnerships with other organisations

Alongside developing partnerships with the national and European Rectors Conferences, other organisations were identified as relevant potential partners:

- European and national agencies and programmes, such as Erasmus and NORDPLUS
- Professional organisations in other world regions, such as NAFSA in the US, JAFSA in Japan and ISP in Australia
- Relevant international students' organisations
- 'Neighbouring' professional European associations such as EUPRIO (Association of European Public Relations and Information Officers) and FEDORA (European Association of Student Counsellors).

Partnering with 'sister' organisations has been a central part of the EAIE policy over the past 25 years and many affiliations have been established, as will be described later, but two deserve special attention here.

The first is FEDORA, which had been recently created with European funding. For this reason, some people in the Commission were hesitant to support the development of a second organisation and encouraged the new association to become a subdivision of FEDORA. However, the EAIE founders considered the two initiatives to be fundamentally different and felt that the FEDORA membership base was too small to absorb the larger community of international educators. They convinced the Commission of their position and, interestingly, 25 years later it is FEDORA that has been incorporated into the EAIE.

The second is the role of international student organisations. The decision was taken to create a strong link to the student voice and Desiree Majoor, Chair of the Erasmus Student Network (initiated in 1989 in Ghent and formally established in 1990 in Copenhagen), became the first student member of the Executive Board of the EAIE at the Founding Conference in 1989. This initiative of a student representation lasted only five years although there has been stronger student participation in the EAIE conferences in recent years, as a result of more active student involvement in European higher education and its reform process.

The EAIE founding conference in 1989, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

The first conference in Amsterdam

The new Association took inspiration from other association models, and in particular the more established American sister organisation, NAFSA, for its organisational model, governance structure and also its conference programme. It was able to rely on strong support from the European Commission (EC), in particular the Erasmus programme, as well as from the Dutch National agency Nuffic, and the University of Amsterdam, where the Secretariat was (and still is) based. Fired with enthusiasm, it was now ready to launch its first conference in Amsterdam, which attracted an incredible number of almost 600 people mainly, but not exclusively, from Europe.
A clear illustration of the key role that the EAIE would play in driving the discourse on international education in Europe can be seen in the quote from the Keynote Address at the Founding Conference by Ladislav Cerych, Director of the European Institute of Education and Social Policy in Paris:

> Assuming that within the next three to five years the original goal of Erasmus is achieved – implying that 10% of all students spend at least one semester at a higher education institution in another Member State – what happens to the remaining 90% is certainly a matter of utmost importance.

Ten years later, this statement and related call for curricular changes in the context of international education would form the basis for the initiative within the EAIE by Bengt Nilsson and others on 'Internationalisation at Home', a development that was to give both international education and the EAIE a new impetus after its first 10 years of existence.

The EAIE founding conference in 1989, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

The founding years in summary

The creation of the EAIE is embedded in the developments in Europe in general and its higher education in particular. The start of the Erasmus programme in 1987, the opening up to Central and Eastern Europe – reflected in the creation of the Tempus programme in 1990 – as well as other European and national initiatives to stimulate internationalisation of European higher education, were influenced – and strengthened – by the creation of the EAIE in 1989. The resounding success of the Founding Conference in Amsterdam demonstrated the clear need for such an association. The energy to make it happen came from the enthusiasm and vision of a small group of volunteers, but how it would develop over the next five years would be critical to ensuring its place as a player in international education.

THE FIRST FIVE YEARS: 1989 TO 1994 – FINDING A CLEAR DIRECTION

The emergence of a European policy for international education

The Maastricht Treaty of 1992 (and its inclusion of education) was a high point in European integration, a period in which the later failure of the plans for a European Constitution and the current sentiments against further integration would have been unimaginable. The Maastricht Treaty, related European Commission initiatives and increased attention by national governments and institutions of higher education to internationalise set the scene for the first half of the 1990s. Student mobility as an integrated part of study, widening of scope to other regions (third countries in Western, Central, and Eastern Europe as well as beyond Europe), development cooperation and

European research became central pillars of internationalisation strategies at European, national and institutional levels.

The increasing importance of international education in Europe was given concrete form in a range of EC programmes such as Erasmus, Tempus, the first external dimension programmes and the early predecessors of the framework programmes for research. The EAIE's first five years reflect these developments.

The conferences

Conference participation more than doubled from roughly 600 at the Founding Conference to 1450 at the 5th Annual EAIE Conference in The Hague. Membership also more than doubled from 600 to 1400 in 1994. The themes of the first five conferences are illustrative of the period. While the theme of the Founding Conference was introductory: *International relations of European higher education,* the next four had a regional focus: *The new Europe* (Amsterdam, 1990), *International education in Europe* (Montpellier, 1991), The Atlantic link (Berlin, 1992) and *Europe and beyond* (The Hague, 1993). The 6th Annual EAIE Conference (London, 1994) chose a thematic approach: *Quality in International Education* – a topic that has never ceased to be highly relevant.

The topics addressed in the sessions were in line with what was happening in the field – updates on the different European programmes, national policies, (administration of) cooperation between countries and regions, language issues (including teaching in English), research outcomes, credential evaluation and admissions, *etc.* There were also some surprising topics, well ahead of their time. Two examples: in 1990 there was already a session on 'Double and Joint Degrees: How to get started' and one of the presenters was Giancarlo Spinelli, who would not only later become an EAIE President but who still is today one of the leading authors and presenters on this hot topic. A year later, in 1991 in Montpellier, Hans de Wit, who would also become an EAIE President, gave a presentation on 'Exchange and fee-paying students in international education: A contradiction?' The tension between exchange and/or recruitment has since become a more current discussion point within the EAIE and international education in general.

During the conferences, the presidential speeches often focused on the role and identity of the new Association. In 1991, the EAIE President, Kjetil Flatin, stated his vision:

> We dare to think of Europe as one continent – with one cultural identity. We dare to dream of a Europe in which access to higher education is equal to all and in which international education in its widest sense is a core activity. We dare to think that the multitude of languages and cultures represents strengths and not weaknesses. We dare to think that an education that emphasises our common heritage and humanistic values gives us a basis for strength, and an openness to other parts of the world and other cultures. We believe that international education in the final analysis is the only safe defence against intolerance, hatred and violence.

This vision very much reflects the first five years of the EAIE, an idealist view as also expressed a year later at the Berlin conference by Kjetil Flatin's successor, France Gamerre:

> The role played by international education through motivations, stimulation and contacts is essential in building our future world.

The EAIE had a strong vision for its future and the annual conference very quickly established itself as the most important activity of the Association as international educators sought the opportunity to learn and connect. However, in those first five years a number of new activities were developed to support the Association's mission.

Public policy, research and dissemination

In 1990, the first EAIE newsletter was published, coming out on a regular basis, and in 1991 and 1992, so-called 'Instant Updates' were introduced to provide members with the latest news, but these were soon replaced with the advent of the internet. In 1992, the first of a long series of *Occasional Papers* was published with the text of the keynote address by Peter Scott at the 3rd Annual EAIE Conference in Montpellier: *Mass higher education in Europe: implications for student mobility and international education*.

In the first five years of the EAIE, the Association published seven *Occasional Papers* and their themes reflected the broad diversity of issues in the field: a critical comment on the Memorandum on Higher Education in the European Community; a reference guide to higher education in the Netherlands, jointly with Nuffic; a reference guide on cooperation with Central and Eastern Europe, jointly with the Tempus Office; a publication on North–South Cooperation; a publication in French on the student income and student loan systems, the only publication by the EAIE in a language other than English; and a paper on quality and international education, based on the keynote speech by Alan Smith at the London conference.

In the period of 1989 to 1994, several research projects were developed that would contribute to the debate on the increasing need for internationalisation of higher education, including a study of education systems in cooperation with NAFSA, credential evaluation and credit transfer, institutional policies for internationalisation in cooperation with the Conference of Rectors of European Universities (CRE), and institutional strategies for internationalisation in Europe with the IMHE Programme of the OECD.

Geographical scope

Membership and conference participation in the first five years was dominated by North-Western Europe, in particular Scandinavia, the Netherlands and the UK, while there have always been lower levels of membership and conference participation from Central and Eastern Europe and in particular from Southern Europe. In order to increase the participation of colleagues from Central and Eastern Europe, an 'East European Participation Fund' was established at the 1990 Amsterdam conference, based on donations from members/conference participants, and this fund was later broadened to make conference grants available to people from low income countries.

There has always been representation from outside Europe, with the first delegations from the US as well as Australia, Japan, South Africa, Mexico and Colombia. The presence of non-European countries may have been small in the early years but it has increased and diversified significantly ever since.

Membership composition in some areas was also reflected in governance. Female membership was roughly 54%, and the presidency alternated between male and female every year. The leadership group had representation from a broad range of countries and regions in Europe, and in 1993 the Executive Board had its first non-European member. However, despite initial investments in developing a strong Russian and former Soviet Union presence in the EAIE (the Executive Board had Russian members in its first years and in 1991 an East–West Seminar was organised in St. Petersburg [then still Leningrad]), participation from most of the former Soviet states became marginal in the 1990s and has not yet recovered.

Professional Sections

There were only minimal changes to the EAIE Professional Sections in the first five years. The five Professional Sections created at the 1990 Amsterdam conference continued to exist: *Admission Officers and Credential Evaluators* (ACE), *International Education Managers, Language Teachers, Research Liaison Officers*, and *Study Abroad and Foreign Student Advisors* (SAFSA). In 1991, *Economics and Business Studies* (EBS) was established and in 1992, so was *European Educational Programme Coordinators* (EEPC). International Education Managers changed their name to *International Relations Managers* (IRM), and the Language Teachers first added 'and Testers' to their name in 1992, then later became *Languages in Educational Mobility* (LEM) the following year, when the Research Liaison Officers also changed to *Research and Industrial Liaison Officers* (RILO).

External partnerships

Partnerships with other organisations evolved rapidly over the first five years. In December 1994, the EAIE had 33 Courtesy Members as partners. In Europe these were firstly national organisations, such as the British Council and UKCOSA in the UK, CIMO in Finland, DAAD in Germany, FondazioneRui in Italy, Nuffic in the Netherlands, and the Swedish Institute in Sweden. Secondly, partnerships were established with other European higher education associations: ACA, CEPES, UNESCO, CRE, EFMD, EURASHE, European Cultural Foundation, EUPRIO, FEDORA and the Liaison committee of Rectors' Conferences. Then there were student associations such as AIESEC, ESIB and ESN, and finally, European Commission Offices such as COMETT and Tempus, as well as the Council of Europe.

Outside Europe, Courtesy Members included sister organisations and other international education organisations such as IIE, NAFSA and AIEA in the US, AUCC and CBIE in Canada, IDP Education Australia and international organisations as IAU, IAEA and OECD.

This list is not only a manifestation of how quickly the EAIE built up its network in a relatively short period of existence, but also a picture of the key players in European and international higher education at that time, a picture that is still relevant today, although Asian, African and Latin American players were still to emerge.

1989 to 1994 in summary

In this period, the EAIE grew from an idea to the reality of an Association that was well positioned in the international and European higher education community. It doubled its membership and conference participation, launched its training activities and publications policy, and entered a European and global network of international higher education organisations. It was driven by a powerful vision and strong ideals. As it developed into a more mature organisation over the next five years, would it continue to be inspired by these visions or would it take a more pragmatic route?

FROM 1995 TO 1999: BECOMING ESTABLISHED IN A PERIOD OF TRANSITION

Internationalisation: from margin to centre, from activity to strategy

1995 to 1999 was a period of substantial change in Europe and in its international education with the shift from Erasmus to Socrates and the introduction of institutional contracts and European Policy Statements. 1999 may have marked the last year of a millennium but it also signalled new beginnings in Europe. It was the year in which the Bologna Declaration was signed and the Internationalisation at Home movement was launched. As of 2000, everything was going to be different, but the EAIE still had five years to become more established in order to face the changes ahead.

The Association started this period with a new Executive Director, Hillary Callan, who would lead the organisation for the next six years, and introduce two Special Interest Groups (SIG) in addition to the seven Professional Sections: *Educational Cooperation with Developing Countries* (EDC), and *Work Placement and Internship Networking Group* (SWING). The first SIG was a revival, not only from an original idea in the developing phase of EAIE, but also of the importance of development cooperation in international education. The second one was a recognition of the importance of international work placements and internships as part of international education, although admittedly it would take another 15 years before this importance was truly recognised (for instance with its inclusion in Erasmus). Later, two other new SIGs were established: *Distance Education Network* (DEN) – a SIG that did not last long but that might be revived under the influence of the new attention to virtual mobility and the explosion of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) – alongside NESS: *Network of European Summer Schools,* which has continued to flourish.

The conferences

For the first time, the conference moved to Southern Europe where 1400 participants from more than 50 countries flocked to Milan in Italy. Growth continued in this five-year period, reaching 2000 participants, and conference locations became an expression of the broad European geographical scope: Budapest, Barcelona, Stockholm, and Maastricht. On the other hand, the geographical spread of members and conference participants did not change much, although under the impetus of the SIG EDC there was some increase in participation from developing countries, along with a growing trend from non-European countries such as Canada, New Zealand, the US and Australia, where international education was developing rapidly.

The themes of the five conferences became broader and more abstract: *The cultures of education* (Milano, 1995), *On equal terms: New partners in international education* (Budapest, 1996), *Boundaries and bridges in international education* (Barcelona, 1997), *International education: Interactions with the wider community* (Stockholm, 1998) and *Good neighbours and faraway friends: Regional dimensions of international education* (Maastricht, 1999). As with other similar associations and conferences, as the Association grew and the field broadened, the general themes became less central while workshops and sessions became more diverse, catering for a wider range of constituencies. Specialisation became increasingly more apparent.

In the publication *1989 to 1999,* founding member and Past President Hans de Wit wrote – in the chapter titled 'The EAIE now has a past, but will it have a future?' – that when the Association was established in 1989 its main mission was professional development in the field of international education in Europe:

> The need to learn the do's and don'ts, to develop a network of partner institutions and to influence decision making processes in Brussels and at the national level, created a fertile soil for the Association.

But he continued:

> It is no longer the flavour of the month, and mainstreaming, prioritisation and efficiency are becoming key words. […] Secondly, the division of labour in international education is becoming more noticeable than before. In the past, international education administrators were sheep with five legs. […] Now, more and more, we get specialised professionals, hierarchical divisions and divisions between central and departmental offices.

Professional development

Training activities expanded in the period 1995 to 1999 to meet professional development needs. In addition to international education management courses in Maastricht, additional courses were offered on internationalisation of the curriculum and on international credential evaluation, first in Maastricht but later also in other locations. Professional Sections also started to offer their own training courses, such as the EEPC on Socrates institutional contracts and SAFSA on cross-cultural training. Perhaps the Maastricht courses could be considered as an 'EAIE Academy' *avant la lettre,* since from 1996 onwards training courses grew in number and spread all over Europe, only to become concentrated again in 2011 in a rotating EAIE Academy.

Public policy, research and dissemination

A tradition started in 1992 with the publication of an EAIE professional view on the EC Memorandum on Higher Education, which was continued in the period of 1995 to 1998 with the publication of *EAIE Comments* on: the EU's pilot projects for *Evaluating Quality in Higher Education* (1995); the draft Council of Europe/UNESCO Convention on recognition of qualifications (1996); the White Paper on Education and Training (1996); the Green Paper on Relations between the EU and the ACP countries (1997); *Obstacles to Transnational Mobility* (1997); the Socrates Programme (1997); the EC document *Towards a Europe of Knowledge* (1998) and proposals of the EC concerning the establishment of the second phase of Community Action in the field of education (1998). The public policy role of the EAIE began to emerge through these comments.

The number of *Occasional Papers* also increased in the same period. Four new *Occasional Papers* were published with the titles *Policy and policy implementation in internationalisation of higher education,* edited by Peter Blok (1995), *Crisis across frontiers: impacts, readiness and response strategies for international educators,* edited by Hélène Ullero (1995), *Internationalisation and quality assurance: goals, strategies and instruments,* edited by Urbain de Winter (1996) and *50 years of international cooperation and exchange between the United States and Europe: European views,* edited by Hans de Wit (1998) on the occasion of NAFSA's 50th anniversary.

The EAIE also published two books: *Strategies for internationalisation of higher education: a comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States of America,* edited by Hans de Wit (1995) in cooperation with IMHE/OECD and AIEA, and *Internationalisation of higher education in Asia Pacific countries,* edited by Jane Knight and Hans de Wit (1997) with IDP Education Australia.

Last but not least, the EAIE cooperated with the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) in the development of the *Journal of Studies in International Education* (JSIE). The JSIE started in 1997 with two issues per year, and over the past 15 years has become the leading peer reviewed academic journal of the field, with five issues per year and participation of the main international education organisations around the world.

The large number of *Occasional Papers* and comments, and the publication of the two books and the JSIE illustrated a period of debate and dissemination within the EAIE on the rationales, meanings and concepts of internationalisation. The shift from 'international education' towards 'internationalisation of higher education', which took place in the 1990s parallel to the development of the EAIE, but also inspired by it, was given voice in these publications.

1995 to 1999 in summary

In the first years of its existence, the EAIE developed from an organisation whose primary aims were the professional development of its members and the creation of a network of information and communication in the emerging field of European international education, into a representative European association that had become an active player in public policy and strategic thinking. Its voice was now heard in Europe and beyond.

Advocacy in the direction of the European Commission, Council of Europe and other international higher education entities, as expressed in the *EAIE Comments,* coincided with more fundamental discussions and publications in which the why, how and what of internationalisation was questioned, presented and framed.

The founding and establishment of the EAIE took place in the period in which the pace of political and economic integration in Europe and in its higher education sector had accelerated amid much excitement, innovation, cooperation and expansion. The EAIE was inevitably influenced by these transformations and, although only a small voice in Europe, it had become a central player in the field of international education. The first decade of the new millennium would bring in more change and create new challenges and opportunities for the Association and its members.

The 11th EAIE Annual Conference in 1999, Maastricht, the Netherlands

Would it see a further specialisation of professionals, and what would the implications be for international education and the EAIE? Would the ideals expressed five years earlier by Kjetil Flatin and France Gamarre prevail, or would the gradual commercialisation of international education that was beginning to manifest itself step by step become the more dominant factor?

2000 TO 2010: RESPONDING TO A DECADE OF DYNAMIC CHANGE

A changing European and global landscape

Throughout most of this decade, Europe appeared to be emerging as a stronger reality as the European Union extended its membership from 15 to 27 countries and the Euro was introduced as a single currency. However, the sense of integration and related economic and political security of a single European space would soon come under threat, first by the tragic attack on the Twin Towers in New York on 11 September 2001, then the rejection of the European Constitution by Dutch and French voters in 2005, and more recently the global and European economic problems, triggered by the 2008 world financial crisis.

It was also the decade in which universities felt the first winds of change, when competition entered the discourse of European higher education and universities began to engage in the global search for talent, partly to overcome local demographic decline but also to position themselves beyond their national borders. The 2000 Lisbon Strategy of the European Council strived, perhaps over-ambitiously, to make the EU the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world. Global rankings began to impact on the way universities thought about themselves and on how their role was perceived by society and industry at large. Globalisation and the emergence of the knowledge economy, shifts in economic balances and demographics, and an accelerating IT revolution were putting powerful pressures on higher education institutions, requiring them to change at an unprecedented pace.

The European higher education response to these massive pressures was expressed in the Lisbon Strategy, which identified as one of its targets the creation of a European Research Area, and more specifically in the Bologna Process with its key goal of building the European Higher Education Area. The Bologna Process had started with only four countries signing the Sorbonne Declaration in Paris in 1998 but it rapidly gathered pace in the next decade, reaching a total of 46 countries that represented around 5600 universities and 31 million students.

The Bologna Process was conceived and developed thanks to the extremely positive experience and influence of cooperation under Erasmus, hailed as one of the most successful European initiatives ever. Initially the principal focus of the Bologna Process was on the internal dimension of putting the European House in order through greater commonality in degree structures, credit systems and quality assurance, but it quickly

acquired an external dimension. Convergence of structures and tools was aimed not only at increasing mobility and cooperation within Europe, but also to make Europe more competitive and more attractive to the rest of the world.

The external challenges meant that shared problems now called for shared solutions and the Bologna Process developed very quickly into an unprecedented landmark reform, achieving in 10 years what many national governments had failed to achieve in decades. The emerging European Higher Education Area (EHEA) not only created an external identity for European higher education institutions, but it also generated a strong interest for the new instruments and models in other world regions.

The various action lines of the Bologna Process did not evolve along an equal path in all signatory countries and there was significant variation in the speed and pace of change. The current economic and political crisis in Europe has meant that many of the necessary national reforms to complete the process have been put on hold, but nevertheless, a solid foundation in European Higher Education Reform had been laid and the EHEA emerged as a reality.

The EAIE as a knowledge hub

As European countries engaged in a common agenda for reform, generating interest in the emerging model in other world regions, the EAIE became an ideal annual meeting place for international educators globally. The EAIE embraced the Bologna Agenda as a key European development and the Agenda took on significant importance, not only at the conferences but in the many Bologna seminars that the EAIE organised throughout the decade in a number of European countries. The Bologna goals may have been the same, but each country faced the issues differently and needed to develop its own pathway to achievement. The EAIE provided European best practice and knowledge while working together with the national agencies at the local level.

Conference attendance expanded yearly as not only more Europeans, but also more international participants marked the EAIE dates in their calendars. The 10% target for international participation at the conference was easily surpassed, with almost a quarter of participants from outside Europe by 2008. In the first decade, there had been a gradual increase of participation from primarily Northern America and Australia, but now participation had spread to other parts of the world, in particular Asia and Latin America and to a lesser extent Africa and the Middle East, resulting in over 80 countries now present at the annual conferences. Numbers soared from 1550 participants at the 1999 Maastricht conference to over 3600 at the 2010 Nantes conference. The trend has since continued with numbers reaching a remarkable 4200 in Dublin in 2012, apparently unaffected by the many cutbacks in higher education budgets. This constant growth has required ever bigger conference venues and ever more hotel rooms, and did not occur without hiccups along the way as conference attendance often far exceeded expectations, putting local providers under pressure to find extra last-minute rooms to accommodate demand.

Throughout the decade, the conference ran a dedicated Bologna track celebrating outcomes and highlighting challenges as the Process moved forward, but this was not the only change that could be observed in the programme. Bologna was a response to external pressures that were leading to broader change within higher education institutions, affecting the activities they engaged in as well as the way they organised their operations. New international education professions were emerging in what was now increasingly being termed the 'business of higher education'. This trend was reflected in the emergence of new Professional Sections such as *Marketing and Recruitment* (M&R), which underwent rapid expansion, as well as in the provision of seminars around issues such as global rankings and their impact on universities. While a more commercial side to higher education emerged (apparent also in the growing number of booths at the Conference Exhibition), interest in – and commitment to – cooperation did not fade away.

On the contrary, it became Europe's key competitive advantage. Strategic partnerships, joint programmes, double degrees and other collaborative projects featured high on the conference programme, and closer attention was given to special needs in internationalisation such as disability and student counselling, reflected in the emergence of more Special Interest Groups. Another key change was the insertion of more structured networking events, since it had become increasingly apparent that alongside gaining new knowledge, a primary reason for attending the conference was connecting with other institutions and organisations. The conference became a very cost-effective way of meeting both current and potential partners in just a few days.

The EAIE began to notice that many of its members were in fact leaders in their respective fields, innovating and shaping internationalisation in Europe, and decided to recognise their achievements through a range of awards acknowledging professional excellence. Over the decade, seven awards were developed for both junior and senior international educators engaged in a broad range of international activities.

Professional development

Outside the conference, the Professional Development Programme also expanded to cater for the need for new knowledge. Alongside the regional Bologna Process seminars, new training courses were developed in addition to the traditional EAIE courses in managing mobility, developing intercultural competences and running international offices. Training in Internationalisation at Home as well as marketing and recruitment was offered by the new Professional Sections and Special Interest Groups and held at multiple locations in Europe throughout the year. By 2008, the Professional Development Programme had reached the highest number of courses ever, and yet the EAIE was keen to attract even higher numbers. Following a survey amongst membership to identify the best training format, the decision was made in 2010 to launch the EAIE Academy in 2011. The Academy would offer a range of short training programmes over one week at a single university location and would be held twice a year, in the Spring and Autumn. The Academy would give greater focus to professional development and also offer more opportunity for networking and exchange at smaller locations. So far,


01

02


03

04

The EAIE Academy training courses in Valencia (01), Gothenburg (02), Porto (03), Birmingham (04)

the Academy has been held in Valencia (2011), Gothenburg (2012), Porto (2012) and Birmingham (2013) and has attracted participants from all over Europe – and surprisingly from other parts of the world as well – as international educators seek to hone their skills and improve their professional practice.

Public policy, research and dissemination

The EAIE also branched out into new publications. In addition to its membership magazine *Forum,* which underwent a complete overhaul in style and layout, the Association continued publishing the *Occasional Paper,* with 12 new volumes, bringing the overall total to 23. Many of these reflected the changes in the field and addressed topics such as the impact of tuition fees on student recruitment, strategic management of internationalisation, legal issues, measurement of success in internationalisation, the multinational university and international educators as agents of change. It also launched the *Professional Development Series,* which is a set of five manuals exploring basic skills for international education in topics such as managing an international office or running a summer school.

In 2011, the EAIE also became the editor of *Internationalisation of European Higher Education Handbook* published by Raabe in Germany. The handbook focuses on key

practical and operational issues of relevance to European higher education, placing them in the context of global developments and overarching policy processes, and facilitating the discussion on institutional goals of internationalisation and their implementation. It fills the gap between the EAIE professional manuals and the research-based, more scholarly *Journal of Studies in International Education*.

Although the research agenda at the EAIE is still relatively limited, its focus being much more on professional development, a new Special Interest Group *Researchers in International Education* (RIE) was founded in 2010 with the precise aim to create stronger links between research professional practices in internationalisation. It is currently building a community of practice for practitioner researchers in the field, in response to the growing number of international educators who are returning to studies either to complete a Master's or Doctoral degree as a means to enhance their knowledge and careers. It is hoped that the research done by these colleagues can further inform practice in international education.

Strategic partnerships

As international education associations grew in number across the world, the EAIE played a leading role in the development of the 'Network of International Education Associations' (NIEA). This is an association of non-profit, non-governmental international education associations from different countries and world regions who share a common mission for the advancement of the internationalisation of higher education. The network's principal activities are the exchange of information and dialogue, advocacy of international education, professional development, and discovery of new approaches to international education. One key development has been the contribution of key speakers from the different associations to the conference in providing updated and insider knowledge on international education trends in their countries and regions. Cooperation with sister organisations continued to flourish but underwent a process of revision as the EAIE sought to identify among its many partners those organisations that could build a strategic network, not only for the dissemination of information and practice but also for complementary activities and events. This has led to a less extensive but more dynamic list of organisations with whom the EAIE interacts.

Rethinking structures and processes

As is the case with many new organisations, growth can often be a bumpy ride and the EAIE has been no exception. Rapid expansion put the EAIE under increasing financial pressure and it became the key focus of the new Director, Alex Olde Kalter, when he was appointed in 2000.

Inevitably, difficult decisions had to be made, but once the financial crisis had been successfully overcome and the EAIE had a more secure base, it became possible to move beyond short-term pressures and decision-making to build the Association's future more strategically. The EAIE had become not only a much larger but also a much more complex organisation. Higher education and internationalisation were changing rapidly, and it was essential for the EAIE to undergo a similar transformation if it

were to remain relevant to its members. Change is not always an easy choice but the EAIE knew it could build on the lessons learnt during the early years of development. The key was to focus on the future, without becoming over protective of the past. While the leadership could not know what would lie ahead, it could identify a path of development for the Association and the role it should play. As was increasingly the case for its member institutions, the EAIE needed to develop the ability of long-term strategic thinking.

The first step was reaffirming its mission in three key articulations: the first and most important was identified as service to members, the second developing the professional field, and the third was promoting interests through a stronger involvement in issues of public policy. Until this point the third articulation has been the least developed but was now identified as increasingly important.

A lot of energy was spent in the second half of the decade on organisational reform, building the structures that would enable the EAIE to fulfil its mission in a changing world. While members experienced the renewed conference formats, they were inevitably less aware of what was going on behind the scenes in ensuring that the Association had strategic capacity and organisational structure to build its future. What they did see, however, was a new logo and house style, launched at the Trondheim conference in 2007, which marked the start of the reform process.

Organisational change is never pain free and inevitably produces disruption and resistance. However, if the EAIE was to become a more strategic organisation, able to anticipate rather than simply respond to external events, it required a structure that would facilitate proactive behaviour and strategic thinking.

Most people experience the EAIE as an annual conference only, but there is an Office (once known as the Secretariat) in Amsterdam that works extremely hard all year round to ensure the success of all EAIE events and provide membership services. The first step was re-organisation of the Office to make it more functional to the type of association that the EAIE was becoming. It now had almost 1800 members and over 3700 people attending its conference. It was developing stronger and more strategic links with sister organisations globally; its advice was being sought by other associations and higher education organisations in other world regions. Like universities, the EAIE had to think about how it wanted to profile and position itself in the new environment.

The next step was governance. There had been many alterations made to the statutes and by-laws of the EAIE over the years as it grew as an association. Now was the time for a full review and this led to radical changes in the way the EAIE is governed. These are not changes that happen overnight and the new governing structures were put in place over a number of years, with the process being completed in 2010. As is the case with all dynamic organisations, the process of change is an ongoing one and the EAIE has since begun a second process of revision that seeks to further enhance governance and restructure its Professional Sections and Special Interest Groups, who have key

responsibilities in designing the conference programme, to ensure they are relevant to the key issues driving the internationalisation agenda in the current environment. Nothing stands still for long these days.

Along with these major changes, many other aspects of the EAIE were overhauled. A new communication strategy was developed, both internally and externally, leading to greater functionality but also a refreshed image for the EAIE website and publications. Inevitably, there was greater use of technology, putting all election procedures online (no more postal ballots!) and creating a much more robust database that was able to manage the ever-growing conference and other activities.

With the arrival of the new Executive Director, Leonard Engel, in 2010, the office staff were re-organised into four key teams for the conference, professional development, finance and operations and marketing and communications. The financial administration was overhauled to ensure that financial information could make a key contribution to strategic decision-making alongside changes in the database – now the backbone of daily operations – and a broader range of communication technologies via the EAIE website.

2000 to 2010 in summary

The first decade of the 21st century was an exciting and dynamic time of change for the EAIE. The Bologna Process had put Europe centre stage and the EAIE took advantage of global interest in European higher education by promoting itself as a knowledge hub through its annual conference, regional seminars and training programmes.

External change leads to internal change in responsive organisations and the EAIE continued to renew its own structures and activities throughout the decade, driven by its desire to remain relevant to its membership by providing the best possible services.

The 22nd Annual EAIE Conference in 2010, Nantes, France

Having gone through a period of such dynamic transformation, will the next decade offer a chance for respite, or is the pace of change destined to accelerate? Will the EAIE see itself principally as an organisation that responds to that change, or one that can become a key agent in shaping the field of international education?

2010 ONWARDS: WHAT LIES AHEAD?

A new role for the EAIE?

Three years into the post-Bologna phase, the world has changed dramatically yet again. The decade that lies ahead of Europe is one of uncertainty, as it finds itself in the grips of a global economic crisis. The issues have become bigger, the climate tenser, and in some areas less cooperative. The European dream, which so greatly influenced the creation of the EAIE 25 years ago – as described by the 1991 EAIE President, Kjetil Flatin – is being seriously challenged. The emergence of European citizenship, a key objective in European programmes such as Erasmus, seems to be slipping further away into the distance.

The Bologna Process was undoubtedly the greatest higher education reform ever in Europe, bringing about unprecedented change. But by the time it drew to its conclusion, it had become apparent that it was already insufficient to provide adequate solutions to the challenges of the new and increasingly globalised environment.

It is an environment in which global competition for talent and knowledge becomes fiercer and the race to rise in the rankings and become globally positioned becomes more intense. When people or institutions compete for prestige, talent or income, there will not only be winners but also losers. Not all are in the same position to take advantage of the new environment, not all are willing to take the risk.

Higher education is operating today in a world that is struggling to overcome a global economic crisis, with far-reaching impact not only on funding policies but also student enrolment. It is not only the (in)ability to pay rising tuition fees that influences student choice, but also shifting demographics as some populations increase and others decline, creating new pressures on universities.

New providers of higher education emerge, challenging traditional university models. The rapid rise of private higher education, both non-profit and for-profit, has become a global phenomenon with 30% of the global student population in this sector. New forms of higher education appear, such as the latest explosion of MOOCs, currently hailed as the new game changer.

Many see only challenges and threats. However, in crisis there is always opportunity. Universities are expected to become key players in the global knowledge economy and internationalisation is identified as the key response to globalisation. This has radically altered the understanding of internationalisation in universities as it shifts from being

a marginal to mainstream activity, no longer located exclusively in the international offices but an integral part of university strategy. This requires significant re-thinking and each university must interpret what internationalisation means in the specific context of its own mission. Developments such as Internationalisation at Home and Internationalisation of the Curriculum, the increased focus on intercultural, international and global competences and learning outcomes of graduates and staff, the link between internationalisation and employability as well as citizenship, require new approaches and strategies and new ways of thinking with a shift from outputs to outcomes and impacts.

What will these many transformations mean for the EAIE and how should it respond in the next decade? As internationalisation shifts in role and scope in the universities, what impact will this have on the services that the EAIE provides? Will its target group diversify further as new professions emerge or will it see a return of more academics to the Association as they take on more key management roles in internationalisation? And how will the EAIE interpret these diverse needs?

Those who work in international education know of the good that it can bring, but is internationalisation still all 'motherhood and apple pie'? Or will the so-called darker sides of internationalisation generate tensions that will detract from the reasons that make international education worthwhile? Will we see more or less 'Europe' in the next decade? And how will its relations with other world regions develop?

The EAIE continues to innovate. However, is simply reviewing and modernising current structures and policies enough? The EAIE has always had a strong focus in providing services to membership and developing the professional field. Has the time come for the EAIE to develop its third articulation and become a strong voice for the field by advocating a powerful and positive role for internationalisation of higher education that not only enhances the academic experience but nurtures institutional vitality and capacity for response?

Inevitably, more change lies ahead as fundamental questions are asked about the roles and responsibilities of higher education, and consequently of the purpose and scope of internationalisation. To what extent does the EAIE see its role as one of responding to the environment as it emerges, or of becoming one of the pro-active players shaping the future of internationalisation? The answer to that question will set the path for its development in the next decade.

About THE AUTHORS

Hans de Wit is Director of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation at the Università Cattolica Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy, and Professor of Internationalisation of Higher Education at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, the Netherlands. He is Co-Editor of the *Journal of Studies in International Education* and has published several books and articles on internationalisation of higher education. He is a founding member and Past President of the EAIE, and currently Vice-Chair of the EAIE SIG *Researchers in International Education* (RIE). He received the EAIE Constance Meldrum Award in 2008.

Fiona Hunter is a higher education consultant who has worked in internationalisation of higher education for the last 20 years, and until recently was International Director at the Università Carlo Cattaneo, Italy. She is also a Past President of the EAIE and currently Vice-Chair of the EAIE SIG *Researchers in International Education* (RIE). Currently she is a member of the Editorial Board of the *Journal for Studies in International Education* and of the Scientific Committee of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation in Milan as well as Chair of the Board of Directors at Education Credential Evaluators Inc. in the US.

ESSAY 1

The internationalisation of higher education and research: European policies and institutional strategies

— Lesley Wilson

Lesley Wilson is Secretary General of the European University Association (EUA). Prior to this she held a number of senior positions such as Director of UNESCO's European Centre for Higher Education (UNESCO-CEPES) in Bucharest, Romania, Head of the Science Policy Unit at the European Science Foundation in Strasbourg, France and Director of the EC TEMPUS Office. In 1988, she joined the newly established Erasmus Bureau. In her different capacities she has been and is actively involved in internationalisation.

"Internationalisation is an increasingly important strategic priority not only for institutions but also for governments, which are increasingly aware of the importance of universities in supporting national and regional competitiveness. This throws up questions of expectations on both sides and potentially conflicting agendas."

The last 25 years have seen the development of significant support for European higher education cooperation and for the development of common research and innovation policies and programmes. Reform has been driven through European processes: the pan-European Bologna Process leading to the development of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), and the EU-led European Research Area, now enshrined in the Lisbon Treaty, as well as the European Commission's 'Modernisation Agenda' for universities. These policies have developed in a context characterised by growing rates of participation in higher education, the demands of increasingly knowledge-led economies and growing global competition.

These developments have also translated into policy change at a national level in areas such as external quality assurance, autonomy, funding and research policy, as captured in the several Bologna Trend reports over the past years. At the same time, the shape and size of many European higher education systems are changing in response to both external and internal competitive pressures, resulting in merger processes, national level 'excellence initiatives' and the introduction of a range of performance-based funding mechanisms.

Internationalisation today: its relevance for governments and institutions

The *Trends 2010* report states that, "Internationalisation has been identified by HEIs as the third most important change driver in the past three years and is expected to move to first place in the next five years". No clear picture emerged, though, as to whether this strategic approach would prevail over the more traditional form of 'bottom up' cooperation initiated by individual academics. While internationalisation affects all elements of the university mission, it is worth considering, from a European perspective, what this means in the context of the increased institutional differentiation taking place in Europe.

For research-intensive institutions, research and innovation are particularly strong drivers for internationalisation – also due to increased investment – often through competitive funding programmes at the national and European levels. The emphasis on promoting excellence and attracting the most talented graduate students and young researchers from around the world has been underpinned by major changes in doctoral education at European universities over the last decade, leading to the introduction of structured doctoral programmes and research or doctoral schools, which often become a focus for institutional internationalisation processes. There has also been an expansion in international research collaborations as universities address global research challenges through targeted international partnerships. Of course there is also a small number of universities that see themselves as true global players and promote this as their mission, although the number of such 'world-class universities' is limited, if only for reasons of costs and historical positioning.

At the same time, more and more universities, including those with only a limited scope of global engagement, are becoming more international; through changes in knowledge generation and dissemination, through the development of joint programmes, through staff research interests or in response to student expectations regarding mobility. The continual expected growth in the international student body is also seen as an opportunity for European universities in regions of demographic decline, or facing economic hardship and underfunding, even if increasing international student recruitment – with all the challenges this brings in terms of funding models and adaptation of services and student support – also puts pressure on institutions.

As demand grows, internationalisation is an increasingly important strategic priority not only for institutions but also for governments, which are increasingly aware of the importance of universities in supporting national and regional competitiveness. This throws up questions of expectations on both sides and potentially conflicting agendas as education comes to be viewed in some national contexts as an export commodity, with targets set for enrolments and incentives for attracting particular groups.

International strategic approaches are being elaborated on, not only at the institutional and national levels but also at the European level, with ongoing attempts to define the added value of joint action and specific European initiatives for both higher education and international research collaboration. This is challenging as each country has its own tradition and national external policy goals. Thus, building consensus around shared European objectives requires time and considerable effort.

Looking forward: opportunities and challenges for Europe and European universities

Looking to the future, there are opportunities for universities and for Europe to benefit from the further internationalisation of the higher education sector, but there are also challenges to be addressed. Internationalisation is taking many different forms, and many more institutions and countries are involved than in the past. At the same time, competition has grown, with international rankings focusing principally on the top research universities worldwide, signalling greater opportunities for international comparison. The example of Europe's Multirank project is interesting in this respect as it seeks to map and promote, also internationally, the different types of excellence

to be found in an increasingly diversified European higher education landscape. Here follow five key trends:

1. **Internationalisation will continue to assume different forms**
   There are ever more multinational providers, universities with campuses in different countries with different missions, and much discussion of global alliances. One such link is the partnership between the Universities of Warwick and Monash, which seek to provide global education for their graduates and jointly address world-relevant problems. Research intensive universities will surely continue to seek alliances in this way. One question for the future is perhaps the emergence of European global players, or global networks, and whether they should be recognised as such, and financed through European funds, as a means of promoting Europe and European universities; and if so, what would be the attributes of such global European institutions?

   Large numbers of European universities will nevertheless continue to principally serve the needs of their local communities in producing graduates with relevant skills and competences, and in supporting regional innovation while also continuing to strengthen their international outlook and engagement based on their specific strengths. One aspect of their international effort will consist of meeting European/international quality standards in their teaching and learning, and in the qualifications they award. Their regional role, coupled with an increasingly international approach and outlook, will be crucial not only for their local communities but also for the vibrancy of European higher education as a whole.

2. **Finding common ground**
   Given the trend in many developed countries to view the internationalisation of higher education as an important component of national trade policies, to generate significant resources for institutions and local economies, and attract talented individuals from around the world, greater efforts will need to be made to bridge the gap that exists both within Europe and between developed and developing countries. One can only hope that university leaders everywhere can be encouraged to reconcile their different perspectives at the institutional level, as advocated by IAU's 2012 paper *Affirming Academic Values in Internationalisation of Higher Education: A Call for Action,* so that future graduates will have both the knowledge base and the cultural and linguistic skills and competences that are required in today's competitive world, as well as a strong sense of social responsibility and commitment towards social justice globally and locally.

   In this context it is important to recall that the EU's *Europe 2020* agenda underlines the importance of the internationalisation of higher education, research and innovation for Europe's future growth and competitiveness. Hence the EU is both seeking to encourage young scientists to (re)turn to Europe and is making a major effort to consolidate the European Research Area, focusing on improvements in doctoral education and young researchers' careers, mobility and cross-border cooperation. This, in turn, requires further intra-European integration on key issues not yet resolved – such as pension rights – and will certainly be a major challenge for the coming decades.

3. **The role of information technologies and open access**
   All higher education institutions will have to be receptive towards globally produced learning and knowledge resources, as well as to have access not only to online research publications but also to global research data. Taking into account the constant evolution of information technologies and how they operate, changing the structure of knowledge availability and thus how learning and teaching are practiced and quality is assured in universities – as the ongoing discussion of the impact of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) demonstrates – will also be an important element of the debate on internationalisation in the years to come.

4. **The importance of global engagement**
   As the global pressure to develop knowledge societies accelerates, there is a risk that the gap between the developed and the developing countries will continue to widen. Brain drain, the large scale emigration of highly-skilled human capital, is a major concern to society at large, and for the higher education and research community. In spite of attempts to promote 'brain circulation', it will surely remain a major concern in the decades to come. Awareness needs to be raised of the importance of building a global research community that takes account of the situation, interests and needs of all partners involved. The potential for building such a global community is evident in relation to doctoral education, or in systematically addressing the grand challenges.

5. **The importance of strategic thinking**
   The rapid pace of change will – even more so than in the past – require universities of all sizes, types, strategic orientation and geographical orientation to consider their specific approaches, strategies and policies towards internationalisation. This will need to take account of the impact of various factors, particularly the emergence of new higher education models in other parts of the world that are focused on inclusion and access, leading to new institutional types: more virtual and online learning; different curricular provisions; a decoupling of education and research; and more engagement with the private sector. The pace of change is such that institutional leaders are facing a dramatically different landscape, which requires them to be more nimble, find new ways of integrating the local and international aspects of institutional missions and accept that the philosophical underpinnings of the Humboldtian model are evolving and not necessarily shared in other parts of the world.

In conclusion

The challenges faced by institutions are complex, interlinked and common, including: challenges of diversity (balancing home and international students); overseas operations that have to be set in different cultures and be sustainable in spite of high initial costs; developing partnerships (who to choose, what criteria, which networks or perhaps international mergers?); language policies (how to preserve linguistic identity and add to it); ensuring critical mass in research and dealing with intellectual property rights and publications; and the appropriate balance between research and education. Institutions are also faced with common questions: How to work within the framework of new government policies about international engagement? Are HEIs in the international arena to gain resources or are they committed to scholarly

and intercultural exchange? All these questions require answers in order to define how each institution views the global arena. They also require institutional leadership in setting an internationalisation strategy and achieving both external engagement and institutional buy-in. Brought down to the institutional level, the quest for global positioning must in all cases align with the fundamental purposes of higher education institutions and their specific profiles, and require a contextualised set of metrics to assess the quality of activities.

ESSAY 2

Strategically positioning the EHEA in a global world

— Ellen Hazelkorn

Ellen Hazelkorn is Vice President Research and Enterprise, Dean of the Graduate Research School and Head of the Higher Education Policy Research Unit (HEPRU) of the Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland. She works closely with the International Association of Universities (IAU), the European University Association (EUA), and is a consultant to the OECD. She is a member of the Higher Education Authority (Ireland), and is incoming President of the European Higher Education Society (EAIR). Professor Hazelkorn has published articles and books on Irish politics and society, and higher education policy.

"From today's vantage point, the Bologna Process has achieved great success. It has become a model of success for others. How can we build on these attributes?"

The quality of higher education has become a key determinant of reputation and status in a global market. With the onslaught of global rankings, the higher education world is becoming more competitive and multi-polar. While the US and Europe still dominate the upper echelons of global rankings, there is early evidence of a challenge to their position due to the investment strategies of some countries (most notably led by China), and the debilitating effect of the ongoing global economic crisis on others (most notably Ireland and southern Europe). This is leading, on the one hand, to a growing gap in 'world-classness', and, on the other, to the emergence of countervailing strategies to strengthen national and regional higher education and research systems.

Over the past decade, many governments have copied the *Chinese Project 211* (1995), which aimed to build up 100 top level universities to an international competitive level; that was followed by *Project 985* (1998), which had a more focused objective of developing 10 to 12 world-class universities able to compete with the best universities in the US and Europe. The German government launched the *Exzellenzinitiative* in 2005. Similar initiatives have been developed in the intervening years by Korea, India, Russia, Malaysia, Singapore, Vietnam, France, and Denmark, to name just a few. More recently, supranational regions, led by the MENA states, African Union, ASEAN countries and the European Union, have sought to devise strategies that directly link social and economic development with the performance and productivity of their respective higher education and research systems (Hazelkorn, 2013 forthcoming).

Across Europe, the Sorbonne Declaration, 1998, and subsequent Bologna Process, emerged as a voluntary arrangement of national governments. It was predicated on the free movement of students, faculty and workers across national boundaries, and anticipated the need for enhanced convergence across national systems in order to compete internationally. Focused on enhancing cooperation, the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué (2009) emphasised the necessity to "fully recognise the value of various missions of higher education, ranging from teaching and research to community services and engagement in social cohesion and cultural development". Today, there are 47 member states, and the Bologna Process has given way to the European

Higher Education Area (EHEA), launched in Vienna in 2010 and now firmly implanted as a key component of official EU strategy for economic competitiveness.

From today's vantage point, the Bologna Process has achieved great success: the introduction of the three cycle system (Bachelor/Master/Doctorate), quality assurance and recognition of qualifications and periods of study (Zgaga, 2012). Andree Sursock, Senior adviser at the EUA has suggested that we have "missed an opportunity ... to talk about what education is about" and to agree on a "coherent vision of what kind of educated citizens we need for the 21st century" (Morgan, 2010). Yet, for all these lapses, Bologna has been a model for others. Both the US and Australia have recognised the inherent significance not just in bringing coherence to otherwise disparate national systems, but in creating a system which makes European higher education unique and attractive internationally. How can we build on these attributes?

Bologna's big idea

According to Adelman (2009), Bologna's *big idea* is the "accountability loop", which begins with a qualification framework setting out a clear statement of what students must demonstrate to earn a "short-cycle" degree (comparable to an American associate's degree), a Bachelor's degree, a Master's degree, and a Doctoral degree. Rather than measuring inputs (*eg* credit hours or classroom teaching) (Laitinen, 2012), Bologna formalised the concept of learning outcomes, underpinned by "quality assurance systems, which set evaluation standards and guidelines for institutional self assessment and external monitoring, and the glue which links it to the student, the 'Tuning' project" (Corbet, 2009). Indiana, Minnesota, and Utah have begun road-testing the Tuning process while the US-based Lumina Foundation is piloting the *Degree Profile,* which, similar to a qualifications framework, will define the "learning that each degree should reflect, regardless of the major field of study" (Lumina Foundation, 2011). The Australian government has also initiated discussions on the significance of Bologna for Australia on the basis that it "is likely to influence developments in higher education in many parts of the world including our region" (DEST, 2011).

In a world gone global, the Bologna Process and EHEA provide the basis for a coherent educational roadmap for students and other stakeholders for what often appears to be a mystifying and fragmented landscape of higher education options. More importantly, the EHEA has the capability of strategically positioning Europe's higher education, capitalising on the benefits of a truly international experience. It presents an opportunity for a stronger European dimension in education during this era of globalisation, which can help improve the status and visibility of European higher education by synergising the educational capacities of EU member states.

What might this look like? Over the last decade, global rankings have purported to measure higher education quality, focusing on a limited set of attributes for which internationally comparable data is available. There has been much criticism of their "norming" effect and the choice of indicators, which do not measure what is meaningful in addition to ignoring the multi-dimensional attributes of European higher education (Hazelkorn, 2011).

The term 'total student experience' refers to *all* aspects of the engagement of students with higher education. Because it shapes future citizens, it is important to understand not only how higher education aids human capital capacity and capability but also how it enhances the ability of individuals to make choices, have control over their lives and contribute to society (Streeting, 2009; McInnis, 2003). Building on the seminal work of Chickering (1969, 1993) and the notion of "the whole student", it is now widely recognised that satisfaction with the wider student experience is intimately connected with enhancing student performance, including reduction in dropout rates and improving academic standards.

Rather than seeking to position Europe or individual institutions according to their place in the rankings, the EHEA offers a way to actively promote a genuinely international educational experience across diverse institutions, focused on learning outcomes and aided by structured mobility – all within a single framework. Erasmus/Erasmus Mundus and Marie Curie actions provide a small glimpse of what is possible. As Robertson notes (2010), it is a way of projecting European soft power globally, rather than conceptualising it simply as a European initiative. In this way, the EHEA could be synonymous with a quality mark, overcoming concerns of consumer protection by extending quality assurance, qualification recognition and accreditation to transnational or borderless education (Amaral, 2007; Knight, 2002, p13).

References

Adelman, C. (2009). *The Bologna Process for U.S. Eyes: Re-learning Higher Education in the Age of Convergence.* Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy. http://www.ihep.org/assets/files/EYESFINAL.pdf

Adelman, C. (2008). *Learning Accountability from Bologna: A Higher Education Policy Primer.* Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy. http://www.ihep.org/assets/files/publications/g-l/Learning_Accountability_from_Bologna.pdf

Amaral, A. (2007). Higher education and quality assessment. The many rationales for quality. In L. Bollaert, S. Brus, B. Curvale, L. Harvey, E. Helle, H. Toft Jensen, J. Komljenovič, A. Orphanides & A. Sursock (Eds.), *Embedding Quality Culture In Higher Education. A Selection of Papers from the 1st European Forum for Quality Assurance* (pp. 6–10). Brussels: EUA. http://www.eua.be/Libraries/EQAF_2010/EUA_QA_Forum_publication_1.sflb.ashx

Chickering, A. (1969, 1973). *Education and identity.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Corbett, A. (2009, April 16). A European view of the new Adelman report on the Bologna Process. Message posted to http://globalhighered.wordpress.com

DEST – Department of Education, Science and Training. (2006). *The Bologna Process and Australia: Next Steps.* Australia. Retrieved from http://www.ihep.org/assets/files/gcfp-files/Bologna_Process_Australia_Next_Steps.pdf

European Commission (2011). *The EU and the Bologna Process: shared goals, shared commitments, Supporting growth and jobs. An agenda for the modernisation of Europe's higher education systems.* COM (2011) 567 final, Brussels. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/education/higher-education/doc/bologna-goals_en.pdf

Hazelkorn, E. (2011). *Rankings and the Reshaping of Higher Education: The Battle for World Class Excellence.* UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hazelkorn, E. (2013 forthcoming). Striving for "World Class Excellence": Rankings and Emerging Societies. In D. Araya & P. Marber (Eds.), *Higher Education in the Global Age: Universities, Interconnections and Emerging Societies, Routledge Studies in Emerging Societies.* New York: Routledge.

Knight, J. (2002). *Trade in Higher Education Services: the Implications of GATS.* London: The Observatory on borderless higher education. http://www.unesco.org/education/studyingabroad/highlights/global_forum/gats_he/jk_trade_he_gats_implications.pdf

Laitinen, A. (2012). *Cracking the Credit Hour.* Wahsington, DC: New America Foundation. http://higheredwatch.newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/Cracking_the_Credit_Hour_Sept5_0.pdf

Lumina Foundation. (2011). *The Degree Qualifications Profile.* Indianapolis: Lumina Foundation. http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf

McInnis, C. (2003, August 24–27). New Realities of the Student Experience: How should universities respond? Keynote at 25th Annual Forum, European Association for Institutional Research, Limerick.

Morgan, J. (2010, March 18). Process Report – Bologna lacks coherent Europe-wide focus. Times Higher Education. Retrieved November 27, 2012 from http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk

Robertson, S.L. (2010). The EU, 'regulatory state regionalism' and new modes of higher education governance. In *Globalisation, Societies and Education,* Volume 8, Number 1, (pp. 23–37).

Streeting, W. (2009). Quoted in "Higher education and the student experience", House of Commons Seminar, 21 April, 2009, HEPI. Retrieved October 29, 2010 from http://www.hepi.ac.uk/files/Highereducationandthestudentexperience.pdf

Zgaga, P. (2012). Reconsidering the EHEA Principles: Is there a 'Bologna Philisophy'? In A. Curaj, P. Scott, L. Vlasceanu & L. Wilson (Eds.), *European Higher Education at the Crossroads. Between the Bologna Process and National Reforms* (pp.17–38) Part 1. Dordrecht: Springer.

ESSAY 3

The need for more emphasis on intra-organisational dynamics in strategic management of internationalisation

— Jeroen Huisman

Jeroen Huisman is Odysseus Professor of Higher Education Governance, Ghent University, Belgium. His research interests include the impact of the change from governments to governance in higher education, inertia and diversity in higher education, institutional management and governance, and internationalisation and Europeanisation. He has published widely on these topics. He is Editor of *Higher Education Policy* and an editorial board member of *Tertiary Education and Management*, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *European Journal of Higher Education*, and *Educational Researcher*.

"The internal organisational dynamics of strategising internationalisation is insufficiently addressed in the current academic literature, preventing a balanced insight into which strategies work, and which do not."

This contribution is inspired by the provocative claims of Brandenburg and de Wit (2010) and Knight (2011a). Brandenburg and de Wit proclaim the end of internationalisation. Well, not really …. But their point is that with the mainstreaming of internationalisation – on governments' and higher education institutions' agenda everywhere and with the emphasis on form instead of substance – many are lured to confuse internationalisation as an instrument with internationalisation as an objective in itself. Through increasing attention for internationalisation input and output, particularly in the quantitative sense (number of international students, number of partnerships), we are at serious risk of forgetting to think through how internationalisation can – as an instrument – contribute to the improvement of education. Coming from a slightly different angle, but basically sending the same message, Knight (2011a) presents five myths about internationalisation. Most of these also relate to confusing ends with means or taking internationalisation outputs or inputs as proxies for quality.

Whereas one could be tempted to qualify the concerns as being internationalisation's identity crisis (Knight, 2011b) or its unavoidable side-effects, there is obviously a serious undercurrent of concern. In this contribution I will focus in particular on the internal organisational dynamics of strategising internationalisation. I think this topic is insufficiently addressed in the current academic literature. It appears that it is not only institutional leaders and managers who may be tempted to focus on the outside world, but also researchers tend to (over)emphasise this. For sure, the myriad of environmental changes are worthy of analysis and it may be easier to gather relevant data on this (as opposed to getting access to internal actors about their motivations and strategic decisions), but only by focusing on the external *and* internal organisational challenges will we have balanced insight into which strategies work and which do not, and which factors affect success, or the lack thereof.

Environmental changes as drivers

Many academic contributions to the debate on internationalisation in higher education include claims that we are going through turbulent times, and that we are confronted with numerous challenges related to globalisation,

information technology, the changing nature of research, marketisation, competition, *etc.* True, the macro-developments do affect higher education institutions and systems to a considerable extent, and whereas the attention to the environment and how it might impact the higher education fabric and individual higher education institutions is fully justified and necessary, it appears that only watching trends and placing an emphasis on the system and higher education institution outputs (rankings!) is a limited and actually dangerous perspective. Limited, for we only see half of the story, and dangerous, for we cannot get a full picture of the link between internal deliberations and decisions and the outcomes. Hence we have limited insight into which strategies could be successful and which barriers possibly limit their success.

Internal challenges?

It is interesting to note that the key word 'strategy' hardly ever appears in titles and abstracts of papers in the *Journal of Studies in International Education* (JSIE). Taylor (2004) analyses strategies of four universities and presents interesting findings on the motivations of these universities for such strategies. Stressing that "the international strategy must be concerned with internal university arrangements, not simply the external environment" (p. 152), he touches upon the point I try to make, but his focus is still very much on the accomplished strategic plans and not the – equally interesting – preceding negotiations and discussions that led to the plans. Likewise, Childress' (2009) paper is an important contribution but also focuses on plans (as in internationalisation documents). Walters and Adams (2001) come close to elements of internal strategising in their paper on the emergence of a new business model, based on supply chains and value creation, for Australian universities.

Remarkably, the internal strategic management challenges are hardly addressed in the literature. Bartell (2003) is probably is a good example of an exception as well as the pioneering works by Knight (1994), de Wit (2002) and Davies (1992), which do address planning cycles for internationalisation. And possibly I have missed a couple of other good examples. But it does not take away my concern about a neglect of the inner workings and the micro-dynamics of strategic management. Paradoxically, in the more general literature on organisational change and adaptation, there is an abundance of attention given to the inner workings of higher education institutions (see *eg* Clark, 1998; Toma, 2010).

Synthesis: the best of both worlds

Again, knowing and understanding what is happening in the complex environment of higher education is necessary. Learning what the expectations are of future home and international students, living up to the expectations of global businesses and industry, as well as meeting governmental internationalisation objectives are key. But this must be matched with in-depth analyses of the internal organisational dynamics, cultures, capacities, and institutional strengths and weaknesses. Crucial questions are, for example: How do organisations deal with risk and reward? How do organisations deal with the – often – diverging needs and demands of various stakeholders? How do organisations decide on internationalisation priorities? How does the organisation deal with the different internal cultures in preparing, developing and implementing its strategies? How is internationalisation seamlessly integrated in the organisation's planning processes? The internal elements and dynamics may be more difficult to investigate (*eg* strategic sensitivity), but are very much

needed to enable us to learn from the investigations, even if they show us the darker sides of internationalisation: the power games, the difficulties of getting a strategy in place that pleases all internal stakeholders, and the problems of matching short- and long-term objectives.

If we were to apply a sound balance to our research activities by focusing on both the external and internal dynamics, we would be much more able to come up with reflections and recommendations on what works (and what does not) in strategising internationalisation, which might help to overcome the problems and concerns referred to in the introduction.

References

Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalisation of universities: A university culture-based framework. In *Higher Education,* Volume 45, Number 1, (pp. 43–70).

Brandenburg, U., & Wit, H. (2010, Winter). The end of internationalisation. *EAIE Forum,* (pp. 30–33).

Childress, L.K. (2009). Internationalization plans for higher education institutions. In *Journal of Studies in Internationalisation,* Volume 13, Number 3, (pp. 289–309).

Clark, B.R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Davies, J.L. (1992). Developing a strategy for internationalisation in universities: Towards a conceptual framework. In C. Klasek (Ed.), *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education.* Carbondale: AIEA.

De Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Knight, J. (1994). *Internationalization: Elements and checkpoints.* Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education, (pp. 177–190).

Knight, J. (2011a). Five myths about internationalisation. In *International Focus,* Number 67, (pp. 1–2).

Knight, J. (2011b). Is internationalisation having an identity crisis. In *IMHE Info,* August 2011, (p. 1).

Taylor, J. (2004). Toward a strategy for internationalisation: Lessons and practice from four universities. In *Journal of Studies in International Education,* Volume 8, Number 2, (pp. 149–171).

Toma, J.D. (2010). *Building organizational capacity.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Walters, D., & Adams, T. (2001). Global reach through a strategic operations approach: An Australian case study. In *Journal of Studies in International Education,* Volume 5, Number 4, (pp. 269–290).

ESSAY 4

Why the university as we know it will still be here in 25 years

— Eric Beerkens

Eric Beerkens is Senior Advisor for International Affairs at Leiden University in the Netherlands. Prior to this, Eric was Head of Studies and Senior Researcher at the Netherlands Organisation for International Cooperation in Higher Education (NUFFIC) and from 2005 to 2008, he held a postdoctoral fellowship at the University of Sydney in Australia. Before that, he was a researcher at the Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS) in the Netherlands, where he also earned his PhD degree (*cum laude*).

"Predictions that the old model of the contemporary university is coming to an end show both a lack of knowledge about the contemporary landscape of higher education as well as a lack of historical understanding of the development of universities."

Although the global apocalypse did not occur on 21 December 2012, the year 2012 was full of apocalyptic headlines about the end of the university as we know it. Three main drivers have been and still are fuelling these predictions: the world-wide massification of higher education, the increasing use of information and communication technology (ICT) in teaching and the delivery of education, and the ongoing globalisation of higher education. These developments will make the traditional university obsolete in 2038. At least, that's what some want us to believe.

The massification of higher education worldwide – even more than the massification in Western Europe, the US and Japan in the post-war period – demands new and more efficient types of delivery. The acceleration in the demand for higher education, especially in China and other parts of South and East Asia, has made it nearly impossible for governments to respond to this demand. This increase in demand, together with the decreased funding due to the financial crisis, has put pressure on traditional modes of university education. Innovations in ICT have expanded the possibilities to deliver education and have led to new teaching instruments. The advent of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) in 2012 combined new technologies in order to reach a massive audience. These developments are intensified through the ongoing globalisation of higher education. Because of the globalisation process, opportunities of where to study have increased, ranging from attending universities abroad to attending online courses.

The concept of 'the university' is gone

The conjunction of these developments has led many to believe that the centuries-old model of the contemporary university is coming to an end. If we believe them, the higher education landscape of 2038 will be completely different from the current one. I would argue that these predictions show both a lack of knowledge about the contemporary landscape of higher education as well as a lack of historical understanding of the development of universities. And, on a side note, often the proclaimers of these drastic changes are lending you their helping hand to find the right path in this turbulent world.

The time when the concept of 'the university' was clear-cut, referring to a single organisational and educational model, has long been gone. Especially since the massification of higher education in the post-war period, this single model has been accompanied by a wide variety of other higher education institutions. More vocationally oriented institutions were established, such as community colleges, *fachhochschulen, hogescholen, etc.* Very large distance-education institutions emerged in many western countries and beyond. What's more, when the organisational boundaries of the traditional university were reached, new activities and new organisations appeared. One thing's for sure: in not one country in the world is the traditional university model representative for the entire higher education system anymore.

But even if the proclaimers of the end of the university are only referring to the traditional model (whatever that is), they will be proven wrong in 2038, and far after that. The traditional university has been one of the most enduring institutions in the modern world. Granted, university research and university teaching have adapted constantly to changes in the economy and to society. This process of adaptation might be too slow according to many, but it is a constant process in the university. Despite this continuous change and adaptation, the model of the university as we know it has changed very little.

The organisation of faculties, schools and departments around disciplines, accountability in the form of peer review, comparable tenure and promotion systems, the connection between education and research, the responsibility of academic staff in both education and research and both graduate and undergraduate education, the primacy of face-to-face instruction, *etc;* these are all characteristics that can be found in universities throughout the world and which have existed for many, many decades – if not centuries. My bet is they will still be there in 2038. It would be rather naive to think that a financial crisis or even a new type of delivery (like MOOCs) will profoundly change these enduring structures and beliefs.

The university DNA

In the words of Clayton Christensen and Henry Eyring (2011), we are talking about the DNA of the university, and that this does not change easily. They argue that the university DNA is not only similar across institutions, it is also highly stable, having evolved over hundreds of years. Replication of the DNA occurs continuously, as each retiring employee or graduating student is replaced by someone screened against the same criteria applied to his or her predecessor. The way things are done is determined not by individual preference but by institutional procedure, written into the genetic code.

New technologies will enable new forms of education and delivery. In the coming 25 years, we will see the emergence of new institutions focusing on specific target groups and we will witness traditional institutions employing these new technologies. But will this make the university as we know it obsolete? No, it will not, because the function of the university as we know it is much more comprehensive than 'just' the production and transfer of knowledge. Students attend universities not simply to 'consume' knowledge in the form of a collection of courses. They go there for an academic experience; they go there for a degree that will provide them with an entry ticket to the labour market and which will give them a certain status.

Does the fact that I do not see any substantial changes in 2038 mean that there should be none? The fact that structures and beliefs endure does not always mean they still serve the functions they used to. This is also the case with many of the traditional structures and beliefs in the university. Holding on to these practices is not an end in itself. At least, it shouldn't be. Yet, in making policy *and* in making predictions, it is good to take into account the stabilising character of these structures and beliefs.

25 years from now

Because of the university DNA, there is rarely a revolution of the type so frequently predicted by politics, business and consultants. In addition to the major source of universities' value to a fickle, fad-prone society, the university's steadiness is also why one cannot make it more responsive to modern economic and social realities merely by regulating its behaviour (Christensen and Eyring, 2011). A university cannot be made more efficient by simply cutting its operating budget, nor can universities be made by legislative fiat to perform functions for which they are not expressly designed. Again an argument why the university as we know it will still be there in 2038!

Many say the best way to predict the situation in 25 years is to look back 25 years and see what has changed since then. I was first introduced to university life 25 years ago, in what you could call a traditional university. In the past 25 years I have studied and worked at four universities in and outside the Netherlands. At the time of writing, I work at Leiden University, another traditional university. Comparing the university of 1988 with the university of 2013, it is remarkable how little these organisations have changed. Of course the university has adapted to societal, political and economic changes, but in its core the traditional university has remained very much the same. I can safely say that the DNA of the traditional university has not changed in the past 25 years and I can safely predict that it won't change in the coming 25 years. And essentially, that is a good thing!

Reference

Christensen, C., & Eyring, H. (2011). *The Innovative University: Changing the DNA of Higher Education from the Inside Out.* San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

ESSAY 5

We are becoming more global

— Simon Marginson

Simon Marginson is Professor of Higher Education in the Centre for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Melbourne, Australia. Simon Marginson specialises primarily in higher education and comparative and international education. He is Editor-in-chief of the *Journal of Higher Education*, jointly with Finland's Jussi Valimaa, and is an editorial advisory board member of the *Journal of Studies in International Education*. He has published many books and articles on international higher education.

"In higher education and knowledge we can detect a continuing long-term trend to global convergence and integration. This long-term trend will increasingly shape not just international education but the national systems that are joined together."

Globalisation is commonplace. Mobility across national borders moved long ago from the margins of modern societies to the centre. Yet as the term 'inter-national' suggests, international education still plays out largely between separated sovereign nations. We are not one single world society or polity, and there are no signs that this is going to happen. With the present troubles that have beset European governance and financial management, the day we transcend the nation state seems to be moving not closer, but further away.

Nevertheless, I want to suggest that in higher education and knowledge we can detect a continuing long-term trend to global convergence and integration. The spirit of the 1990s is unabated. This long-term trend will increasingly shape not just international education but the national systems that are joined together.

Consider: what have been the major developments affecting national education systems in the last decade or so? I suggest there are four such developments. And all are changes that are occurring at the global level, through global comparisons, or global systems, or shifts in the global balance of power in education and science.

1. The growing impact on policy and practice in secondary schooling, due to the OECD's PISA assessments of the educational achievement of 15-year-olds

This has become perhaps the principal performance indicator for school-level education bureaucrats and ministers. Not all countries are focused on lifting their Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) scores, but many are. Some such as South Korea have implemented major programmes focused specifically on lifting reading, science or mathematics achievement. There is intense international interest in systems such as those used in Finland, Korea and Shanghai, which are doing especially well in the PISA. This has led to a spate of policy borrowing.

2. The rise of university rankings, especially research rankings

Global university rankings were a minor news item when the first Shanghai Jiao Tong University top 500 league table was issued in 2003. They have grown in importance by leaps and bounds and are now installed on the front page in many countries. Research, especially by Ellen Hazelkorn, persistently shows that despite the shortcomings of this form of cross-border comparison, rankings are highly influential with families and students when deciding on international education. They also affect the esteem (and often the revenue) given to universities by governments, industry and philanthropy, and shape patterns in the cross-border movements of academic faculty. Global rankings inexorably push governments and universities alike towards the model of the comprehensive Anglo-American science university, which makes up the ranking template. They drive mergers designed to secure critical mass and offshore recruitment designed to lift citation rates. University ranking has become perhaps the chief performance indicator for ministers of higher education, and university presidents, rectors and vice-chancellors.

3. The advent of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) in September 2011 at Stanford University

Through the for-profit corporations Coursera and Udacity at Stanford, and Ed-X run by MIT and Harvard, MOOC offerings and enrolments have grown extraordinarily rapidly. It is already apparent that MOOCs are a major game-changer in worldwide higher education. MOOCs have taken off because they are high quality programmes from global brand universities that feature leading world experts, students' work is assessed using multiple choice online software, and the minority of students who complete the programme successfully receive a certificate. MOOCs also provide scope for social networking between students. As a free platform with user navigated content and social interaction they are perfectly attuned to the web, unlike other online prototypes that tend to replicate the bricks and mortar university in a virtual form. As free programmes from prestigious universities, they are an attractive alternative to any programme in any mode that charges tuition fees. MOOCs are already recognised by many leading universities, though the extent of recognition among employers is as yet unclear. MOOCs might substitute for existing international education on a large scale. It is more certain that MOOCs will be introduced alongside conventional delivery in existing institutions. Either way, they promise to radically reduce the average cost of teaching, lower the number of academic faculty in many countries, and weaken the position of universities that are prestigious at national level but left in the shade by the global giants. MOOCs also promise to increase the power and authority of the leading US universities on a global scale.

4. The growing weight of higher education and science in East Asia and Singapore

There used to be two major zones in worldwide higher education and science: North America, primarily the US and Canada; and Western Europe, including the UK. Now there are three such zones. Already the Post-Confucian systems in East Asia – China, Hong Kong SAR, Taiwan, South Korea and of course Japan – invest as much in research and development as does the whole of Europe. The output of published journal papers is growing by 17% per year in China and already their total output is almost half the level of the US. Quality (as measured by citation rates) lags behind quantity of output, but is improving rapidly. Already China produces more than 10%

of the world's most cited top 1% papers in both Engineering and Chemistry. Science output in Korea, Singapore and Taiwan is also growing rapidly. World-class universities are advancing in all these systems. The National University of Singapore has a scientific output that, of quantity and quality alike, is competitive with the best western European universities. These outputs reflect the investments of the past 5–10 years and, given that funding of the leading universities continues to increase, we can be certain that the rise of Asian science will continue. In turn, this ensures that universities in the East will attract ever more talent from all over the world. In a radical transformation of the Atlantic and European domination of the last three centuries, much of the world's knowledge will come from East Asia, in future. And with power in economy and science comes power in politics and culture. The rise of higher education in East Asia and Singapore, amid dynamic modernising economies, is leading to a more plural world in which the cultural mix will be more diverse. MOOCs assert American domination, but this process of pluralisation is working in the opposite direction.

While national education systems will remain intact, they will be increasingly influenced by these profound global changes: comparisons of performance at the school level, global rankings of universities, free cross-border delivery of high quality programmes at the university level, and the global role of Post-Confucian science and culture. All but the last tend to homogenise the world either along the lines of a single global system, or closely related units within a single system. The rise of Asia brings a welcome opportunity for mutual learning across all borders, while at the same time that diversity will become folded into common education networks and a common world society. These are exciting global times; the next 25 years will be more exciting still, and international education is right at the forefront of momentous human developments.

ESSAY 6

Future trends in international education

— Peter Scott

Peter Scott is Professor of Higher Education Studies at the Institute of Education, in the UK. Prior to that he was Vice Chancellor of Kingston University, UK; Pro Vice Chancellor for external affairs, Professor of Education and Director of the centre for policy studies in education at the University of Leeds, UK; and for 16 years, Editor of the *Times Higher Education Supplement*. He has published several books and articles about international higher education and globalisation in higher education.

"Under the impact of accelerating globalisation, the world could become a radically different place; a new paradigm of international education might emerge that is both more threatening and more hopeful."

There are two narratives about the future of international education. The first is the 'market' narrative – in other words, a continuation and intensification of the drive towards regarding international education as commerce in 'knowledge goods' within the global economy. The second narrative is more subtle, containing elements of markets and competition but also embracing other elements such as the (backward-looking?) claims of institutional autonomy, academic solidarity, disinterested science and social development, and also the (forward-looking?) challenges of global equity and environmental sustainability.

These two narratives can also be aligned with standard and alternative paradigms of international education. The standard paradigm is characterised by familiar trends such as the dominance of international education by a small number of major players led by the US, a 'free' market heavily biased in favour of these players, an emphasis on the recruitment of international students (and, to a lesser extent, international staff) by these major players so perpetuating the uneven and imbalanced global flows and the preponderance of physical mobility.

The alternative paradigm has other characteristics – the drift not simply from a unipolar world (the 'old world' of the North Atlantic and its Antipodean outliers) to a bipolar world (this 'old world' and the 'new world' of East and South Asia) but also to a multipolar world (potentially embracing all continents), the growth of regional blocs (like the European Higher Education Area), the rise of virtual mobility and a growing recognition of the interdependencies between international education and other aspects of globalisation (world cultures – and world crises).

Trend lines

The standard paradigm relies, above all, on the extrapolation of existing trends. The most significant is sustained growth. There are now 3.7 million international students; 75% more than there were in 2000 and an impressive 350% more than there were in 1975. Of course, this pattern of apparently irresistible growth has to be qualified in a number of ways.

First, leaving aside the difficulty of counting international students because different countries have different definitions; global higher education is a very complex, and highly differentiated, category. It includes everything from relatively short study visits (not, admittedly, the very shortest) to long-term, even permanent, migration. Some substantial flows are comparatively local, reflecting imbalances of provision between neighbouring countries. So this omnibus category needs to be unpacked. Some parts will grow rapidly; others more slowly; and some may even contract.

Secondly, impressive as the growth in global higher education has been in the past quarter century, it has actually been less than in higher education as a whole, *ie* domestic as well as international. This suggests that what has powered global growth has been one aspect of the, largely domestic, phenomenon of the development of mass higher education systems – or, at any rate, that the same forces that have been working to drive demand for international education are essentially the same forces that have been driving growth at home. In other words, the expansion of global higher education is not a separate phenomenon, driven independently by the rise of a unique global market place.

So growth on the impressive scale of the past cannot be taken absolutely for granted. Overall there could be a slowing of demand. There are certain to be highly differential growth rates leading to interesting changes in the existing 'pecking order' in international education. At present, the top players, as measured by the number of international students enrolled in their universities, are the US, followed by the UK and then Australia, Germany, France and Canada. Taken together, these five countries account for more than half of all international student recruitment. The rise of China, India, Malaysia, Singapore and others as major 'importers' rather than 'exporters' of international students have been frequently signalled – and with good reason.

But, even if growth in the international education market proves to be less impressive than currently expected, the standard paradigm still seems likely to hold. Although the North Atlantic world may no longer dominate the global pecking order as decisively as in the past, its countries still retain formidable advantages – for example, open societies, sophisticated economies and Anglophone (or 'Globlish') cultures. And, because its countries include not only open societies but also market societies, it will be able to use innovative strategies (often in partnership with the commercial sector) to maintain its position in the pecking order – in transnational education, leveraging its powerful brands and building global alliances of elite universities.

Of course, there will be some important shifts. The most important will be the increasing prominence of universities from Malaysia and Singapore – and, a little bit later, China and India. This East and South Asian challenge to the Atlanticist *status quo* will be strong. But perhaps this challenge will be accommodated rather than resisted because key partnerships will be formed between universities in these two centres of global higher education, the established and the emergent. The rest of the world will be still be (almost) nowhere. The Middle East, despite the academic pleasure palaces being constructed in the Gulf, can probably be discounted as a powerful player in international education because of the absence of the necessary social and cultural conditions to promote sustainable development of global higher education. There may be exceptions. Perhaps Turkey may develop as a powerful regional player as it rebuilds links into central Asia.

But the essential picture will still be recognisable. The global pecking order will still be familiar – and restricted to particular regions (the 'old world' of the West, and the 'new world' of East and South Asia). A small number of countries will still dominate the 'trade' in international students – conferring on them substantial advantages in terms of world-class science because of their worldwide recruitment of PhD students, postdoctoral students and younger researchers. Whole continents will continue to be sucked dry in terms of their high-skilled human and scientific capital.

New paradigms?

However, the future will not necessarily be an extrapolation of present trends. There are two reasons for believing that this might be the case. The first is that, under the impact of accelerating globalisation, the world could become a radically different place; and the second is that a new paradigm of international education might emerge that is both more threatening and more hopeful.

A new world order?

Will there still be a common global framework based on a geo-political order in which the US continues to be, as it has been since the collapse of the Soviet Union, the only global super-power – and rooted in trade liberalisation and global markets, especially in finance and banking? This is the framework within which current notions of international education have been developed. But there are other possibilities.

One is that the US and the European heartland continue their slow and gradual, but inexorable, comparative economic decline – and that these regions will then have to struggle to maintain the world's scientific base as their economies decline (and their leading role in international education).

A second is that the emergent economic powers – notably China and India – fail to replace the old heartland; the former because the tensions between an increasingly ruthless free-market economy and a totalitarian political order become unbearable (and even explode); the latter because the co-existence of increasing wealth and extreme poverty become increasingly difficult to manage.

A third is that the unified world economy will increasingly be challenged by protectionism, fears of immigration, and the demoralising effect of the moral (and maybe actual) collapse of global institutions (especially banks and multi-national corporations). Also challenged could be the idea of secular, multi-cultural civilisation rooted in so-called 'Enlightenment' values of liberty, equality and individual self-realisation.

A fourth is that the impact of environmental stress may lead to far-reaching changes – not simply curbing economic growth with all its social consequences without producing a new and more sustainable equilibrium, but maybe provoking new regional and even global conflicts.

The implications of an unstable geo-political world order and a disordered global environment on international higher education are difficult to predict. But it is hard to imagine that things would go on as before. At the very least student flows could be dammed – or diverted into new channels. Metropolitan heartlands might lose their appeal. New regional exchanges, and collaborative partnerships, might emerge in Africa or Latin America.

Global higher education

The second driver of a new paradigm of international education could be the transformation of global higher education itself. Conventionally that transformation is described in terms of changes that are relatively easy to predict, such as the increasing impact of information technology or the drift towards cost-sharing. In the case of international education, the focus has often been on essentially tactical responses to shifts in student demand (for example, more in-country provision with more limited forms of progression involving physical relocation); or the growth of partnerships between universities and commercial operators.

But it is possible that there will be more radical transformations. For example, the current balance of power in international education, with its existing centre of gravity in the North Atlantic world and its emerging centre of gravity in East Asia and other world regions, might be overturned. Maybe Africa, by any standards already a much less troubled region than the Middle East and with sound academic traditions, might overcome its current dependencies. Latin America, and the wider Luso-Hispanic world, are possible centres of dynamism in international education.

A second example might be that the current patterns of international student flows – still dominated by direct or indirect forms of student recruitment – will have been categorically displaced by new patterns of global engagement that are, genuinely, based on networks, collaboration and partnerships. Branch campuses might cease to be 'branch' campuses, and become campuses in their own right. Maybe new forms of global higher education networks will coalesce around truly global concerns – cultural diversity, the environment, social movements opposed to war and poverty.

A third, even more radical example could be that 'education' will cease to be a discrete category, rooted in recognisable institutions, processes and values. Viewed negatively, international higher education might be categorically absorbed into the global 'info-tainment' industry. More Apple and less Harvard. Viewed more positively, it could mean that international higher education might be one component in a complex web of wider global exchanges. The talk today is of 'clever cities' – those creative milieux where science and education, social and cultural experimentation and innovation and enterprise flourish together – and the 'race to the top'; in future the talk may be of a 'clever world' and 'united we stand, divided we fall'. A new global moral economy may emerge out of the debris of world conflicts, economic crises and brand/celebrity culture. International education would not only be powerfully influenced by such an economy; it could also be one of its sources.

ESSAY 7

From the New World

— Jo Ritzen

Jo Ritzen is Professorial Fellow International Economics of Science, Technology and Higher Education at UNU-MERIT and Maastricht Graduate School of Governance, the Netherlands. He was Dutch Minister for Education and Science, Special Adviser to the Human Development Network of the World Bank, Vice President of the World Bank's Development Economics Department, and Vice President of the World Bank's Human Development Network. Then he became President of Maastricht University, the Netherlands and is now the driving force behind 'Empower European Universities' (EEU), an NGO that aims to ramp up innovation and internationalisation at universities and research institutions across Europe.

"Internationalisation will become more and more central in universities as a means for students to develop an international attitude, to develop cultural sensitivity and to become in that way more productive as well as better citizens. This is internationalisation of the mind, which will be linked to mobility at the end with passion and pleasure (allegro con fuoco)."

I focus on this subject – borrowing the title from Dvorak's 9th Symphony – by first looking forward at the world in 2038, realising quite well that in that year, people will read this and have a good laugh: "Listen, this is what they thought back in the old days that life would be like today!" My second topic is the evolution as I see it in higher education in the next 25 years, prompted by the thorough changes that have taken place on the labour market. I need this in order to position internationalisation in the evolution (which may have revolutionary traits) of university education.

Internationalisation will become more and more central in universities as a means for students to develop an international attitude, to develop cultural sensitivity and to become in that way more productive as well as better citizens. This is internationalisation of the mind, which will be linked to mobility at the end with passion and pleasure (*allegro con fuoco*). These are mere sketches without any attempt to be complete, let alone exhaustive.

The New World in 2038

Dvorak's 9th symphony starts with a very soft, almost inaudible adagio. This is in agreement with my modesty in claiming to have a good idea of the world in 2038. In 2000, many of us looked back on the Future Studies in the 1960s and 1970s. What I take as lessons from this journey 'back to the future' is, first of all, that the world does not develop linearly and according to certain set rules. Rather it is highly unpredictable.

We learned that technological development as well as globalisation of financial and product markets have their own course. They are likely to continue to dominate life on this planet. I expect that ecological crises are going to make their impact felt in forcing more and more greening of the economy, with implications for physical mobility. I expect long distance (air) travel to become more and more expensive as we run out of oil, despite new techniques, such

as fracking. ICT will be even more pervasive and will – in combination with less use of non-replaceable resources and more intensive communication – be overwhelmingly present in all aspects of life, including education.

Internationalisation of the mind, as a way to understand cultural differences and to communicate across cultural divides, will be in demand more than ever. Internationalisation on the move might well be under pressure due to the likely increased costs of (air) travel. Virtual movement with ICT may well overtake physical movement.

An anticipated higher education

The world needs a new innovation boost and will have it (says the optimist). It is likely that we will only have sustained economic growth on a level of 2% per year if in the years to come our new graduates are increasingly more entrepreneurial or 'intrapreneurial' (working as entrepreneurs within existing firms), and boost innovation within a setting of the greening of the industry.

Higher education has been recognised before (through research activities) as a major source of innovation (Verspagen, 2006), but hardly from the perspective of what is required from the graduate to succeed as an entrepreneur or an intrapreneur in the first four decades of the 21st century.

More and more, high quality education will be associated with added value: how much students have been able to increase their competences through learning in higher education. Entrepreneurship and innovation will be even more international than today in terms of those who produce and the markets they produce for. Clearly, among the traits that graduates miss is the ability to be highly productive on the international labour market, where Borghans and Ritzen (2006) show that 80% of the graduates of 1995 to be working.

Universities used to think primarily in terms of cognitive achievement while 'talent development' could be understood to also encompass the attitudinal talents, which are important in order to function well in society. Some of these attitudes refer to endurance, perseverance, team work *etc,* while others are in the field of 'cultural sensitivity' (Vande Berg, 2012), or in terms of social responsibility and civic engagement (Branson, 1998).

Higher education needs to reinvent itself and focus on the outputs in student learning that expand the capacities of graduates to be productive in this world where innovation needs a boost. At present, higher education still operates by and large in the dark. Its present focus is mainly on hard skills or a subset thereof, namely reproductive knowledge (without the associated problem-solving ability), ignoring the feedback from their graduates, whether in the form of informal feedback or organised feedback, by institutions of higher learning or in projects, like CHEERS, Hegesco and Reflex (see their websites on these surveys).

Higher education needs to free itself from the bounds of being nationally embedded and follow the call of the present youth, who are the children of globalisation. In this respect it would be important to make sure that in the next 25 years at least, Europe is able to create a truly open European Higher Education area in which students and staff can seamlessly join any university regardless of its location in Europe.

It is in line with Dvorak's 'Largo' to see here a movement in a broad perspective, making the higher education of 2038 almost unrecognisable compared to present-day higher education.

Internationalisation of the mind

It was a sea-change when Hofstede (1993, re-edited in 2010) published his treatise on the contribution of cross-cultural cooperation on productivity. This is in agreement with Dvorak's *molto-vivace's* piece in the New World. Since then, large corporations such as Shell and others have engaged cross-cultural experts, *eg* Trompenaars (1996), in training the staff it sends out as expats.

When it comes to their internationalisation strategies, most universities seem to still believe that it is about *methods* rather than a single goal: to present the students with the environment in which they can grow, develop their talents to work in an international environment, and develop their cultural sensitivity or intercultural competence (Berardo and Deardorff, 2012).

Teekens (2003) has warned that the proceeds from the international classroom will not come by themselves: there should be, for example, requirements to develop 'Specific Skills for Teaching in an Intercultural Setting'. From everything we know to date (which is not too much, as very few universities have tried to measure this) the impact of more foreign students on the acquisition of skills in intercultural competences has been minimal, mostly because Teekens' advice is generally ignored.

However, despite the lack of solid evidence that the substantial increase in student and staff mobility has led to more international understanding on the part of graduates, one can clearly see that internationalisation (in terms of the number of mobile students) is related to innovation (measured as productivity growth) on the country level (Hoareau and Ritzen, 2012) while at the same time the CHEERS survey shows that mobile students find better jobs than those who were not mobile during their studies (Borghans and Ritzen, 2006).

Internationalisation on the move

Internationalisation of higher education will continue to be associated with student and staff mobility, albeit – as I imagine – more and more in the framework of learning to think and act across cultures. Internationalisation will increasingly be linked to entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship in a global context. The differentiation in the mobility will continue as it is, from short-term, rather haphazard visits, to mobility for full-time studies abroad. Yet, mobility will be more in the form of virtual than physical mobility. The ensuing increase in cross-cultural understanding will be a great boost to tolerance and peace worldwide.

References

Berardo, K., & Deardorff, D.K. (2012). *Building Cultural Competence: Innovative Intercultural Training Activities and Models.* Virginia: Stylus Publishing.

Borghans, L., & Ritzen, J. (2006). *The International Dimension of Higher Education and the Work of Graduates in Europe.* Research Paper, Maastricht University.

Branson, M. (1998). *The Role of Civic Education,* Position Paper. The Communitarian Network, Center for Civic Education.

Hoareau, C., Ritzen, J., & Marconi, G. (2012). T*he State of University Policy for Progress in the Europe.* Empower European Universities.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations, Software of the Mind.* McGraw-Hill Education.

Teekens, H. (2003). The Requirement to Develop Specific Skills for Teaching in an Intercultural Setting. In *Journal of Studies in International Education,* Volume 7, Number 1, (p. 108).

Trompenaars, F. (1996), Resolving International Conflict: Culture and Business Strategy. In *Business Strategy Review,* Volume 7, Number 3, (pp. 51–68).

Vande Berg, M., R. Michael Paige, & Kris Hemming Lou (Eds.)(2012). *Student Learning Abroad: What Our Students Are Learning, What They're Not, and What We Can Do About It.* Virginia: Stylus Publishing.

Verspagen, B. (2006). *University research, intellectual property rights and European innovation systems.* Eindhoven Centre for Innovation Studies, the Netherlands Working Paper 06.05, Department of Technology Management, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, the Netherlands.

CHAPTER 2

From innovation to mainstream and beyond: the unfolding story of internationalisation in higher education

— Uwe Brandenburg, John K. Hudzik, Hiroshi Ota and Susan Robertson

Internationalisation has been one of the buzzwords of at least the last two-and-a-half decades, although the concept itself has been around much longer. The more recent debate has included notions of dependence, inter-dependence, hegemony, colonialism, brain drain, brain gain, trading goods and services, and thus coincided with the rise of neoliberalism, placing the internationalisation debate on the globalisation agenda. The current debate centres around cooperation versus commercialisation or competition. This chapter aims to shed light on the internationalisation vs globalisation debate as a basis for understanding the developments in internationalisation. From there it moves to looking at evidence for the assumption that internationalisation has moved from fringe to core, from exotic to mainstream. In order to do so, theoretical considerations and statistics are looked at and some organisational observations will be made. Some visions on the future of internationalisation are developed and the question of whether the concept has not outlived its usefulness is posed.

Widespread interest in the concept of internationalisation in higher education began to develop more substantially in the late 1970s, with a strong belief in exchange, understanding, and joint research as a means to support freedom and peace. However, with increasing pressure to find funding other than from state sources, higher education institutions' internationalisation was commercialised with the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) regarding education as a tradable commodity, adding a utilitarian dimension (Brandenburg, 2008; Carr *et al,* 2008).

Globalisation as a process has existed since Leif Ericson found his way to the North American mainland around the year 1000. From the 13th century onwards, great European explorers such as Marco Polo, Christopher Columbus, Ferdinand Magellan and Francis Drake began to establish connections between the Americas and Europe in the form of internationalisation of trade. Also the Silk Roads (Routes), which were coined by Ferdinand von Richthofen, were established as trade routes between Asia and Europe.

Economists picked up the term 'internationalisation' in the 1970s (*eg* Johanson and Wiedesheim, 1975). Higher education researchers did not do so on a grand scale until the 1990s. More recently, Robertson argued that the global can be regarded as discourse, project, scale or reach, each of which shape education policies and practices as they are realised in time, space and social relations (Robertson, 2012).

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERNATIONALISATION AND GLOBALISATION

The discussion around globalisation has, in turn, generated a debate as to whether internationalisation is different from the new processes that globalisation seems to have triggered. Consequently, we tend to see two schools of thought: one in fear and one in favour of globalisation.

Those in favour perceive globalisation as a way to flatten the world (Friedman, 2006), to increase cooperation, facilitate interaction, promote democracy or support economic gains and tend to attribute to its characteristics such as equal opportunities, exchange of cultures and the development towards increasing homogeneity across the world. They do not regard globalisation as different from internationalisation by nature, but rather by specificity, and by the direction in which it points. They see globalisation as a general concept and part of a continuous (historical) process. (See, for instance, Scott, 1998; Robertson, Novelli *et al,* 2007; Mittelman, 2004; Held and McGrew, 2007; Denman, 2001; Marginson and Rhoades, 2002; Marginson and van der Wende, 2009; Neave, 2007; Teather, 2004; and Kelsey, 1999.)

Those in fear perceive globalisation as a negative, rather physical phenomenon or force in its own right: uncontrollable, threatening, creating unhealthy dependence and inequality, neo-liberal in its core, fostering commercialisation, outside of the control of the individual state or higher education institution. For them, internationalisation is a force for good, which is threatened by globalisation, seen as a force for bad. Knight, for instance, states: "Internationalisation is changing the world of higher education, and globalisation is changing the world of internationalisation." (Knight 2003, 5) (See also Ninnes and Hellsten, 2005; Knight and de Wit, 1997; Harvey, 2000; van der Wende, 2001 and 2007; Gacel-Ávila, 2005.)

In our view, the terms 'neo-liberalism' and 'globalisation' are often confused within this debate. We believe that the two concepts, globalisation and internationalisation, are related temporally, spatially and socially, but they are not synonyms. Temporally, they represent the dominant social and political relations of different epochs. Internationalisation is a child of the Westphalian nation state; a way of organising social and political relations within states in which national sovereignty claims is central. In Asian countries, internationalisation often overlaps with modernisation – led by a government to import Western knowledge and technology and modify them for the specific needs of a country. Globalisation, on the other hand, is the product of a world order where the national scale has given power, and some sovereignty, to other scales, in particular to that which is defined as 'global'. The global takes for itself the right to move beyond, and remove, or at least diminish the importance of, national territorial boundaries. Clearly such developments do not just happen. Rather, the shift from one to the other is the outcome of political projects, which aim to make national state boundaries more porous and open to the selective movements of ideas, people, goods, services, finance, technology, and so on. The most significant of these ideas for academia is the rapid spread of neoliberalism, and privileging of competition as a motor for change. Spatially, the global replaces the national in terms of the mobilising discourse through which to govern, and therefore rule. Socially, the global becomes the identity which students are encouraged to acquire; as the global learner with a global learning passport. This then furthers the ideological and institutional project, further sedimenting the new global, rather than the old, international ideology in epochal terms.

Also in practical terms, internationalisation of higher education – intertwined with globalisation – has encompassed many new cross-border movements and thereby broadened its original concept, rationalising and basing these new efforts on commercialisation and competition in order to cope with serious global issues within higher education, such as the decrease in public funding and an ever-intensifying global talent war. Recently, in many higher education systems, the term 'international' has been replaced by 'global', for instance, from 'international education' to 'global education' and from 'international studies' to 'global studies'. Examples of this are the MA in Global Studies in Freiburg, the MA in Global studies in Education at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, and the Master of Globalisation at Australian National University. In order to meet the increasing demand for globally-minded graduates in a rapidly globalising business world, governments of countries where English is not the mother-tongue have embarked on new initiatives aimed at globalising higher education, such as supporting universities that wish to expand the number and extent of their English-taught courses and programmes. In terms of international student policy, new policy rationales such as the 'skilled migration approach', which promotes the post-graduation employment of international students (brain gain from overseas), and the 'trade and business approach' are prevalent. Many universities have been partnering with commission-paid agents to aggressively recruit international students in order to generate revenue. The economic contribution of international students to institutions that are struggling financially has become important as governments continue to cut higher education budgets in many countries. Moreover, in nations with demographic challenges, *ie* an aging and declining population, international students are expected to help provide a competitive workforce for the future to further the nation's economic growth. These phenomena have weakened the traditional, policy rationales, *ie* 'cooperation and mutual understanding approach'. In addition, world university rankings, which prospective international students often use as a guide to identifying universities to which they should apply, have heightened the global competition between world-class universities. Concurrently, the governments of industrialised countries are trying to help increase the international competitiveness of their universities, focusing primarily on improving STEM research capacity, so that they can attract high-quality students from overseas. In short, compared with internationalisation based on cross-border cooperation and assistance among higher education institutions in nation states, globalisation has both further emphasised international education's significant economic impact and intensified competition among universities, exhibited by the creation of world university league tables, which have been instrumental in triggering a global talent war in a borderless world.

In our view, we can interpret the concepts 'international, comparative, and global' as, offering a paradigm for understanding the course of higher education internationalisation in the 21st century, rather than as describing a controversy.

'International' references bi-lateral and multi-lateral relations in higher education such as cross-border inter-institutional agreements, educational collaborations and exchanges, and collaborative research. Comparative methodologies are central to inquiry;

they identify salient similarities and differences across entities and seek to explain causes and implications for both. Comparative methodology is core to building cross-cultural understanding, widening appreciation for diversity, and building mutual understanding. Globalisation can be understood as world-spanning forces and factors that transcend political and geographic boundaries. It influences higher education through exponentially accelerating instantaneous, global communication channels and the ensuing ease of transport of people, ideas and commodities. Today, it is effectively impossible to control access to ideas originating somewhere else on the planet, and this in turn expands knowledge and helps level the global playing field for learning, research and application of research.

Robust and comprehensive forms of higher education internationalisation are a response to this intermingling and its implications. It is difficult to imagine any significant challenge or opportunity today in the context of a single place – global forces impact the local and the local mediates and shapes the global as well as bi- and multilateral relations. Few intellectual drivers of higher education have ever been only local or national. Increasingly such drivers are global.

We do not see internationalisation and globalisation as separate from each other, nor is one controllable and the other beyond our control. They are connected to each other and they both shape and are being shaped, by the developments in higher education. The growing prevalence of globalisation may even have helped move internationalisation from fringe to core.

Internationalisation can serve as a means to transform higher education within the paradigm of globalisation.

The question following on from this assumption is whether we can find evidence of this development. We provide observations that might confirm that internationalisation has moved from being an exotic pastime for a few educationalists to a mainstream activity in our higher education institutions.

EVIDENCE FOR THE MOVE OF INTERNATIONALISATION FROM FRINGE TO CORE

Precipitating factors have to be taken into account. Twenty-first century higher education is being challenged by several disruptive forces. Pressures are arising in US higher education for cost and quality control, reduced innovation cycle time and documentation of outcomes in learning, research, and value to society. Internationalisation will have to be responsive to these pressures (Hudzik and Stohl, 2009).

Other pressures have origins in the growing needs of students and other clientele for global knowledge. The 21st century clientele of higher education live, work and conduct commerce in a progressively more global environment; higher education is under

pressure to prepare them for that reality. As a consequence, we can see three main developments in the internationalisation of higher education over the past 25 years as taking/having structural, institutional and subjective forms.

The first significant element was the notion that higher education could be a sector where there was a comparative trade advantage. Countries that promoted looking at higher education as an area of trade (for instance, Australia, New Zealand, and the UK), have all emerged as major traders in higher education, netting significant returns in GDP terms to their economies. In countries such as Australia and New Zealand, trade in higher education is now placed third or fourth as a tradable good and service, and therefore is a significant GDP revenue generator. This shift, however, has changed the meaning of higher education from being dedicated primarily to knowledge creation, truth and reason, to an activity that is increasingly viewed as a commodity and a credential. This has also transformed the basis of student mobility across national borders; from being a more informal, less organised, state of affairs, to a highly organised (in the case of Australia) export where fortunes and futures now tend to be shaped by fluctuations in the wider global economy. The inclusion in 1995 of education in the World Trade Organization (WTO) agreements as a tradable service is an attempt to regulate the globalisation of higher education as a service sector in the interests of higher education investors and providers.

A second significant development is the Bologna Process. In 1998, the Sorbonne Declaration was signed by the education ministers of France, Germany, Italy and the UK. They committed themselves to harmonising the architecture of the European higher education system. The Bologna Declaration followed on from this a year later in 1999. The Bologna Process has influenced many countries around the world – serving variously as a model to emulate, contest, or with which to articulate, for example, ASEAN University Network and CAMPUS Asia. Whichever stance one takes, Bologna is not something that can be ignored by universities. In essence, Bologna embraces New Public Management as the key organising logic in the sector. This has in turn transformed what it means to talk about internationalisation in that it is now the globalisation of a regional, rather than of a national model. In other words, we are looking at a shift from the internationalisation of higher education to the globalisation of higher education in that it is now a major project involving multiple scales of governance.

The third development is what can be called competitive comparison, and that is the use of global rankings in the higher education sector. Opening up your higher education sector to international staff, having an international student population, and so on, all further the new conditions – globalisation – that undermine the old international ones. The internalisation of these dynamics, within institutions and individuals, the subjective element of the shift from internationalisation to globalisation, is aimed at reproducing this shift.

In the context of these three developments and beyond the economic perspective, internationalisation of higher education has contributed to building the infrastructure

for strengthened cultural, educational, technological, and intellectual exchanges across borders over the last 25 years. Specifically, it has encouraged the establishment of international exchanges of students, faculty and staff as well as international collaborations of education, research and development assistance through institutional partnerships. Governments have provided support, typically financial and regulatory support, for those international exchange and collaboration programmes of higher education institutions. Such support has not only stimulated the expansion of international exchanges and collaborations, but also promoted innovative cross-border programmes, such as joint and double degree programmes and transnational education programmes.

Internationalisation has shifted from a marginal to a core university activity, becoming less an option and more of an imperative for organising collaborative efforts within the research and learning process. In sum, international exchanges and collaborations, which are the main activities of internationalisation, together constitute a critical foundation for not only fostering cultural, educational, technological and intellectual ties among nations in the world, but also nurturing 'soft power' thereby reinforcing official foreign policy goals as part of public diplomacy (Nye, 2004).

In addition, many countries have made efforts to reform their higher education systems, and internationalisation has become a major component in the reform process, a process often based on the increasing role of the Bologna Process as a model. As part of the higher education reform agenda, universities have begun to make institutionally-organised, strategic efforts towards internationalisation under the leadership of their presidents. Therefore, internationalisation has often changed the culture, tradition and administration of universities as it has been a catalyst in the development of institutional strategies and task forces for promoting internationalisation. While this makes the system top-down in configuration, it is also tailored in such a way to be attentive to bottom-up initiatives because, apart from the president's leadership, it is equally important that a wide range of faculty and administrative staff understand, take an interest in, respond to, and get involved with international activities carried out by their institutions. In short, in terms of university administration, internationalisation has contributed to shifting from an incremental, add-on approach to a prioritised and core competence-based approach grounded in university-wide missions and visions, rooted in long-term goals and plans.

We have seen a shift from margin to core both in the higher education system as a whole and at the institutional level, both areas in which change is not always easy to quantify. However, the shift has permeated into the measurable areas of mobility and here some comparison is possible. Not every country shows the same development. Overall, increasing numbers of students have become globally mobile. According to the OECD data, from 1975 to 2010 the numbers increased from 0.8 million to 4.1 million (OECD, 2012). In Europe, we see two developments: degree mobility (study abroad for a complete degree) has become more popular in countries such as Germany (24 900 in 1985 compared with 102 800 in 2008) (Wissenschaftweltoffen, 2008), and Erasmus mobility, which has also become a success story even though the ambitious goal of

three million mobile students has not yet been reached. In Asia, there is the same trend of increasing degree mobility in many countries such as Japan (10 428 in 1983 compared with 137 756 in 2012) (Japan Student Services Organization). Trends support the view that internationalisation has become more mainstream.

Outside the classical trends we also see new developments, which have not become standard everywhere but are being considered, or at least debated, at many higher education institutions nowadays: transnational higher education such as branch campuses, offshore campuses and franchising. Some of these activities are clearly taking the commercialisation of higher education to a new level.

Finally, in addition to many other tendencies, we have observed an increase in professionalisation – often as a result of budget cuts – both in staff and activities. International office directors are often sent to assessment centres as part of the recruitment process, training has increased, new staff are expected to have degrees in internationalisation, and management has been streamlined. All of these developments can be seen as part of a comprehensive approach to internationalisation.

If anything proves the mainstreaming of internationalisation, it is the fact that all these developments cumulatively have prompted a wider and deeper understanding of the internationalisation of higher education. A definition of comprehensive internationalisation that is giving rise to widespread discussion in the US sees internationalisation today as, "commitment and action to integrate international, global and comparative perspective throughout the teaching, research and service missions of higher education; achieving benefits in core learning and discovery outcomes; and becoming an institutional imperative not just a desirable possibility" (Hudzik, 2011).

Today, few if any institutions have achieved this 'comprehensiveness' yet and they will differ in how and if they pursue this goal along a continuum of engagement, which is dependent on institutional type, mission and starting point. The common aspirations regarding 'comprehensiveness' include: (1) mainstreaming access of all students and faculty to international, global and comparative opportunities; (2) widening contributors well beyond the international office to include academic departments, institutional leadership, and campus service units; and (3) infusion into core institutional missions.

1. A number of factors are compelling higher education in the US, and in places elsewhere, to expand commitments along the dimensions mentioned above. Growth in higher education 'seat' demand – projected to increase at least 150% between 2000 and 2025 (mostly outside North America and Europe), and mobility more than doubling in the same period or earlier (Ruby, 2010; Banks *et al*, 2007; Haddad, 2009 or 2006) – are powerful factors.
2. There is a similar pattern of growth in the annual doubling to tripling of research capacity in Asia compared to North America and Europe. (National Science Board, 2010.) The map and character of global higher education is being redrawn, not simply in capacity, but in the basis for system interactions.

3. Higher education is increasingly conducted across borders through flows of students, scholars, ideas and inter-institutional collaborations. As a result of globalisation, the social responsibilities of higher education develop global dimensions. It is not local vs global, but local and global, because, for instance, local prosperity is increasingly tied to global prosperity.

WHAT WILL THE FUTURE OF INTERNATIONALISATION LOOK LIKE?

We see some continuing developments and predict others that are probably less easy to foresee. On the one hand, internationalisation will continue to progress towards a mainstream role in higher education systems in the world over the next 25 years. Globalisation will continue to enhance privatisation and marketisation in higher education, and accessibility to higher education will be increased with new business opportunities being created around universities. At the same time, however, the vulnerability (quality issues) of higher education will become more apparent and educational quality problems will not be solved solely by national efforts. It will become essential, but also difficult, to establish a substantial and effective international quality-assurance system in higher education throughout the world.

Despite these seemingly at-odds circumstances, internationalisation will be more and more driven by the economic contributions of international education in the future. Government motivation to pay attention to internationalisation will be further stimulated by the economic impact brought on by the expenditures of international students and their future contribution to a nation's economic growth as highly skilled immigrants (Lane and Kinser, 2012). On the other hand, internationalisation should be more driven by both collaborative learning opportunities for students across the world and intellectual contributions to the developing global knowledge society that needs to address global problems in the fields of global public goods such as climate change, energy, agriculture, health, water and ecosystems. In this sense, both government and industry support for universities' internationalisation efforts is of paramount importance. Their support will yield long-term dividends in terms of developing global citizens and a globally competitive workforce. Internationalisation needs not only the long-term commitment of institutions, but also long-term, triangular cooperation among institutions, government, and industry.

Realistically, however, due to the relatively high public debt-ratios of many developed countries under a prolonged period of economic stagnation, it will be difficult for governments to continuously provide robust, financial support for universities' internationalisation efforts. There is now a growing concern as to whether universities will be able to clarify both the added value of their international dimensions and the impact of internationalisation on the institution (Ota, 2012). Thus, one crucial challenge for universities is to develop an effective evaluation process of and for their internationalisation efforts. Such an evaluation process will require a creative assessment structure and related evaluation methods, which, in turn, account for, assess and encourage overall

internationalisation initiatives, adding a strategic dimension to further internationalisation as a catalyst for the functional transformation of universities towards meeting the demands of the 21st century's global knowledge society (Ota, 2012).

On the other hand, we also see dramatic changes looming at the institutional level. Global higher education will be characterised for some time by strong aggregated student demand and a short supply of qualified faculty, leadership, and institutional capacity. The global inability of public funding mechanisms to meet growing needs and a parallel rise in private financing, supported by a growing global middle class, buttress an ascendant neo-liberal notion that higher education is less a public good and more a private investment, challenging equitable access worldwide (Teixeira, 2009). The private sector will be more demand absorbing on all continents and will challenge the public sector in markets and innovation (Teixeira, 2009; PROPHE, 2010).

Two seemingly contradictory possibilities for global higher education interactions emerge from these factors. One is trade and competition, particularly increased global competition for the best students and faculty, and shifting trade patterns from predominately brain drain to brain circulation pathways (Wildavsky, 2010). The other is that trade patterns not only awaken competition but establish the routes by which collaborations for mutual benefit can arise.

Stephen Toope, President of the University of British Columbia, notes that the cost and infrastructure complexity to support envelope-pushing research, particularly in STEM disciplines, makes going it alone exceedingly difficult for a single institution (Toope, 2010). Expanding research and graduate education globally facilitates formation of cross-border collaborations. It is more productive and competitive to act on the strong pressures and high incentives emerging for cross-border collaboration than to focus on competition.

From these developments, some opportunities may arise. Student mobility will become a growth industry and funding mechanisms will multiply. Non-traditional students will shape more flexible higher education delivery systems. Massification will challenge quality control, but it remains open as to what form quality assurance will take. Global competition for the best faculty, administrators and students will intensify. Bidding challenges may raise costs for talent, and trade flows will multiply (but global competition may act to control overall costs to consumers). With growth in private funding for higher education and increased personal costs, a savvier consumer will demand quality not just in the form of rankings but in documentable value for money outcomes. Global and public/private competition will value innovation and customer service.

The future resides in recognition that access to global intellectual networks is essential not only to be competitive but to build co-prosperities rather than one-sided advantage (Hudzik and Simon, 2012). Idea networks and talent flows will run through multi-dimensional global trade routes. 21st century engagement abroad is far more complex than merely peering over the fence to gather intelligence about what others are doing.

Cross-border, inter-institutional collaborations take many forms: bilateral and multi-lateral institutional agreements, idiosyncratic project collaborations, and forming cross-border associations or clubs of like-minded and similarly situated institutions. No model alone is adequate and the flattening intellectual advantage in a global knowledge society will require flexible network connections for mutual benefit.

Another area of change relates to the adaptation of higher education institutions to the new forms of education provision and higher education institution types. Due to the specialisation of higher education institutions and a diversified higher education land-scape, we will see most higher education institutions being involved in cross-border activities, albeit on different scales. Large comprehensive universities will struggle for a 'global player' status in the reputation race. However, we will also see many smaller higher education institutions withdrawing from this race once they have calculated the cost-benefit ratio. However, they will still recruit staff and students, but in different markets and with different tools.

Commercialisation will definitely increase and the continuous rise in adult learning and Life Long Learning will foster this. Many provider countries are aging societies and will have to recruit their high calibre workforce increasingly from abroad, both physically and virtually (employment via the internet), and higher education will follow this trend. Consequently, this will also mean more e-learning and distance-education, but also more tensions between countries (brain drain versus brain gain).

Apart from challenges at the institutional or system level, internationalisation will have to find its position with regard to three major global challenges:

1. **Global existential problems and the role of higher education in their solution:** Predominantly, the question will be how mankind can overcome man-made problems, such as climate change. Here we hope that internationalisation/ globalisation of higher education will move from its current stand outside the debate into the centre, using mobility of all forms and global exchange as a means towards solving the core challenges. We are not entirely optimistic about this happening.
2. **Euro-crisis and possible global consequences:** A global economic and financial crisis is looming and, as usual, it will hit the developing countries harder than it hits those nations where the problem was created. If it happens, then many international activities of today will cease, mobility will shrink, possibly half of Europe will see a decline of 50–70% in international activities.
3. **Inclusion vs exclusion:** As the IAU (2012) has rightly stated in its call for action on internationalisation, our task is to overcome the explicit or implicit inherent tendencies of exclusion in internationalisation (tuition fees, travel costs, accessibility of the internet).

> This is not exclusively but predominantly, the question about the inclusion of Africa. Ultimately, it will mean that we need to challenge the neo-liberal trends and face the costs of internationalisation with regards to the environment and to our fellow inhabitants of the planet.

Having discussed the consequences of the current developments from institutional, system and society levels, we would like to end with a much larger and more theoretical aspect: Will internationalisation as a political and cultural project reorient itself in the face of the challenges of globalisation? We are pessimistic about the fate of internationalisation as a dominant organising logic for the higher education sector. At the moment it is a residual logic, and likely to remain so as long as education is viewed as a commodity. However, it is also important to remind ourselves that internationalisation was no innocent political project; rather, universities during this period tended to service elites, especially global elites, rather than being accessible and empowering spaces open to a wide range of learners in order to acquire knowledge. What was often being internationalised was Western knowledge, Western linkages, and Western expertise. What are the politics of internationalisation that need to be made visible, and confronted? We would argue that they concern the particularism of Western modernity. If internationalisation is to go beyond these limits, it must recognise its own particularity, and place, and not seek to impose its world view. It must work toward seeing other modernities, other ways of organising knowledge, other expertise, and use this as a basis for engagement, critical knowledge creation and reflection.

WHAT ARE THE MAIN CONCLUSIONS TO BE DRAWN?

The past 25 years can be regarded as a time of substantial change in the concept of internationalisation and its realisation. Higher education institutions have come under a variety of external pressures (accountability, quality control, and outcome orientation) combined with changing needs of students and staff (global competences). Three significant projects could be detected: regulation of higher education as a trade sector (GATS), the Bologna Process as an application of New Public Management to higher education (although not converging smoothly with internationalisation in all regions, *eg* Germany) and competitive comparison through rankings. As a response, internationalisation has found its way into the core of institutional strategies and provides a critical basis fostering international cultural and other relations. It has fostered strategy-led leadership of higher education institutions and this top-down approach has also fostered bottom-up initiatives supporting a competence-based institutional approach. This has been accompanied by a change in patterns pertaining to receiving and sending countries (*eg* developments in China), more offshore activities and professionalisation in internationalisation at higher education institutions.

We regard these developments as closely related to the internationalisation-globalisation paradigm. Though related in time, space and their effects on society, these concepts

are not synonyms. We see the artificial antagonism between them still prevalent in the current debate as unhelpful. Globalisation is often confused with neo-liberalism in this debate.

In practical terms, the global is continuously superseding the (inter-)national in higher education agendas, thus defining the drivers of internationalisation, which focuses on cross-border cooperation and the resultant economic impact and competition.

Where we four authors disagree with each other to some extent is whether we regard this development as positive or not, and whether any such normative evaluation is in any way useful. This disagreement also reflects the very different perspectives taken because of the cultural settings from which we come (Germany, the US, Japan, and the UK).

We do, however, all agree on the way forward. The future of internationalisation will be challenged by budget cuts and the impact of the Euro crisis making better justification of international activities essential. High student demand, shortage of qualified staff, and the need to respond to core global problems will dominate institutional agendas. Whether a cooperative or competitive approach is chosen by higher education institutions to cope with these challenges is a matter for debate. The trend seems to be towards the latter.

Overall, internationalisation will have to respond to issues such as inclusion versus exclusion by developing a multi-dimensional perspective on value added as opposed to self interest. If it remains in its current shape, it will have little chance to survive against a neo-liberal form of globalisation. However, its chance lies in acknowledging its limitations and transcending them to create true global perspectives.

References

Banks, M., Olsen, A., & Pearce, D. (2007). *Global student mobility: An Australian perspective five years on.* Canberra, Australia: IDP Education.

Brandenburg, U., Carr, D., Donauer, S., & Berthold, C. (2008). *Analysing the Future Market - Target Countries for German HEIs.* Gütersloh: CHE.

DAAD. http://www.wissenschaftweltoffen.de/daten/5/1/1

Friedman, T.L. (2006). *The World is Flat. The Globalized World in the Twenty-First Century*. London: Penquin Books. Updated second edition.

Haddad, G. (2006 or 2009). *The importance of internationalization of higher education.* Paper presented at the International Association of Universities Conference on the Internationalization of Higher Education: New Directions, New Challenges. Beijing, China.

Harvey, D. (2000). *Spaces of Hope.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Held, D., & McGrew, A. (2007, 2nd ed.). *Globalization/Anti-Globalization. Beyond the Great Divide.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hudzik, J.K. (2011). *Comprehensive Internationalization: From Concept to Action.* Washington, D.C.: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

Hudzik, J.K., & Simon, L.K. (2012) From a Land-Grant to a World-Grant Ideal: Extending Public Higher Education to a Global Frame. In D. Fogel & E. Malson-Huddle (Eds.) *Precipice or Crossroads? Where America's Great Public Universities Stand and Where They are Going Midway Through Their Second Century.* New York: SUNY Press.

Hudzik, J.K., & Stohl, M. (2009). Modeling Assessment of Outcomes and Impacts from Internationalization. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Measuring Success in the Internationalization of Higher Education. EAIE Occasional Paper 22.* Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

International Association of Universities. (2012). *Affirming Academic Values in International Higher Education: A Call for Action.* Paris: IAU.

Japan Student Services Organization. (2013). *Result of an Annual Survey of International Students in Japan 2012.* Tokyo: Japan Student Services Organizaiton. Retrived May 20, 2013, from http://www.jasso.go.jp/statistics/intl_student/documents/data12_e.pdf

Knight, J. (2009 or 2003). Internationalisation: Key concepts and Elements. In M. Gaebel, L. Purser, B. Wächter, & L. Wilson (Eds.), *Internationalisation of European Higher Education*. An EUA/ACA Handbook (pp. A1.1 (loose leaf system)). Berlin: Raabe Verlag.

Lane, J., & Kinser, K. (2012, April 19). What is the Role for Governments in Global Higher Education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/blogs/worldwise/what-is-the-role-for-governments-in-university-internationalization/29399

Mittelman, J. (2004). What is critical Globalization Studies. In *International Studies Perspectives,* Volume 5, (pp. 219–230).

National Science Board (NSB). Science and Engineering Indicators 2010. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation Board.

Ninnes, P., & Hellsten, M. (2005). Introduction: Critical Engagements with the Internationalization of Higher Education. In P. Ninnes, & M. Hellsten (Eds.), *Internationalizing Higher Education. Critical Explorations of Pedagogy and Policy* (pp. 1–8). Hong Kong: Springer.

Nye, J.S. Jr. (2004). *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics.* New York: NY, Public Affairs.

OECD http://globalhighered.files.wordpress.com/2011/09/oecd1.jpg

Ota, H. (2012, February/March). Changes in Internationalization of Japanese Higher Education. In *IAU Horizons,* Volume 17, Number 3 and 18, Number 1, (pp. 26–27).

PROPHE. (2010). *Private and public higher education shares for 117 countries.* Program for Research on Private Higher Education. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from http://www.albany.edu/dept/eaps/prophe/data/international.html

Robertson, S. (2012). Researching Global Education Policy: Angles In/On/Out.... In A. Verger, M. Novelli, & H. Altinyelken (Eds.), *Global Education Policy and International Development: New Agendas, Issues and Practices.* London: Continuum Books.

Robertson, S., Novelli, M., Dale, R., Tikly, L., Dachi, H., & Alphonce, N. (2007). *Globalisation, Education and Development: Ideas, Actors and Dynamics.* London: DfID: Centre for Globalisation, Education and Societies, University of Bristol.

Ruby, A. (2010). *The uncertain future for international higher education in the Asia-Pacific region.* Washington, DC: NAFSA, Association of International Educators. Retrieved June 1, 2011, from www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/NAFSA Home/Resource Library Assets/Networks/SIO/UncertainFuture.pdf

Teixeira, P. (2009). Mass higher education and private institutions. *In Higher education to 2030,* Volume 2. Globalization (pp. 231–258). Paris: OECD.

Toope, S.J. (2010). Global challenges and the organizational-ethical dilemmas of universities. In *Inside Higher Education.* Retrieved June 1, 2011, from http://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/globalhighered/stephen_toope_ubc_on_global_challenges_and_the_organizational_ethical_dilemmas_of_universities

Wildavsky, B. (2010). *The great brain race: How global universities are reshaping the world.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

About THE AUTHORS

Uwe Brandenburg earned an MA in Islamic Sciences and an MScEcon in Politics. He was Director International for 11 years, eight of which at Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany. In 2006, he joined CHE and since 2013, he is a managing partner of CHE Consult. His current foci are methods measuring effects, benchmarking in higher education as well as internationalisation. He is a member of the IAU Ad Hoc expert group on internationalisation. In 1998, he received a Fulbright Administrator Scholarship. Uwe was founding President of the German Association for International Educational Exchange (DAIA) and is a member of the EAIE and CHER. He speaks English, French, Spanish and Arabic.

John K. Hudzik is Professor at Michigan State University, US, and the NAFSA Senior Scholar for Internationalisation. He is Past President of the Association of International Education Administrators and also Past President and Chair of the Board of Directors of NAFSA. From 1995 to 2010 he was Dean of International Studies and Programs at Michigan State University and then Vice President for Global Engagement and Strategic Projects. He is the recipient of several national awards for his scholarly work including the AIEA Charles Klasek Award for outstanding service to international education.

Hiroshi Ota is Professor at the Center for Global Education and Director of Hitotsubashi University Global Education Program (HGP) at Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo, Japan. He worked for the Office for the Promotion of International Relations (2007 to 2009) and the School of Commerce and Management as International Student Advisor (2003 to 2006) at Hitotsubashi University. His research primarily focuses on higher education policies and practices related to internationalisation and international student mobility in a comparative perspective. From SUNY at Buffalo, he earned his EdM in 2001 and PhD in Social Foundations of Education in 2008.

Susan Robertson is Professor of Sociology of Education and founding Director of the Centre for Globalisation, Education and Societies at the University of Bristol, UK, and founding Co-Editor (with Roger Dale) of the journal *Globalisation, Societies and Education.* Her interest is in the challenges involved in developing a critical agenda for the study of globalisation and education. Her research broadly focuses on new governing strategies in the education sector, which are aimed at creating different kinds of teachers, learners and citizens. She works closely with Kris Olds, University of Wisconsin, US, around many of these issues, including a blog *GlobalHigherEd.*

ESSAY 8

Probable and preferable futures of internationalisation

— Jane Knight

Jane Knight is Adjunct Professor at Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada. She focuses her research, teaching and policy work on the international dimensions of higher education. Her current work focuses on higher education regionalisation, education hubs, knowledge diplomacy, binational universities, and the benefits/risks of internationalisation. She sits on the advisory boards of many international organisations and journals. She received an honorary LLD from the University of Exeter, UK in 2010 and the Gilbert Medal from Universitas in 2013.

"It is inevitable that internationalisation will continue to evolve. The core question is: change for what purpose and for better or worse?"

The landscape of higher education has fundamentally changed during the last 25 years, stimulated by globalisation trends and transformed by internationalisation strategies. During this period, internationalisation itself has evolved in terms of priorities, rationales and scope. The growth in cross-border education (people, programmes, providers, projects, policy and mobility) has been unexpected and unprecedented. At the same time, campus-based internationalisation has increased in importance and been strengthened by the emphasis on learning outcomes and multi-disciplinary approaches. Internationalisation has brought multiple benefits to individuals, institutions and society. It has also introduced new risks to higher education and some unintended consequences.

Internationalisation of higher education is essentially a process of change through integrating an international, intercultural and global dimensions in the goals, functions and delivery of higher education. The suffix 'isation' denotes process and differs from an 'ism', which suggests an ideology. Thus it is inevitable that internationalisation will continue to evolve. The core question is: change for what purpose and for better or worse?

Probable or preferable future

What does the future hold for internationalisation? A distinction is made between a probable future and an alternative somewhat preferable future. The former takes a reactive approach to the cultural, social, economic, political and academic contexts affecting the international dimensions of higher education. The latter focuses on a strategic and more interventionist approach, which ensures that governments and higher education institutions take the necessary steps to shape and monitor the preferred direction of international higher education (IHE). The purpose of this essay is to examine the probable and preferable futures of internationalisation from a sector-level perspective.

Tertiary education holds a position of increased influence and importance in today's world. Other policy sectors/actors such as trade, economic development, immigration, foreign affairs, industry, labour, science and technology recognise the potential of IHE for national prosperity and international positioning/relations. The result being that while higher education works on

its own agenda, other sectors recognise the importance of international education and look for ways it can be used to meet their goals – another sign that IHE has become a more influential political actor. New partnerships between education and other policy actors can work productively on joint priorities, or alternatively, IHE can be co-opted to serve other more powerful actors' agendas. Both can and do happen simultaneously.

Internationalisation has to be looked at in relation to macro issues such as demographic changes, liberalisation of the markets, the move to a more knowledge-based society, the ICT revolution, the short term economic focus of national foreign policies, and the reality of the bottom billion in poverty. Four major IHE trends bear witness to the impact of these global issues: the trade and commercialisation of higher education, the great brain race to serve the knowledge economy, new education provision alliances between sending and receiving countries, and finally a preoccupation with national or regional self-interest and competitiveness. The near and probable future builds on these trends.

Given the global diversity of higher education needs, issues and provision, the probable future scenarios can touch on many different elements of IHE. Only a few are addressed here.

Multinational universities

'Multinational' universities are known as single institutions that have satellite operations in other countries, strategic international networks, joint degree programmes, global research projects; in short, a broad international engagement programme at home and abroad. It is probable that these will multiply in the future through strategic alliances with overseas partners/investors and a more liberalised higher education market. 'Edu-glomerates' may emerge as an alternative to a multinational university. An 'edu-glomerate' extends the concept of economic free education zones or hubs and can be a private or governmental initiative, which offers a marketplace of education and training providers housed in the same location and using common facilities. Students can mix and match individual courses from a variety of education and training providers using a common and recognised credit system. In this scenario a key issue is the provider of the academic qualification. The 'edu-glomerate' could offer its own credential under a national licensing scheme or individual providers could establish their own prerequisites for conferring their degree. In this scenario, the franchising of the credential may be as important as franchising the academic programme itself.

International and intercultural competences

Efforts to link students' international and intercultural competences with enhanced job opportunities are likely to increase given the current emphasis on the economic justification of international higher education. The combination of these efforts with the recent trend to provide students with data on the potential earning power of each academic programme may morph into a scenario where IHE experiences and competences are monetised and validated in terms of increased earning potential. This narrow approach ignores the social, cultural, personal development, and world-understanding benefits of IHE.

Quality assurance and accreditation

Quality assurance and accreditation processes have definitely been internationalised and become a critical issue for monitoring the quality and legality of cross-border education activities. These laudable efforts need to be closely monitored so as to curb current tendencies and a probable future where a universal model of accreditation becomes an agent of standardisation or alternatively, nothing more than a 'branding label'. Along similar lines, a future based on regionalised or globalised meta-profiles of competences can bring quality to the academic offer but also the risks of homogenisation.

Open Education Resources

The Open Education Resources (OER) movement has a positive role to play in the internationalisation of higher education and will likely take on increased prominence in the near to medium future. The same can be said about the new Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) and creating virtual environments for highly interactive and international learning–teaching opportunities. While virtual mobility will never replicate the benefits of physical academic mobility, it broadens students' access to international and intercultural learning experiences. The challenge for these new developments remains in ensuring quality, access, and respect for the diversity of learners and indigenous ways of knowing.

Another possible future scenario worthy of consideration is a major backlash and reduced support for internationalisation. The issues and trends outlined above are causing concern that internationalisation of higher education is not leading to the academic, knowledge creation, capacity building and socio-cultural benefits originally envisioned, and secondly, that the increased revenues promised from cross-border education activities and international student recruitment have not materialised nor are sustainable. Thus, for reasons not related to academic rationales, one may see a future of less public support for internationalisation of higher education. One needs a crystal ball to forecast whether private sources of funding and support such as foundations will step in but it is highly unlikely. A more probable future will be an increase in private for-profit providers and initiatives. Furthermore, governments may attribute increased importance to higher education as a tool for soft power driven by self-interest and competitiveness and ignore a preferred future, which is built on international cooperation and solidarity for scientific, socio-cultural and environmental benefits.

The probable futures build on existing trends and realities and look at possible twists and turns in the road ahead. The alternative and preferred future approach looks at the potential contribution of IHE to areas that have not been fully addressed in the last two decades and where higher education needs to take a more strategic approach in partnership with other policy sectors. These include the areas of social justice, development cooperation and capacity building, attainment of the Millennium Development Goals, environmental sustainability, intercultural respect for peace and understanding, and poverty reduction, among others.

It is true that the process of internationalisation is not an end unto itself but purely a means to an end. The "ends" of internationalisation are to be determined by

nations, institutions and communities, and they will differ country by country and region by region. The term ‘preferred future’ signals the need to consider scenarios that are not driven by economics, commercialisation, competition and self-interest. It involves the higher education sector working in concert with other policy sectors to broaden the lens and contribution that IHE can make; to take less of an instrumentalist and short-term economic approach; to support and put more emphasis on academic, scientific, environmental, human, and social-cultural development.

Values

While changes in policies and programmes are important, it is primarily a question of values because values inform priorities, rationales, goals, strategies and outcomes. IHE will be more likely to reach the preferred future if collaboration instead of competition prevails to solve some of the world’s pressing problems, if mutual benefits instead of self-interest dominate foreign relations, if capacity building prevails over status building, and if academic rationales are given equal or more attention than economic and political motivations.

ESSAY 9

Internationalisation: a gateway to a new inclusive global higher education space

— Eva Egron-Polak

Eva Egron-Polak is Secretary General of the International Association of Universities (IAU), an independent global association of universities and associations of higher education institutions, based at UNESCO in Paris, France. Under her leadership, IAU launched regular global surveys on internationalisation. Prior to this, she was active in senior positions at the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC). She is involved in committees, boards and activities and has published reports, papers and articles related to higher education and internationalisation.

"The old cliché that universities and knowledge are and have always been international is in fact becoming, at least partially, more of a reality."

There seems little need for advocacy for internationalisation, as it has come to be widely recognised as central to higher education policy in most parts of the world. Instead, as we look to the future, more attention needs perhaps to be paid to the ways in which internationalisation is implemented, where and to whom it brings benefits, where it may have negative consequences, who may be left out of the process and – more importantly – where it may lead in the long term.

Though this essay constitutes an expression of personal opinions, it is based on the recent work of the International Association of Universities (IAU) and thus it reflects the values and principles of the Association and of the individuals and organisations that collaborate closely with it. The essay draws on the IAU statement *Affirming Academic Values in Internationalization of Higher Education: A Call for Action,* which was released in 2012, and the discussions that have begun about putting the principles of this statement into operation. It also reflects the IAU's endeavour to encourage higher education institutions to reinforce their commitment to ethical conduct in all aspects of their work, as is outlined in the IAU-MCO *Guidelines for an institutional code of ethics for higher education.* The in-depth and consultative efforts that have led to the adoption of these two distinct but related normative instruments by IAU, serve to frame this essay. The tone adopted in this essay is intentionally aspirational, in that it expresses a view about the goals and directions that the process of internationalisation may need to take, especially if it is to fulfil its potential of improving the quality of higher education.

Changed contexts driving internationalisation

The rapid and profound technological, economic, environmental, social and cultural changes that have taken place in the last few decades have had a far-reaching impact on higher education and research, and continue to shape their future. ICT has altered inter-personal, inter-institutional and international relations in all domains, including in higher education and research. With the spread of connectivity, the knowledge society, a growing push for open access to knowledge, and the recent explosion of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) – which are in turn creating a kind of open access to learning – it is clear that knowledge creation, sharing and dissemination have

been and continue to evolve. In conjunction the quasi disappearance of political boundaries as a hindrance to the flow of ideas and communication also means that ICT has turned higher education internationalisation into dynamic processes that are constantly changing.

Economic transformations have been almost as radical as the ICT revolution, particularly within emerging economies such as China, Brazil, India, South Africa and Malaysia, among many others. In redefining trade and geopolitical boundaries and interactions, these transformations are making it far more difficult to divide the world using the classic definition of North and South nations. Yet, economic developments have by no means eradicated poverty and exclusion; in some cases gaps have widened and become more visible in a larger number of countries than before, including in the traditionally rich nations. The potential of emerging economies, with their huge, young populations and rapid economic growth rates, have also helped to redefine international relationships in higher education around the world, attracting more attention and successive higher education delegations ready to sign agreements.

Another reason why internationalisation has become a central policy in higher education is that the reference points that are used in all industrial and service sectors, and in higher education as well, are now international. Global comparison is the norm, and when searching for distinguishing features or markers of excellence, higher education institutions only rarely compare themselves to others at the national level. Benchmarks are increasingly international – whether they are the global institutional rankings, international citation indices for scholarly publications or the partnerships they seek to develop.

Thus the old cliché that universities and knowledge are and have always been international is in fact becoming, at least partially, more of a reality. Much of the higher education rhetoric and positioning takes place in the global setting; in a global higher education space.

In many respects, ease of communication and travel has made this global space seem both more real and much smaller. As well, the global pervasiveness and interconnectedness of challenges that face humanity – environmental degradation and climate change, health pandemics and inter-religious strife among others – have done away with boundaries, making people in all corners of the global space both vulnerable, but also collectively responsible for finding solutions.

These challenges are exerting new pressures on higher education and may shape international collaborations in research and education in the future. Collective responsibility requires a new kind of internationalisation – inclusive of all world regions, and institutional types; comprehensive in both disciplinary terms, and bringing global issues and the diversity of possible solutions into the learning and research environment for all students: those who can, and those who cannot travel abroad.

Consensus and divergence

There is a general consensus that internationalisation is an integral part of higher education development. The vast majority of institutional leaders are committed to pursuing a strategy of internationalisation that acts as a central aspect of institutional change. Being part of international networks in research, taking part in student

exchanges, hosting international students and researchers and sending students for short or longer-term study stays in foreign institutions are now accepted hallmarks of an institution of quality. There is a growing recognition of the need to address challenges facing our planet and humanity and many members of the higher education and research community actively seek to play a major role in finding solutions and alternatives as well as raising awareness among students, and the public at large, about global issues.

Yet, there are also areas of divergence in the ways internationalisation is perceived and acted upon by higher education institutions. Furthermore, in some regions of the world there is a growing sense of scepticism about the process, which requires both attention and a concrete response.

Naturally, differences exist with regard to the real and perceived purposes and aims of internationalisation. For some institutions the priority is on research and capacity building, while for others the primary purpose is to enhance the curriculum and provide more international learning opportunities and competences to students. Indeed for some the process appears to mean primarily international student recruitment for financial gain, to fill the gap left by decreased public investment. Internationalisation strategies are developed in the context of diverse demographic realities, in institutions with different capacities to meet student demands, by academics with a variety of interests and by leaders facing multiple expectations.

Despite these real and perceived differences in the impetus for and the path chosen to achieve higher education internationalisation, it remains true that the process is also taking place in a global context that remains highly asymmetrical in terms of institutional capacities to determine the terms of partnership and collaborative projects. The critics of internationalisation point out that revenue generation, pursuit of a greater market share in the global competition for talent or simply position-seeking in the race for prestige and reputation, have become more important objectives of internationalisation than issues such as quality of learning, academic research interests or international scholarly cooperation. They underline that current trajectories of internationalisation bring possible dangers of cultural and linguistic homogenisation, exclusion, and growing competition rather than increased collaboration.

New, long-term goals and purposes for internationalisation

This diversity of aims and interpretations of internationalisation of higher education is simply a reflection of the differences among higher education systems and institutional types around the world. It is also the source of a multitude of international projects, and innovative initiatives that are creating a dynamic global higher education space populated by numerous interactions, networks, new types of institutions and interconnections among stakeholders at all levels.

So, in addition to trying to determine the form that internationalisation policies may adopt in the future, or trying to find new more accurate ways to define or describe the process, it might be more useful to engage in a dialogue about the nature of the global higher education space that we *wish* to build. Working backwards from that end-point would help the development of internationalisation strategies particularly conducive to reaching these long-term goals.

Building on the IAU discussions so far, the key features that could characterise this global learning and research space include the following: scientific openness and diversity; inclusiveness and commitment to equity in access to learning and opportunities; respect of multiple perspectives; collaborative relations; commitment to pursuing mutual benefits; multilingualism; ethical conduct; commitment to solidarity, to sustainability, to overcoming global challenges by research, and to higher education as a global public good.

Despite the diverse contexts in which higher education strategies are being pursued in the present, the social responsibility of higher education includes the critical analysis of and preparation for various possible futures. Therefore, creating a new narrative of the overall goals and purposes of internationalisation, couched in terms of a shared global higher education space, may provide a new way to determine the specific national, regional and institutional contributions that are required to create such a space in the long-term and to focus the conversations on the shared benefits of improved and more internationally open higher education and research systems.

Just as the scope and complexity of the challenges facing humanity are unprecedented, so are the opportunities to address them. Higher education and research institutions are central to finding solutions and to creating greater awareness among students and the larger public about numerous global issues. Since most of these challenges are intrinsically linked to the globalised nature of our world, internationalisation – defined in the simplest but perhaps the most comprehensive manner as an appreciative openness to the world and to other ways of knowing and learning – is an essential dimension of higher education and of the search for truth and knowledge in this more globalised context. It can also become an essential pathway to a more inclusive global higher education space of our making.

ESSAY 10

The future of internationalisation: three key questions

— Madeleine F. Green

Madeleine F. Green served as Vice President for international initiatives at the American Council on Education until 2010. She is now an independent consultant, senior fellow at the Association of International Universities and at NAFSA, and senior programme consultant at the Teagle Foundation. She was awarded the AIEA's 2010 Charles Klasek Award for outstanding service to the field of international education administration. She is the author of numerous publications on higher education, leadership, and internationalisation.

"The future is not simply an extrapolation of the past."

Predicting the future of higher education is risky business. The external environment is rapidly changing and unpredictable: global and national economies, politics at every level, and forces of nature are not only difficult to predict but also beyond the control of higher education. The last 25 years have seen rapid shifts in higher education, characterised by increasing demand and burgeoning enrolments, growing competition, and the rise of market forces. The growth of private and for-profit-institutions has transformed the higher education landscape in many countries; the increasing search to align higher education with needs of the labour market has unleashed debates about the fundamental purposes of education. Although technology has not yet revolutionised universities, this could change with the meteoric appearance of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), which have challenged conventional assumptions about instructional models and access. Given that the future is not simply an extrapolation of the past, I approach it through three key questions. How policymakers and institutional leaders choose to address them will be crucial in determining the future of internationalisation.

Will internationalisation create winners and losers?

It is not self-evident that globalisation is a boon to all; the internationalisation of higher education also risks creating uneven benefits. Altbach (2008) and others point to the potential for globalisation to create winners and losers and increase the divide between the developed and developing world. The race to rise in the rankings and to attain 'world-class status' disadvantages institutions in developing countries and may push them (or their governments) to make unwise investments. The same divide can also be found within countries, between richer and more elite universities and mass institutions. The heightened role of competition for students and revenue risks putting traditional academic values in jeopardy and affecting access for poor or marginalised students.

Opposing views abound. Friedman (2005), an early proponent of the positive effects of globalisation, points to greater equality of opportunity, the benefits of technology, and the potential of globalisation to level the playing field. Wildavsky (2010a) echoes this optimism, seeing "academic free trade" as a boon, intensifying the trends of mass access, meritocracy, and greater use of technology, and an overall increase in world knowledge. The latter, he

points out, is not a zero-sum game. The advent of MOOCs and other uses of technology support his assertion in that they could help level the playing field by providing increased global access to high quality education.

Concerned about this potential, the International Association of Universities (IAU) has provided an important service to the global higher education community by calling attention to "the need to act to ensure that the outcomes of internationalisation are positive and of reciprocal benefit to the higher education and the countries concerned" (IAU, 2012). The pressures on higher education, including the search for revenue and the competition for prestige, suggest that without conscious efforts by institutional leaders and policymakers to ensure equitable participation and benefits, internationalisation will drive greater global inequities.

Will technology finally be a game changer?

Predictions of the potential of technology to transform education have thus far not materialised. In some countries, technology has greatly enhanced teaching and learning (both face to face and distance learning), yet, the basic model endures. Two applications of technology to higher education are particularly important to consider relative to the future of internationalisation: MOOCs and the use of technology to substitute for or supplement mobility.

MOOCs could indeed be a game changer; time will tell. Thus far, the most prestigious US universities have led the way and other highly respected institutions are joining in – giving MOOCs greater visibility and credibility than they might have had otherwise. And, to date, MOOCs have been free (although this is unlikely to last), with some courses attracting tens of thousands of students from all over the world. MOOCs could precipitate a number of different profound changes in higher education.

Traditional universities around the world could use them to enhance their curricular offerings by adding them to their repertoire of course offerings, with each user institution perhaps supplying additional lectures, discussion sessions and examinations. In this model, universities would greatly enhance their capacity by reaching beyond their borders to take advantage of courses developed anywhere in the world.

Although the MOOCs could be absorbed by universities into their existing programmes and structures, the practice would likely lead to a rethinking of what and how the university teaches as well as who teaches. Another possible path would be for universities to grant credit for successful completion of a MOOC, which assumes that secure and appropriate testing can be developed and that institutions will choose to recognise such learning and count it towards attainment of a qualification.

There is a great deal of precedent for this in the US – including the recognition of credits transferred from other universities at home and abroad, validation of prior experiential and other learning through examinations and portfolios, and evaluation of and credit recommendations for courses offered by businesses and the military by a respected third party. In this scenario, MOOCs simply join a tradition, especially well developed in institutions and programmes catering for adult working students, of evaluating and granting credit for learning acquired in a variety of settings.

The third scenario is a more dramatic departure from current practice: a degree granted for an education obtained through MOOCs. This could be done by an existing higher education institution (depending on the requirements of the accrediting or quality assurance body) or by institutions created for this purpose. The effect would be a 'parallel universe' of a possibly free, but more likely low-cost, education, provided to a great extent by professors from prestigious institutions. There are many questions about the mechanics of this scenario, but it points to the loss of traditional higher education institutions' monopoly over educational credentialing, which is a radical departure from the *status quo*.

Another application of technology with potentially profound impact is its use to internationalise teaching and learning – for example, bringing in lectures from around the world via video (in real time or not), and joining classrooms in different parts of the world for true collaborative experiences. The technology already exists to do this, and the cost goes down every year. As institutions in the developing world gain bandwidth, it will become even easier to implement. Were institutions around the world to become serious about connecting their students and professors to their counterparts in other countries and to use the technology at hand, the impact could be enormous. Every classroom has the potential of being a global one.

Will an institutional commitment to global student learning move from rhetoric to action?

Research conducted by the IAU (2010, p. 21) revealed that by a substantial margin, responding institutions ranked improving student preparedness for a globalised/internationalised world as the most important rationale for internationalisation. Yet the reality on most campuses suggests that there is a significant gap between goals and practice; few institutions view internationalisation through the lens of student learning.

For most institutions, internationalisation is viewed as a set of activities and success is judged by indicators of institutional performance, such as numbers of students going abroad, numbers of international students, or numbers of joint research projects. What these institutional activities mean for student learning is rarely addressed. What is the impact of these activities on student learning? What is the evidence of this impact? For many institutions, mobility is synonymous with internationalisation. Yet only a tiny proportion of higher education students world-wide have the opportunity to study for any period of time outside their home country. Fortunately, 'Internationalisation at Home' is receiving increasing attention, but it is not yet front and centre, nor has the discussion shifted sufficiently from inputs and activities to what students should be learning.

Thus, the key question for higher education institutions is how the overwhelming majority of students who do not go abroad will learn about the world and develop the knowledge and intercultural skills they will need as citizens and workers. To address this question, institutions will need to be very clear about what knowledge and capacities students must acquire, where and how they will acquire them, and what constitutes evidence of such learning. For most institutions, this is a tectonic shift in thinking.

In conclusion

The internationalisation of higher education could proceed in many different ways. Institutional leaders will have important choices to make about balancing the market and academic mission, harnessing technology to increase both quality and access, and the extent to which institutions put student learning at the heart of the institution. Policymakers and institutional leaders will shape the future through the choices they make, or fail to make, and the extent to which they are willing and able to ride the waves of change rather than ducking them.

References

Altbach, P. (2008). Globalization and forces for change in higher education. In *International Higher Education,* Volume 50, (pp. 2–4).

Friedman, T. (2005). *The world is flat.* New York, NY: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux.

International Association of Universities. (2010). *Internationalization of Higher Education: Global Trends, Regional Perspectives. IAU 3rd Global Survey Report.* Paris: International Association of Universities.

International Association of Universities. (2012). *Affirming Academic Values in Internationalization of Higher Education: A Call for Action.* Retrieved November 26, 2012, from http://www.iau-aiu.net/content/re-thinking-internationalization

Wildawsky, A. (2010). *The great brain race: How global universities are reshaping the world.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

ESSAY 11

The future of internationalisation in the contexts of globalisation and a changing higher education landscape

— John K. Hudzik

John K. Hudzik is Professor at Michigan State University, US. He is Past President of the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) and of the Association of International Educators, NAFSA. He is a NAFSA Senior Scholar for internationalisation. He was Dean of international studies and programmes and Vice President for global engagement and strategic projects at Michigan State University. He serves on several boards. He has published widely on international education. He has received several awards, including the Charles Klasek Award of the AIEA.

"Higher education will engage a more robust and comprehensive internationalisation involving all institutional missions. Success will require documenting outcomes and adopting cost effective ways to internationalise."

Internationalisation is undergoing an evolution of *meaning-in-practice* within the context of radically transforming global and higher education environments. Much is in play at once in the arenas of internationalisation, globalisation, and higher education change. The transformations are of global scope, and interconnections across them provide a basis for speculating about the future of higher education internationalisation. There are several dimensions of a future scenario to consider.

The evolving practice of internationalisation

The cross-border flow of scholars and ideas dates from ancient times (*eg* Greece, Rome, China, and more), reinvigorated in Europe during the Renaissance, and again more robustly in the late 20th century. In the 21st century we see a strengthening of higher education internationalisation through a more comprehensive set of *behaviours* within and across higher education. The alignment of academic and public attention, institutional strategic plans incorporating internationalisation, and government policy pronouncements encourage these behaviours. Budget shortfalls and change-resistant academic cultures offer challenges but not insurmountable obstacles to continuing development.

Across world regions, there is rising attention to: (1) mainstreaming student and scholar access to international, global and comparative perspective, including for non-traditional and life-long learners; (2) infusing and integrating internationalisation into all higher education missions (teaching, research, service); (3) expanding participation across academic disciplines, professions, and service and support units; and (4) infusing internationalisation into core institutional values, culture and ethos. These are among the institutional behaviours associated with a more comprehensive approach to internationalisation. A robust scale and scope for internationalisation was presaged by Jane Knight's definition of internationalisation in the mid-1990s and has been made explicit from about 2003 forward in the term 'comprehensive internationalisation', used mainly in the US. Internationalisation will continue to build in such behavioural directions regardless of its title.

Global forces, capacities and consequences

The globalisation of almost everything – labour, markets, cutting-edge knowledge, talent, and challenges such as in the global flow of communicable disease, threats to food safety, security, and conflict – is a reality that shapes life globally. The boundary between local and global is dissipating, if not gone. Local prosperities are increasingly dependent on global co-prosperities. Higher education is not immune to these realities and it seems a matter of common sense to forecast that pressure from students, parents, employers and governments will grow on higher education to become more robustly engaged internationally in its functions.

The concepts 'international', 'comparative', and 'global' intermingle to offer a paradigm for understanding the direction of higher education internationalisation. Historically, the term *international* references bi- and multi-lateral relations among sovereign states. Higher education parallels exist in cross-border, inter-institutional exchanges and project collaborations. *Comparative* methodologies identify salient similarities and differences across entities and have a rich history in building cross-cultural understanding, diversity and learning. Globalisation is about world-spanning forces and factors, which transcend political and geographic boundaries. Global forces affect bi-lateral relations and encourage network formation. The global impacts the local, but the local also mediates and shapes the global. In consequence, few intellectual drivers of higher education are only local or national but rather incorporate the global. A more comprehensive set of behaviours associated with internationalisation are a response to this intermingling and its implications.

The global spread of higher education capacity and the emergence of a global higher education system also shape internationalisation. There is reasonable convergence on views that global higher education capacity will increase 150% from 2000 to 2025, mostly outside Europe, North American and the Antipodes. Mobility is expected to more than double over roughly the same period. Global research capacity is also spreading. Research and development expenditure is widening with Europe presently accounting for roughly 23% of the world's total; the US roughly 31%; and the 10 most research-engaged countries in Asia roughly 31% (up from 23% in 1996). Cross-border joint publications have increased 300% since 1988. Mobility patterns of students and scholars are switching from uni-directional (brain drain) to multi-directional matrix patterns ('brain circulation').

Changes in higher education capacity portend increased competition as well as pressures for collaboration. Stature and success will depend on competing for the best students, scholars and ideas. At the same time, the cost and complexity of cutting edge research makes it difficult for institutions to 'go it alone'. Inter-institutional collaborations become a coping mechanism; the ongoing global spread of research and educational capacity will extend institutional partnering across borders.

Some speculate that higher education will divide into a two-tier system with the 'best' institutions globally engaged through exclusive 'clubs' and the rest locally focused. However, given pressures on higher education generally to internationalise, it seems more likely that a continuum of global/local engagement is more likely. Some institutions because of missions, size and stature will be more comprehensively engaged globally, others will do so in more focused ways matched to narrower

missions and circumstances. Given the powerful realities of globalisation and clientele needs, purely local orientations don't seem appropriate for most institutions. Cross-border 'clubs' of varying kinds and purposes will likely spread.

Forces reshaping higher education

Challenges facing higher education lead some to believe that higher education as we know it will be a thing of the past – for example 'from bricks to Web clicks'. Others are less sanguine about the short-run scope of change. Yet studies in the US, Australia, Europe and by the OECD signal fundamental change in modes of operation and the 'business' model. Three factors seem particularly germane.

Rising costs

In the first place, rising cost, cost shift and changing 'buyer' behaviour. Costs of higher education have risen well above inflation for decades. Across world regions, the proportion of costs borne by consumers is increasing (*eg* rising tuition fees). Public disinvestment in higher education, (decreased funding or inability to keep pace with rising demand) is moving higher education from a public investment toward being privately funded.

Rising costs create inequalities in access; consumers who must pay more become more demanding; informed buyers shop around, sometimes globally, for high value and lower cost alternative locations and formats (*eg* online, private, or for-profit niche options, certifications instead of degrees). Governments, too, demand more in documentable outcomes. Regulation, market pressures and competition will change how higher education does its job.

Will internationalisation be seen as added costs or as adding benefit? This will depend on whether internationalisation: (a) is implemented as an 'add on' (a new cost), or integrated into existing institutional missions (dual purposing existing courses and programmes, projecting institutional research priorities into a global frame); (b) demonstrates valued *outcomes,* and (c) adopts innovative and cost effective methods.

Technology

In the second place, technology is becoming both a substitute for and a supplement to existing learning pedagogies and for enhancing research collaborations; most predict at minimum a hybridisation of pedagogy and research interactions. Web technology is central to the 21st century framework of borderless knowledge access. International engagement will have to fully infuse and integrate the use of technology as a ubiquitous feature of strategy for both instruction and research.

Flexible global networks become essential for linking local and global idea pathways, and soften some of the asymmetries that arise from simpler bi-lateral arrangements. Flexible networks recognise that students, researchers and global partners directly access a plethora of information using the internet.

Given the relative ease of learner access to data and information from global sources, higher education will be able to shift from using classroom time to present data and information (transferring more of that responsibility to learners) to enhancing analytical and critical thinking skills (learning how to learn in a global frame of reference). The internationalisation of learning can focus on understanding the differing lenses through which cultures and places view and act on information. Active-learning pedagogies and peer-to-peer co-creation of knowledge will play key roles in internationalisation.

Documenting outcomes

Thirdly, questions about higher education's added value and demand for greater documentation of outcomes will spread to internationalisation, particularly given scarce resources. Debates over internationalisation being an end or a means will be laid to rest by pressures to demonstrate its learning, research, service and capacity building outcomes. Concerns over one-sided flows of benefits from internationalisation (*eg* brain drain) will also ameliorate through the rise of global higher education capacity, competition, and collaborative networks. Mutual benefits will be the expected standard.

Outcomes need to encompass the overarching purposes of higher education: (a) providing perspective and intellectual skills for interpreting and using knowledge across the global map of human understanding and values; and (b) preparing graduates and societies for life and careers in a global environment. The challenge for internationalisation will be to service both intellectual and applied aspirations. This can be a challenge well met if internationalisation preserves its core interests in building cross-cultural understanding and relations while addressing 21st century global challenges and opportunities.

In conclusion

Higher education will engage a more robust and comprehensive internationalisation involving all institutional missions. Success will require documenting outcomes and adopting cost effective ways to internationalise. The evolving global environment forces the mainstreaming of learning and research access to a global perspective. Internationalising curricula will become pervasive, and mobility (both real and virtual) an integrated part of it. Both cross-border competition and collaboration will increase; however, collaborative networks for learning and research will grow in number and kind as well as in importance. The use of technology will become a core component of learning and research internationalisation. Expanding internationalisation mission behaviours significantly beyond teaching and learning will profoundly reconfigure the mix of decision makers and criteria for cross-border collaborations. Academic units and research sectors will become major leadership players along with the 'traditional' international office.

ESSAY 12

Corruption: a key challenge to internationalisation[1]

— Philip Altbach

Philip G. Altbach is J. Donald Monan, S.J. University Professor and Director of the Center for International Higher Education in the Lynch School of Education at Boston College, US. He served as editor of several higher education journals and is author of many articles and books on international higher education. He has been a visiting Professor and a Fulbright scholar in universities in countries such as China, France, India, Malaysia and Singapore. He has received awards from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD).

"If something is not done to ensure probity in international relationships in higher education, an entire structure built on trust, a commitment to mutual understanding, and benefits for students and researchers – a commitment built informally over decades – will collapse."

A spectre of corruption is haunting the global campaign toward higher education internationalisation. An overseas degree is increasingly valuable, so it is not surprising that commercial ventures have found opportunities on the internationalisation landscape. New private actors have entered the sector, with the sole goal of making money. Some of them are less than honourable. Some universities look at internationalisation as a contribution to the financial 'bottom line', in an era of financial cutbacks. The rapidly expanding private higher education sector globally is largely for-profit. In a few cases, such as Australia and increasingly the UK, national policies concerning higher education internationalisation tilt toward earning income for the system.

Countries whose academic systems suffer from elements of corruption are increasingly involved in international higher education – sending large numbers of students abroad, establishing relationships with overseas universities, and other activities. Corruption is not limited to countries that may have a reputation for less than fully circumspect academic practices, but is a problem that occurs globally. Several scandals have been reported in the US, including the private unaccredited Tri-Valley University; a sham institution that admitted and collected tuition from foreign students. That institution did not require them to attend class, but rather funnelled them into the labour market, under the noses of US immigration authorities. In addition, several public universities have been caught admitting students with substandard academic qualifications.

Quality-assurance agencies in the UK have uncovered problems with 'franchised' British degree programmes, and similar scandals have occurred in Australia. A prominent example is the University of Wales, which was the second largest university in the United Kingdom, with 70 000 students enrolled in 130 colleges around the world. It had to close its highly profitable degree validation programme, which accounted for nearly two-thirds of institutional revenue.

With international higher education now a multi billion dollar industry around the world, and with individuals, countries, and institutions depending on income, prestige, and access, it is not surprising that corruption is a growing problem. If something is not done to ensure probity in international relationships in higher education, an entire structure built on trust, a commitment to mutual understanding, and benefits for students and researchers – a commitment built informally over decades – will collapse. There are signs that it is already in deep trouble.

Examples and implications

A serious and unsolved problem is the prevalence of unscrupulous agents and recruiters funnelling unqualified students to universities worldwide. A recent example was featured in Britain's *Daily Telegraph* (June 26, 2012) of an agent in China caught on video, offering to write admissions essays and to present other questionable help in admission to prominent British universities. No one knows the extent of the problem, although consistent news reports indicate that it is widespread, particularly in countries that send large numbers of students abroad, including China and India. Without question, agents now receive millions of dollars in commissions paid by the universities and, in some egregious cases, money from the clients as well. In the University of Nottingham's case, the percentage of students recruited through agents has increased from 19% of the intake in 2005 to 25% in 2011, with more than one million pounds going to the agents.

Altered and fake documents have long been a problem in international admissions. Computer design and technology exacerbate it. Fraudulent documents have become a minor industry in some parts of the world, and many universities are reluctant to accept documents from institutions that have been tainted with incidents of counterfeit records. For example, a number of American universities no longer accept applications from some Russian students because of widespread perceptions of fraud, document tampering and other problems. Document fraud gained momentum due to commission-based agents who have an incentive to ensure that students are 'packaged' with impressive credentials, as their commissions depend on successful student placement. Those responsible for checking the accuracy of transcripts, recommendations, and degree certificates face an increasingly difficult task. Students who submit valid documentation are placed at a disadvantage since they are subjected to extra scrutiny.

Examples of tampering with and falsifying results of the Graduate Record Examination and other commonly required international examinations used for admissions have resulted in the nullifying of scores, and even cancelling examinations in some countries and regions, as well as rethinking whether online testing is practical. This situation has made it more difficult for students to apply to foreign universities and has made the task of evaluating students for admission more difficult.

Several countries, including Russia and India, have announced that they will be using the Times Higher Education and Academic Ranking of World Universities (Shanghai rankings), as a way of determining the legitimacy of foreign universities for recognising foreign degrees, determining eligibility for academic collaborations, and other aspects of international higher education relations. This is unfortunate, since many excellent academic institutions are not included in these rankings, which mostly measure research productivity. No doubt, Russia and India are concerned about the quality of foreign partners and find the rankings convenient.

Several 'host' countries have tightened up rules and oversight of cross-border student flows in response to irregularities and corruption. The US Department of State announced in June 2012 that visa applicants from India would be subjected to additional scrutiny as a response to the 'Tri-Valley scandal'. Earlier, both Australia and Britain changed rules and policy. Corruption is making internationalisation more difficult for the entire higher education sector. It is perhaps significant that continental Europe seems to have been less affected by shady practices – perhaps in part because international higher education is less commercialised and profit driven.

The internet has become the 'Wild West' of academic misrepresentation and chicanery. It is easy to set up an impressive website and exaggerate the quality or lie about an institution. Some institutions claim accreditation that does not exist. There are even 'accreditation mills' to accredit universities that pay a fee. A few include pictures of impressive campuses that are simply 'Photo-shopped' from other universities.

What can be done?

With international higher education now big business and with commercial gain an ever-increasing motivation for international initiatives, the problems mentioned are likely to persist. However, a range of initiatives can ameliorate the situation. The higher education community can recommit to the traditional 'public good' values of internationalisation, although current funding challenges may make this difficult in some countries. The International Association of Universities' recent report, *Affirming Academic Values in Internationalisation of Higher Education,* is a good start. The essential values of the European Union's Bologna Initiatives are also consistent with the best values of internationalisation. The University of Nottingham, mentioned earlier, provides transparency concerning its use of agents, supervises those it hires, and in general adheres to best practice – as do some other universities in the UK and elsewhere.

Accreditation and quality assurance are essential for ensuring that basic quality is recognised. Agencies and the international higher education community must ensure that universities are carefully evaluated and that the results of assessment are easily available to the public and the international stakeholders.

Governmental, regional, and international agencies must coordinate their efforts and become involved in maintaining standards and protecting the image of the higher education sector. Contradictions abound. For example, the United States Department of State's Education USA seeks to protect the sector, while the Department of Commerce sees higher education just as an export commodity. Government agencies in the UK and Australia seem also to be mainly pursuing commercial interests.

Consciousness-raising about ethics and good practice in international higher education, and awareness of emerging problems and continuing challenges deserve continuing attention. Prospective students and their families, institutional partners considering exchanges and research, and other stakeholders must be more sophisticated and vigilant concerning decision making. The Boston College Center for International Higher Education's Corruption Monitor is the only clearinghouse for information relating directly to corrupt practices; additional sources of information and analysis will be helpful.

The first step in solving a major challenge to higher education internationalisation is recognition of the problem itself. The higher education community itself is by no means united; and growing commercialisation makes some people reluctant to act in ways that may threaten profits. There are individuals within the academic community who lobby aggressively to legitimise dubious practices. Yet, if nothing is done, the higher education sector worldwide will suffer and the impressive strides taken toward internationalisation will be threatened.

Endnote

1. This is an edited version of a previous contribution with the same title to *International Higher Education,* Issue 69, Fall 2012, page 2–4

CHAPTER 3

The impact of internationalisation of higher education in Europe on other parts of the world

— Francisco Marmolejo, Jocelyne Gacel-Ávila, James Jowi and Rahul Choudaha

In the last two decades, Europe has experienced a dramatic evolution of its higher education system especially in matters related to internationalisation. This transition has caused a series of intended and unintended consequences not only in Europe, but also in other parts of the world. This chapter includes an analysis of how developments in European higher education have impacted on other world regions and how these relations are likely to develop in the future. We do not intend to give an exhaustive review of all relevant regions of the world, we reflect on perspectives from Latin America, Asia, Africa and North America as representative of how Europe has impacted the internationalisation process beyond its own borders.

INTERNATIONALISATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE WORLD: HOW MUCH IS DUE TO EUROPEANS?

On a worldwide scale, higher education has in recent years grown in complexity with significant influences from globalisation forces (de Wit, 2012; Hudzik, 2011). Internationalisation of higher education, which used to be seen as a privilege of just a few countries and institutions, and a 'territory' of institutional units dedicated to administering student mobility, has now been adopted in the rhetoric of the majority of institutions and has become a relevant and important component of institutional, regional and national educational policies in a variety of countries.

At the same time, higher education continues to face diverse challenges, which also vary in intensity by region. They include among others, issues of access, quality, financing, institutional capacities, relevance and even ethics. Within this context, more than two decades ago, Europe embarked upon an ambitious enterprise aimed at harmonising higher education degrees, establishing common qualification frameworks, fostering cross-border collaboration among higher education institutions, and massively facilitating mobility amongst students in Europe. Terms such as 'Bologna', 'Tuning' and 'Erasmus' became brands in themselves, not only in Europe but beyond. At the same time, organisations such as the EAIE became important conveners of higher education leaders and practitioners not only from Europe but also from the rest of the world to discuss developments in internationalisation.

The internationalisation process, which was mostly intended to improve higher education within the European context, later became a tool to promote European higher education in the world. It also provided the basis for a more prominent and influential role of European higher education in different regions of the world, it established standards and practices that were adopted in different countries, such as the European Credit Transfer System or Tuning, and it even evolved into an effective tool for European diplomacy.

Latin America

The notion of academic relations between Europe and Latin America (LA) is not new. In fact, this same link is as old as the higher education system in LA itself, as it was established in colonial times emulating the structures already present in Spain, with further influence from the Napoleonic model. Currently, higher education in LA continues to be heavily influenced by these historical roots, mostly in matters related to governance and the professional orientation of academic programmes. In addition, while higher education in LA was experiencing a process of further development during the last century, it relied on faculty members being trained in graduate programmes in Europe, particularly in Spain, France, England and Portugal. To complement this intellectual exchange, European researchers, especially in social science disciplines, preferred LA for international work, occasionally collaborating with peers from Latin American institutions.

In recent years, in the midst of the process of higher education internationalisation in Europe, LA has benefited from a broad range of European Commission (EC) programmes, particularly those focusing on student and faculty mobility, collaborative research projects, development of international networks, institutional capacity-building and reform. One of the leading projects is the 'Alfa Programme', with an investment of more than 100 million euros and the participation of roughly 1700 higher education institutions (HEI) from the European Union (EU) and 18 LA countries.

It has had three phases: *Alfa I* (1994 to 1999), which supported student and faculty mobility including postgraduate studies with the participation of 903 HEIs of both regions; *Alfa II* (2000 to 2006), which was geared to strengthening institutional capacity through inter-institutional cooperation, including scientific and technological projects with the participation of 777 HEIs; and *Alfa III* (2007 to 2013), designed around the following priorities: reform of higher education institutions and systems; highly skilled human resources training; the establishment of an LA common area for higher education, and cooperation between networks from both regions; joint projects for institutional, academic and research management, reform and harmonisation of higher education systems; and the sharing of good practices.

A key initiative has been the 'Alfa Tuning Latin America Project', launched in 2004, in the framework of *Alfa II*. This initiative sought to apply the Tuning methodology to the LA context, with the following objectives: to identify generic and subject-specific competences for 12 disciplines and professional fields (architecture, business administration, chemistry, civil engineering, education, geology, history, law, mathematics, medicine, nursing and physics); to design a competence approach to teaching, learning and assessment; and to outline a system of transferable and comparable credits to measure students' workload similar to the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS).

The first phase of the Alfa Tuning Latin America Project ended in 2007, with the participation of 190 HEIs from 18 LA countries. It excluded the Caribbean countries, with the exception of Cuba. Currently, the project is in its second phase (2011 to 2013) and aims to delineate competences for more areas (agronomy, informatics and psychology), as well as to identify emergent professions for the region.

Another significant initiative was the 'ALBAN High Level Scholarships Programme for Latin America' (2003 to 2007), which awarded 3319 scholarships for students from 18 countries, to study in Master and Doctorate programmes in 17 European countries (European Commission, 2009). The newer programme, Erasmus Mundus, offers scholarships to students and academics through multilateral cooperation projects offering different mobility schemes such as: 'Joint Programmes with mobility scholarships', and 'Erasmus Mundus-External Cooperation Windows', which offer short mobility and postgraduate studies scholarships, as well as faculty mobility grants with third country HEIs. Between 2004 and 2011, Erasmus Mundus has awarded a total of 1829 MA and 45 PhD scholarships, of which almost 50% were granted for MA studies and 60% for PhD studies to Brazilian and Mexican students, followed by Colombians, Argentineans and Chileans (European Commission, 2011a; 2011b).

Also, the Marie Curie Programme has resulted in significant support to build research capacity in Latin America. It was designed to support researchers and HEIs through two modalities: the International Research Staff Exchange Scheme (IRSES), which funds the exchange of researchers and members of institutional networks between Europe and third countries; and the International Incoming Fellowship (IIF), which offers grants to individual researchers with top quality projects to be carried out in the EU. By 2010, IIF had awarded five grants to projects from Brazil, Mexico and Argentina.

The EU has also established the 'Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development' (FP7) (2007 to 2013), with a total budget of 50.5 billion euros. It is open to a wide range of organisations and individuals, such as universities, research groups, public administrations, firms, researchers, international organisations, and civil society, amongst others, and it has two key objectives: to support European competitiveness in selected fields through strategic partnerships with third countries such as those in Latin America, and initiatives that encourage the best third-country scientists to work in and with Europe; and to address specific problems that either have a global character or are commonly faced by third countries, on the basis of mutual interest and benefit (European Commission, 2012).

Besides the EC, other European agencies and organisations sponsor programmes to foster inter-institutional collaboration and support student and faculty mobility, joint academic programmes, postgraduate scholarships and research grants for Latin America such as: the Organisation of Ibero-American States (OEI); the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation for Development (AECID); the German Service for Academic Exchange (DAAD); and the Netherlands Organisation for International Cooperation in Higher Education (Nuffic), supporting such programmes as the Academic

Exchange and Mobility Programme (PIMA), the Pablo Neruda Programme, and the Scientific and Technological Development (CYTED), amongst others.

Such a variety of programmes has undoubtedly contributed to increasing the flow of students and faculty members between Latin America and Europe.

Nevertheless, this type of initiative has also brought about an unavoidable concern for the brain drain of Latin American talent, as has been documented in different studies (Romero, 2009). However, beyond the aforementioned programmes mostly aimed at supporting individuals, an important European influence at the institutional and system-wide level worth mentioning on the regional higher education systems is the so-called external dimension of the Bologna Process. One resulting project has been the 'ALCUE Latin American and Caribbean-European Union Common Area for Higher Education', which is focused on the establishment of comparability criteria for credits and degrees, exchange programmes for students, faculty and administrative staff, quality assurance as well as mechanisms for innovation and technology promoting sustainable development and social inclusion. Another initiative of this kind – although funded mostly by a private European bank – is the recently launched 'Ibero-American Space for Knowledge' between LA, Spain and Portugal, which was promoted by UNIVERSIA at the Second Meeting of Ibero-American Rectors in June 2010. UNIVERSIA is a network of 1232 HEIs in 23 Ibero-American countries, supported by the Spanish Santander Bank (UNIVERSIA, 2010).

The Bologna Process has raised the notion of intra-regional convergence, at the heart of initiatives such as ENLACES, whose aim is to merge all regional networks into a single comprehensive meta-network, with one of its objectives being the establishment of 'Latin American and the Caribbean Common Area for Higher Education'. In Spanish, ENLACES stands for *Espacio de Encuentro Latinoamericano y Caribeño de Educación Superior* (ENLACES, 2009). The idea of regional harmonisation has provoked an ongoing debate on its feasibility and convenience for the region (Brunner, 2009).

One conclusion drawn from the European concepts of diversity and convergence applied to the Bologna Process is that such a process would not imply the standardisation of HEIs in the region, which has been pointed out as an obstacle for a regional harmonisation. Other arguments raised against a regional convergence, grounded in the inter- and intra-regional differences of the higher education systems in the region, definitely need more careful analysis and further research, in order to reach strong conclusions on the feasibility of such a process. In any case, the region has much to learn from the educational model implemented by the Bologna Process, which is at the centre of the ALFA Tuning Latin America Project (Gacel-Ávila, 2010).

Asia

Europe, through three major policy initiatives – the European Higher Education Area under the Bologna Process, the European Research Area (ERA) and Erasmus Mundus

– has played an increasingly important role in influencing internationalisation directions of Asian higher education. These policy initiatives have positively influenced Asia on at least three levels: they established pathways for student mobility and institutional capacity building; they created a framework for higher education reforms; and they also provided a model for intra-regional higher education cooperation. The focus of this section is on East, Southeast and South Asia; it excludes Central and West Asia and Oceania.

Student mobility and capacity building: Similarly to the Latin American case, the European Union has strategically established and funded higher education linkages with Asia. This includes the Erasmus Mundus External Cooperation Window (2009 to 2013), which has enabled the development of major Asia-related higher education projects such as the ACCESS project for institutional cooperation, and the Erasmus Mundus Europe Asia Scholarship Programme, for facilitating the mobility of students from Asia to the EU.

In the period of 2004 to 2011, a total of 5329 Asian students and scholars studied in Europe with the help of Erasmus Mundus scholarships. Of that total, 30% came from India and 25% from China, indicating an over-reliance on these two source countries.

Other programmes facilitating EU–Asia exchange and institutional partnerships, such as Asia Link, a collaboration with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations University Network (AUN), have also been important capacity building tools for Asian institutions.

In 2008, the EU established a Strategic Forum for International Science and Technology Cooperation (SFIC) within the policy framework of the European Research Area to facilitate international science and technology cooperation with third (non-EU) countries. Currently, SFIC works on three international pilot initiatives, directed at China, India and the US, respectively.

The harmonisation of European higher education systems also opened more opportunities for several Asian higher education students and institutions. Post Bologna, the European higher education structure and degree nomenclature are more transparent to Asian students and compatible with their own educational systems. Assefa and Sedgwick (2004) note that "[by] adopting the new Bachelor's/Master's degree structure, European countries also hope to boost the global competitiveness of their institutions of higher education".

Likewise, the introduction of English-taught Master's programmes in Europe has substantially improved the perception and attractiveness of Europe, where language used to be a major hindrance for many Asian students. "The race to develop competitive Master's programmes that are attractive to both European and international audiences has made English-taught Master's programmes one of the most closely watched trends in European higher education." (Brenn-White and van Rest, 2012, p. 6)

Higher education reforms in Asia: One of the major unintended influences of internationalisation in Europe is on the quality assurance and reform processes of countries outside the region. Several Asian countries have recognised the importance of taking a strategic approach to internationalisation and they are learning from the Bologna-inspired reforms in Europe. The Bologna Process put pressure on European countries to develop tools and good practices to make the transition smoother, and these approaches, tools and practices are still adaptable to the Asian context.

Countries such as India, where the pace of reform is slow, are under increasing pressure from the international higher education community to step up their internationalisation activity. However, the response is expected to be mainly at the institutional rather than at the national policy level. For example, given the funding potential from Erasmus Mundus or the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7), institutions need to be competitive to earn those awards and hence they are attempting to improve programme and research quality. At the same time, there are emerging models of collaboration between Europe and India driven by European funding support to entrepreneurial private universities (Choudaha and Orosz, 2011).

As the largest source of international students, many of whom are self-financed, China is a significant force in international higher education, especially now that China is also experiencing success in attracting international students and programmes to its shores to create a more balanced engagement with international higher education (Li and Zhang, 2011). With regards to Sino-European partnerships and mobility, education leaders from the two sides continue to work towards increased collaboration. More than 2000 Chinese students have benefited from Erasmus Mundus grants and nearly 550 Chinese researchers have received funding for research work abroad through the EU's Marie Curie Actions since 2007 (European Commission, 2012).

China is increasingly interested in Asia-Pacific collaborations, as it establishes pilot programmes for credit transfer with Japan and South Korea (Yomiuri, 2012), and a joint scholarship programme with AUN (Gajaseni, 2011). However, China is not without its challenges as the issues of quality have been raised, and recent announcements point in the direction of stringent regulations to come (Sharma, 2012).

Intra-regional cooperation: The Bologna Process is an example of regional cooperation that started as a voluntary process to create a broad regional higher education area. It has since inspired intra-regional cooperation in Southeast Asia as it is the case of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), a geo-political and economic organisation of 10 countries including Malaysia and Thailand, which has been proactive in pursuing a regional higher education cooperation agenda.

The ASEAN University Network (AUN) was established in 1995 (pre-Bologna) with the signing of its Charter by the ministers of higher education from six member countries, and with initial participation of two universities from each country. More recently, in 2009, AUN has developed a credit transfer system called ACTS (ASEAN Credit

Transfer System) to facilitate the recognition of qualifications and to enhance talent mobility within the ASEAN region. The Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO) first articulated the possibility of creating ASEAN research clusters – a concept resembling the European Research Area – at a conference in 2010.

Another major Southeast Asian initiative is the establishment of the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) by 2015, which aims to transform the region into a common market with free flows of goods, services, investment and workers. The new urban class would give rise to a new segment of students – 'glocals' – who are willing to pay for a global educational experience while staying in their home country or region (Choudaha, 2013). This presents significant opportunity for European institutions to engage with 'glocal' students who would stay within the region and not come to Europe.

Africa

Europe has been a leading player and has long historical links with Africa in higher education. As has happened in Latin America, modern higher education in Africa is largely a consequence of the European colonial legacy and was modelled on European university traditions. Most African scholars trained abroad attained their qualifications in Europe. Africa–EU relations have been shaped by some key policy documents. They include the Treaty of Rome (1957); the Lome Convention (1975); the Cotonou Agreement (2000); the joint Africa–EU Strategy (2007); and the European Neighbourhood Policy (2008). These agreements provided a long term policy orientation for cooperation between the two continents based on a shared vision and common principles. In recent years, the main objective has been attainment of the Millennium Development Goals by 2015 and university partnerships for capacity building in different sectors.

The main focus areas of EU support to Africa's higher education have been in: enhancing access and retention amongst disadvantaged populations; expanding research partnerships; establishing collaborative African doctoral programmes; embedding mobility in collaborative frameworks that minimise brain drain; promoting mobility of European students to Africa; improving governance and management of African universities; and supporting increased communication, coordination, data collection and analysis (EUA, 2010).

The historic Africa–EU Summit in Cairo in 2000 was an important milestone for partnerships and collaborations between the two regions. Both regions recognise that higher education and research are essential in tackling the challenges of Africa. While in Europe internationalisation focused mainly on academic mobility, in Africa the focus has been on instructional capacity building and research. As such, most African universities engage with their European counterparts in these two main areas (Jowi, 2010).

These have been useful in institutional capacity building in areas of human resources, infrastructure development, management reforms and research productivity. EU mobility schemes have increased access to specialised programmes especially in post graduate training. The intra-Africa Caribbean Pacific (ACP) Programme is also enhancing

student exchanges within Africa and is working to stem brain drain. In addition to all these developments, many EU member states have substantive bilateral research and development cooperation programmes with African countries, which are complementary to the programmes and projects at the European level.

In another vein, the international attractiveness of the Bologna Process has led to new developments in Africa. Even though Africa's Arusha convention is much older than the Bologna Process, its implementation was halted and has now been resumed following the success of the Bologna Process. This could be considered a wholesale policy transfer that tends to confirm dependency but the consequences may end up being positive for Africa through the programmes for harmonisation, comparability and integration that are now gaining ground (AU, 2008).

Internationalisation efforts between Africa and Europe have led to several opportunities for African universities. The overall results, however, have not been wholly rosy. Internationalisation still presents Africa with the challenge of brain drain, which has claimed leading African scholars to Europe and other developed countries. The other negative outcomes have included: the imposition of wrong policies; the adoption of inapplicable educational models; the manipulation of research agendas; intellectual property concerns; and feelings of superiority from European partners – especially commercial providers, taking advantage of weak regulatory mechanisms in Africa. These have led to varied negative outcomes in different country systems.

North America

The recent process of accelerated internationalisation in European higher education was initially seen in most US and Canadian institutions as something distant and somewhat irrelevant, later as a threat to quality of international undergraduate education, and more recently as an opportunity to learn from some innovative practices and as a venue to expand international academic mobility.

During the initial stages of the process of European integration of higher education, very limited attention was given to US and Canadian higher education institutions. Even during the last decade of the 20th century in meetings organised by the EAIE, participation from the region was still limited. At that time, most individuals and institutions involved in international education in the US and Canada initially welcomed the European process, although later they started to express concerns when the percentage of international students attracted to their institutions started to shrink, while the European percentage started to grow. Concerns were expressed again when some of the harmonisation policies adopted in Europe as part of the Bologna Process began to be implemented at their own institutions (AUCC, 2008) (Roper, S. 2007).

Three-year versus four-year undergraduate degrees: More specifically, in the middle of last decade, when some European countries began adopting the three-year Bachelor's degree model, an ample sector of admissions officers and graduate colleges in US

and Canadian institutions expressed concerns that the new undergraduate degrees were not equivalent to the traditional four-year Bachelor's degree in North America. This created challenges, especially in the case of European undergraduate students intending to pursue Master's or Doctoral studies in the US or Canada.

By 2008, according to a survey conducted amongst research oriented universities in the US by the Institute for International Education (IIE), roughly only one third of 167 respondents had developed policies that treated European and US Bachelor degrees as equivalent, while 13% of institutions were not accepting Bologna degrees as equivalent to the US four-year Bachelor degree. Similarly, a study conducted in 2006 by the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) amongst its members (including 80% of the top 25 international admitting US institutions) showed that 18% did not accept three-year degrees, but that 49% considered such a degree as equivalent to a US four-year degree (Bennett, 2009).

Some years later, despite initial resistance, in general the equivalence has been established although institutions tend to rely on the specific department to which the student is applying in order to make an admission decision no longer based on the number of years of study or the academic workload, but more so on the readiness of the candidate to follow a graduate programme. A good indication of the amount of influence that such European degree harmonisation processes had in US institutions was expressed well by a respondent of the 2008 IIE survey when they indicated that "our focus has shifted from degree equivalency to academic readiness or preparedness" (Bennett, D. 2009).

Tuning: just for Europeans? The methodology developed in Europe to establish common points of reference, understanding and convergence of academic programmes was, in general, unknown in the US and Canada until the Lumina Foundation for Education decided in 2009 to convene in Chicago a group of educators from similar disciplines in different types of institutions to learn about and discuss the feasibility to establish a related initiative in the US. Initially, Lumina's idea was met with a high degree of reluctance and even mistrust by academic staff and institutional administrators. An incentive funding programme from the Lumina Foundation, offered to higher education authorities in Indiana, Minnesota and Utah, allowed academic staff from community colleges, four-year colleges and universities to meet in order to discuss commonalities in their courses, and to define qualifications for graduates.

All of the above led to the creation of a semi-formal network known as Tuning USA, still supported by the Lumina Foundation, and managed by the Institute for Evidence-Based Change. Preliminary reports indicate that this initiative, initially developed for the European higher education context, has allowed participants in institutions and disciplines in the US to recognise that learning can and must be defined in terms of knowledge, skills and application – both general and discipline-specific – and that these outcomes should define degrees at each level in each discipline (McKiernan, 2010).

Likewise, Canada has been exploring ways to implement Tuning in its higher education system. In this regard, the Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE) coordinates and co-sponsors the Canada–EU Tuning Project Feasibility Study, which intends to identify convergences and divergences of approaches to articulating and measuring learning outcomes and reference points in higher education for Canada and member countries of the European Union (CBIE, 2012).

LESSONS LEARNT, AND A LOOK AT THE FUTURE

There is no doubt that in the foreseeable future, European international higher education will continue having a prominent role in the world. However, its importance will vary based on the capacity of its higher education system to improve and innovate. In terms of student and faculty mobility, Europe will continue attracting people from different parts of the world but increased competition from other destinations will make it harder to make the case in favour of Europe, unless – in addition to tradition – relevance and quality of international education is concordant. The more other regions of the world continue expanding and improving their own educational systems, the more the traditional pathways for international engagement with Europe will evolve as well. We share our reflections from the four regions of the world included in this chapter.

Latin America

Future developments in Latin American higher education will be determined by economic and political events, and are difficult to foresee given current regional and global uncertainty. Nevertheless, most experts agree that there is an ongoing shift in the world economy characterised by weak growth in developed countries and a growing participation of emerging economies in the globalisation process through an increase of South–South trade and foreign direct investment (ECLAC, 2011; OECD/ECLAC, 2011). Under this trend, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Peru and Venezuela – just to mention a few typical cases in Latin America – are engaged in new trade avenues by exporting commodities produced from their natural resources; *eg* Mexico is involved in the import-export trade of medium-high technology manufacturing to North America (OECD, 2010a; IDB, 2011). Under both paths, these LA countries will likely achieve a pattern of sustained growth throughout the remainder of the decade if required structural reforms are undertaken. According to the OECD (2012), growth of non-OECD countries will continue to outpace that of the present OECD economies, driven mostly by a narrowing of productivity rates, but the difference in growth rates will likely narrow over coming decades.

As a result, there will be more pressing demands on higher education systems in Latin America, including its internationalisation process, in order to graduate the human resources able to compete in international markets, specifically with higher order cognitive skills, and global and inter-cultural competences. Towards this end, new public and institutional policies have to be implemented, with a corresponding increase in resources.

In planning these policies, the expected decrease of the 15–29-year-old population should be taken into account, a segment amounting to 26.3 million in 2010 and dropping to 22 million by 2030, and to 9.2 million by 2050 (CINDA, 2011; CEPAL, 2011). Without a doubt, this demographic trend will have both positive and negative consequences for regional development.

Nevertheless, the combined effect of a decreasing population of young people and higher economic growth would provide an opportunity to simultaneously improve access and the quality of the higher education systems. In this regard, higher education needs an urgent modernisation in such areas as: implementation of an educational model based on learning outcomes; higher faculty professionalisation with a larger amount of PhD holders, the strengthening of the international dimension of the teaching and learning process and stronger international competitiveness of the research, technological and innovation sectors, amongst others.

To achieve these goals, it is of utmost importance that the traditional idea of internationalisation – limited to student and faculty mobility – should evolve into the concept of comprehensive internationalisation for which the international dimension must be systematically integrated into all development policies in teaching, curricular design, research, innovation, human resources and outreach services.

To conclude, EU programmes have positively and greatly impacted the Latin American region in terms of the modernisation of its higher education systems, institutional governance, curricular development and innovation, and cooperation among industry and the educational sector. In particular, institution-building programmes are key to enhance a greater convergence between tertiary education systems and create a greater synergy with the European Higher Education Area. Finally, there is no other world region than the European Union that offers cooperative programmes with such a large and efficient impact on the sustainable and equitable development in Latin America.

Asia

On the basis of its demographic advantage and the rise of urban consumption, Asia is generally viewed as the engine of future global economic growth. Nearly 100 million people will enter the consumer class with an annual income of more than $5000 by 2015 in six Southeast Asian countries (Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam), according to a recent report from The Boston Consulting Group (2012).

Likewise, in terms of demographics, by 2025, 61% of the world's population will live in Asia, responsible for 30% of world GDP, while the EU will make up only 6.5% of the world's population although responsible for 20% of world GDP (European Commission, 2009). Europe's population is expected to decline by over 8% during this period, while Asia's is set to increase by 30% (Berlin Institute for Population and Development, 2008).

These massive demographic and economic shifts should be critical factors in designing and prioritising Europe's engagement with Asia. The changes in Asia are expected to not only be large in scale but also fast in pace, which means that "Europe should look beyond itself where big changes are happening" (Chan, 2012).

European policies and processes of internationalisation of higher education need to be more aligned with immigration and labour market needs. In particular, skilled immigrants could help increase growth potential and competitiveness (Kahanec and Zimmerman, 2010, p. 1). Within Asia, Japan is already shifting its strategy to a 'skilled migration approach', to encourage employment of international students in a demographically challenged country (Ota, 2012).

In addition to recognising the strong link between student and labour mobility, the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) should also consider increasing intra-regional mobility as a driver to more aggressively build partnerships and programmes with Asian countries. If the EHEA wants to continue to benefit from cooperation with this region, it must recognise that several Asian countries will not accept the role of supplier on the international higher education market for long. Consider the case of Malaysia, which is already positioning itself as a major exporter of higher education, with 90 000 international students currently enrolled at its institutions of higher education.

To conclude, the future of the Asian relationship with Europe in international higher education will mirror its increasing interdependence on economic issues and globalisation. Asia has been positively influenced by European internationalisation policy initiatives by establishing pathways for student mobility and institutional capacity building; creating a framework for higher education reforms; and providing a model for intra-regional higher education cooperation. In contrast to Europe, the demographic and economic growth advantage of emerging countries will strengthen bargaining power of some Asian countries and institutions. This is a shift that European policy-makers and institutions must anticipate and take into consideration in building and sustaining their relationships with Asian countries. While engaging with Asian higher education has its share of challenges that come with Asia's diversity, scale and complexity, the future for strong win-win relationships between the two regions is promising.

Africa

Compared to other world regions, Europe still remains the most strategic partner for Africa in higher education collaboration (IAU, 2010) and, as such, university collaborations between the two regions could be poised to increase. The challenges that these partnerships pose to Africa could also still persist. The EU–Africa strategies, especially in higher education collaborations, could offer more opportunities especially for the development of higher education in Africa. With the increasing global competition for talent, it could be likely that mobility from Africa to Europe could still be on the rise. If the economic crisis in Europe continues, this could have implications on future mobility and university partnerships between the two regions.

Research collaborations will remain an area of mutual interest for the two regions. More than ever before, scientific knowledge has become important for transforming challenges into opportunities for sustainable development. Higher education cooperation could enable Africa to reap more from its opportunities. Notice should also be made of the new developments in other parts of the world, especially the roles of the emerging economies and the growing South–South collaboration. The role of China, Japan, South Korea and other new economies may challenge Europe–Africa relations. Already many African countries are looking east for new collaborations. Another key development is that the higher education scene in Africa is bound to change in the coming years. The positive developments in Africa's higher education – such as increasing enrolment, harmonisation programmes, new mobility schemes, and the strengthening of institutions – may make Africa one of the promising regions for future internationalisation.

To conclude, higher education is now back on the agenda of African governments and of partner organisations. Africa has begun to rise and many developments can be recognised in different sectors including higher education, governance and innovation. These need to be sustained and could be scaled up by strengthening the universities to take their rightful roles in African societies. Governments and development cooperation agencies should develop programmes in close cooperation with stakeholders in Africa. Europe can contribute positively through continued support to Africa to develop its own scientific and technical skills and enhance capacity for utilisation of knowledge for Africa's development. Greater outcomes will be attained through more responsibility where Europe's gains in internationalisation do not necessarily translate in Africa's loss. European and African governments should affirm more priority to mutual partnerships in higher education and develop programmes that open up more opportunities for mutual collaborations.

North America

Even though much attention has been placed lately on increasing international academic collaboration with some Asian countries, in reality a stable connection will continue existing between US, Canadian and European partners – despite the fact that initiatives from governments aimed at financially stimulating such collaboration (such as the 'European Union–United States Atlantis Programme' and the 'Canada-European Union Programme for Co-operation in Higher Education, Training and Youth') have been dramatically reduced or cancelled in the midst of the financial crisis. At the same time, it is evident that both regions increasingly will compete, as they are currently doing, to attract talented young students, especially as a way to populate their graduate programmes.

On the other hand, collaboration between European and US researchers, for instance, remains high, which one would expect considering that almost half of world researchers are located in these two regions and that Europe and the US produce almost three quarters of world patents (Horvat, 2012). However, considering the global demographics and

the continued expansion of higher education and research infrastructure, especially in Asia, international higher education collaboration between Europe and North America may become less relevant and dynamic, even though it is currently stable.

To conclude, in North America, the influence of the European higher education internationalisation process has helped institutions reduce insularism and recognise that there exist ample opportunities for collaborative engagement with European peers. At the same time, institutions in the region no longer ignore developments in Europe, nor do they compete for international students as Europeans do. In fact, these institutions have even begun to accept that some European approaches may make sense in the local context. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that institutions consider further structural changes in curriculum and harmonisation of degrees feasible, as has gradually happened in Europe.

A FINAL THOUGHT

There is no doubt that, for the most part, the impact that the internationalisation process of European higher education has had in the rest of the world has been associated with positive outcomes, but also with some negative consequences. EU sponsored international higher education collaboration programmes and initiatives are regarded as important contributors to regional economic and social development, to the strengthening of democracy and the battle against poverty and inequity in different regions of the world.

The internationalisation process experienced in European higher education during recent years has had a significant impact on the parallel internationalisation processes happening in other parts of the world. In addition, it has contributed to revamping the presence of Europe as a key player in higher education worldwide. Nonetheless, it remains to be seen in future years how such a process will continue evolving, especially considering the financial and political restructuring dynamics happening in Europe and around the world, which will undoubtedly have significant consequences for international higher education in Europe and beyond.

References

Assefa, M., & Sedgwick, R. (2004). The Bologna bachelor's degree: An overview. In *World Education News and Reviews,* Volume 17, Number 1. Retrieved June 30, 2012, from http://www.wes.org/ewenr/04Jan/Feature.htm

AU (2008). *Harmonization of Higher Education Programmes in Africa: Opportunities and Challenges.* Addis Ababa: Africa Union.

AUCC. (2008). *The Bologna Process: Implications for Canadian Universities.* Ottawa: AUCC.

Bennett, D. (2009). *Institutional Strategies for Addressing Three-Year Degrees: Bologna and Beyond.* Proceedings. Council of Graduate Schools 49th Annual Meeting. Retrieved June 30, 2012, from http://www.cgsnet.org/ckfinder/userfiles/files/am09_Bennett.pdf

Berlin Institute for Population and Development. (2008). *Europe's demographic future.* Retrieved from http://www.berlin-institut.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Europa/Kurz_Europa_e_Map.pdf

Brenn-White, M., & van Rest, E. (2012). English-taught Master's programs in Europe: New findings on supply and demand. In *Institute of International Education Briefing Paper.* Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Publications-and-Reports/IIE-Bookstore/English-Language-Masters-Briefing-Paper

Brunner, J. (2009). The Bologna Process from a Latin American Perspective. In *Journal of Studies in International Education.* Retrieved November 13, 2009, from http://jsi.sagepub.com/cgi/rapidpdf/1028315383298O5v1

CBIE. (2012). *Canada-EU Tuning Feasibility Study.* Retrieved June 25, 2012, from http://www.cbie-bcei.ca/international-education-services/tuning

CEPAL (Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe), Centro Latinoamericano y Caribeño de Demografía. (2011). *Estimaciones y proyecciones de la población a largo plazo 1950-2100.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.eclac.cl/celade/proyecciones/basedatos_BD.htm

Chan, T. (2012, April 1). Europe should look beyond itself where big changes are happening. In *University World News.* Retrieved June 30, 2012, from http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20120326232625877

Choudaha, R. (2013, April 27). Know your international student – Global or glocal? In *University World News.* Retrieved May 15, 2013, from http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20130426103907495

Choudaha, R., & Orosz, K. (2011, September). Emerging models of Indian-European higher education Collaborations. In *University World News.* Retrieved June 30, 2012, from http://www.wes.org/ewenr/11sept/feature.htm

CINDA (Centro Interuniversitario de Desarrollo) (2011). *Educación Superior en Iberoamérica.* Informe 2011. Santiago de Chile: CINDA.

Clark, N. (2007, September). The impact of the Bologna process beyond Europe, Part II: Asia-Pacific. In *World Education News and Reviews,* Volume 20, Number 9. Retrieved June 30, 2012, from http://www.wes.org/ewenr/07sept/feature.htm

De Wit, H., Jaramillo, C., Gacel-Ávila, J., & Knight, J. (Eds.)(2005). *Higher Education in Latin America: The International Dimension.* Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

De Wit, H. (2012). Student mobility between Europe and the rest of the World: Trends, issues and challenges. In A. Curaj *et al* (Eds.) *European Higher Education at the Crossroads: Between the Bologna Process and National Reforms,* (pp. 431–439). the Netherlands: Springer.

ECLAC (Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean). (2011). *Latin America and the Caribbean in the World Economy.* United Nations-ECLAC.

ECLAC. (2010). *Social Panorama of Latin America.* ECLAC.

ENLACES (Espacio de Encuentro Latinoamericano y Caribeño de Educación Superior). (2009). *Declaración de Lima.* Retrieved January 3, 2010, from http://www.iesalc.unesco.org.ve/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1186&Itemid=560&lang=es

EUA. (2010). *Africa-Europe Higher Education Cooperation for Development: Meeting Regional and Global Challenges.* Brussels: EUA.

European Commission. (2009). *Programme AlBan.* Retrieved April 17, 2012, from http://www.sgroup.be/data/files/alban-leafleten.pdf

European Commission. (2009).*The World in 2025. Rising Asia and socio-ecological transition.* Retrieved June 30, 2012, from http://ec.europa.eu/research/social-sciences/pdf/the-world-in-2025-report_en.pdf

European Commission. (2011a). Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency. Statistics by country - Erasmus Mundus Masters students selected each academic year, 2004-05 to 2011-12. Retrieved April 18, 2012, from http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/results_compendia/statistics_en.php

European Commission. (2011b). Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency. Statistics by country - Erasmus Mundus Doctorates candidates selected each academic year, 2010-11 to 2011-12. Retrieved April 18, 2012, from http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/results_compendia/statistics_en.php

European Commission. (2012). *Education & culture: EU and China launch people-to-people dialogue.* Press release IP/12/381. Retrieved June 30, 2012, from http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/381&type=HTML

European Commission. (2012). *Seventh Framework Programme* (FP7). Retrieved April 18, 2012, from http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html

Gacel-Ávila, J. (2010). Factibilidad del Proceso de Bolonia en América Latina. In F. López Segrera, & D. Rivarola (Eds.), *La Universidad ante los desafíos del siglo XXI. Asunción.* Paraguay: Revista Paraguaya de Sociología.

Gajaseni, N. (2011). *Cross-border higher education and regional cooperation in East Asia.* Retrieved June 30, 2012, from http://www.rihed.seameo.org/mambo/activities2010/III-I-2_Aj.%20Noi_Cross-Border%20HE%20and%20Int%27l%20Coop%20in%20East%20Asia_AUN.pdf

Horvat, M. (2012). *EU-USA S&T cooperation in a global context.* Proceedings. BILAT-USA Symposium, Vienna, 23-24 April 2012. Retrieved June 30, 2012, from http://www.euussciencetechnology.eu/uploads/docs/KN_01_HORVAT.pdf

Hudzik, J.K. (2011). *Comprehensive Internationalization: From Concept to Action.* Washington: NAFSA. Retrieved June 30, 2012, from http://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/NAFSA_Home/Resource_Library_Assets/Publications_Library/2011_Comprehen_Internationalization.pdf

IAU (International Association of Universities). (2010). Internationalization of Higher Education: Global Trends, Regional Perspectives. In *Third Global Survey Report.* Paris: IAU.

IDB (Inter-American Development Bank). (2011). *One Region, Two Speeds?* Washington: IDB.

Jowi, J.O. (2009). Internationalization of Higher Education in Africa: Developments, Emerging Trends and Policy Implications. In *Higher Education Policy,* Volume 22, (pp. 259–261).

Jowi, J.O. (2010). Africa. In *Internationalization of Higher Education: Global Trends, Regional Perspectives.* Paris: IAU.

Mohamedbhai, G. (2008). *Effects of Massification on Higher Education in Africa.* Accra: AAU.

Kahanec, M., & Zimmerman, K. F. (2011). *High-Skilled Immigration Policy in Europe.* IZA Discussion Paper No. 5399. Retrieved June 30, 2012, from http://ftp.iza.org/dp5399.pdf

Kuensel Online (2012). *University Grants Commissions Committee heads meet.* Retrieved April 20, 2012, from http://www.kuenselonline.com/2011/?p=30193

Li, M., & Zhang, Y. (2011). Two-way flows of higher education students in Mainland China in a global market: Trends, characteristics and problems. In *Higher Education Dynamics,* Volume 36, (pp. 309–327).

Marie Curie Fellows Association. (2012). Retrieved April 30, 2012, from http://www.mcfa.eu/newmcfasite/

McKiernan, H.H. (2010). *The Bologna process: an international focus on quality.* Indianapolis: Lumina Foundation. Retrieved June 10, 2012, from http://www.wiche.edu/info/walf/meetings/annual2010/presentations/mckiernan.pdf

OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). (2012). *OECD Economic Outlook.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2011). *Education at Glance 2011.* Paris: OECD.

OECD. (2010a). *Economic Globalisation Indicators.* Paris: OECD.

OECD. (2010b). *Reviews of National Policies for Education: Santa Catarina State, Brazil 2010.* Paris: OECD.

OECD/ECLAC. (2011). *Latin American Economic Outlook 2012: Transforming the State for Development.* Paris: OECD.

OECD-The World Bank. (2009). *Tertiary Education in Chile.* Paris: OECD.

Ota, H. (2012). Changes in internationalization of Japanese higher education. In *IAU Horizons.* Retrieved June 30, 2012, from http://www.iau-aiu.net/sites/all/files/IAU_Horizons_Vol17_3_18_1_EN.pdf

RICYT (Red de Indicadores de Ciencia y Tecnología). (2010). *Indicadores.* Retrieved January 15, 2011, from www.ricyt.org

Romero, L.M. (2009). Scientific Capacity Building Across Borders. In J. Fegan & M.H. Fegan (Eds.), *Education Across Borders.* Dordrecht: Springer.

SAARC. (2009). *Open and Distance Learning.* Retrieved June 30, 2012, from http://www.saarc-sec.org/areaofcooperation/detail.php?activity_id=15

Salmi, J. (2003). *Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education.* Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Scimago Institutions Rankings. (2011). *Ranking Ibero-americano SIR 2011.* Retrieved March 15, 2012, from http://www.scimagoir.com/pdf/ranking_iberoamericano_2011.pdf

Sharma, Y. (2012, March 15). Not all foreign partnerships are good quality – Top ministry official. In *University World News.* Retrieved June 30, 2012, from http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20120315215016166

Teferra, D. (2008). The International Dimension of Higher Education in Africa: Status, Challenges and Prospect. In D. Teferra, & J. Knight (Eds.). *Higher Education in Africa The International Dimension.* Accra/Boston: AAU/CIHE, (pp. 44–79).

The Boston Consulting Group (2012). *The companies piloting a soaring region.* Retrieved June 30, 2012, from http://bit.ly/IyX8A7

UIS Data Center (UNESCO Institute for Statistics). (2010). Retrieved April 12, 2012, from http://stats.uis.unesco.org/unesco/ReportFolders/ReportFolders.aspx

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2011). *Global Education Digest 2011.* Montreal: UNESCO.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2010). *Global Education Digest 2010.* Montreal: UNESCO.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (1997). *International Standard Classification of Education* (ISCED97). Retrieved November 10, 2010, from http://www.uis.unesco.org/publications/ISCED97

UNIVERSIA. (2010). *II Encuentro de Rectores Guadalajara 2010,* Volume 1. Number 2. Mexico, D.F.: Santander Universidades.

Yomiuri, S. (2012, April 13). Revitalizing Japan – Creative use of land / Nations move toward free trade in brain power. In *Daily Yomiuri Online.* Retrieved June 30, 2012, from http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/dy/national/T120412006128.htm

About THE AUTHORS

Francisco Marmolejo is Tertiary Education Coordinator and Lead Higher Education Specialist of the World Bank based in Washington D.C, US. Prior to this, he was founding Executive Director of the Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration (CONAHEC) and assistant Vice President at the University of Arizona. He has been International Consultant at OECD in Paris, France, American Council on Education Fellow at the University of Massachusetts, US, and Vice President for academic affairs at the University of the Americas in Mexico. He served on the boards of NAFSA and AMPEI and currently is member of the board of World Education Services, and the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation at UNICAT in Milan, Italy.

Jocelyne Gacel-Ávila is Professor at the University of Guadalajara, Mexico, where she has been conducting the internationalisation process for more than 20 years as Director of the Office for International Relations. She has published more than 12 books and roughly 70 articles on the theme. She has conducted research and surveys for different international organisations such as the World Bank, OECD, Ford Foundation, CONAHEC and Observatory on Borderless Higher Education. She was President of the Mexican Association for International Education, is founding Chief Editor of *Educación Global* Journal (AMPEI), and sits on the Advisory Board of the *Journal of Studies in International Education.*

James Otieno Jowi is the founding Executive Director and Secretary General of the African Network for Internationalisation of Education (ANIE). He also teaches Comparative and International Education at the School of Education, Moi University, Kenya. He has published on internationalisation of higher education, especially in Africa and has also presented conference papers on the same. He was a member of the IAU Task Force on the Third Global Survey on Internationalisation of Higher Education. He is also a member of the IAU Ad-hoc Expert Group on Rethinking Internationalisation. He is finalising doctoral studies in Higher Education Studies at CHEPS, University of Twente, the Netherlands.

Rahul Choudaha is Director of Development and Strategic Development at World Education Services, New York. He specialises in strategic management of higher education, transnational education and student mobility. He earned his PhD in Higher Education from the University of Denver, US and holds a Master's in Management and an undergraduate degree in Engineering. He serves as an editorial board member of the *Journal of Studies in International Education* and also edits a blog on international higher education trends.

ESSAY 13

Asia and the need for a new imaginary of internationalisation in Europe

— Fazal Rizvi

Fazal Rizvi is Professor in Education at the University of Melbourne, Australia, having joined the University in 2010 from the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, where he established and directed its online Master's programme in Global Studies in Education. He had previously held academic and administrative appointments at a number of universities in Australia, including as Pro Vice Chancellor (International) at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology and as the founding Director of the Monash Centre for Research in International Education. His most recent book is: *Globalizing Education Policy*.

"Many believe that just as Europe dominated the world in the 19th century and the US dominated in the 20th, we have now entered an Asian century."

Europe's changing and dynamic relationship with Asia

Asia has always occupied an important place in the European imaginary. While Asia is seldom named explicitly as a policy issue in higher education, it nonetheless provides a backdrop against which the possibilities of internationalisation are imagined in Europe. This imaginary is not static, however. It has changed in line with the shifting geo-political conditions, and in light of Europe's shifting strategic requirements. If this is so, then one way of looking back at the past 25 years of international education in Europe is to historicise its changing and dynamic relationship with Asia.

In any review of this kind, it is important to acknowledge that various Asian systems of higher education – at least in their modern form – are colonial constructs, created by various European powers to educate local elites, capable of administering the political machinery of empires. Universities in India, for example, were created by the British Empire not only to provide higher learning but also to develop a local disposition favourable to imperial interests. British universities, such as the University of London, played a major historical role in colonial outreach in education. The ideological form of this Orientalist education was arguably global, designed to inculcate in colonised people a normative perspective on the world.

After independence, European universities had to develop a different kind of relationship with Asia – no longer located within the colonial architecture of dominance but concerned with what was referred to as projects of international development. These projects aimed to bring modernisation to the newly independent countries. European universities played a major role in providing the technical skills that the newly independent countries needed in order to eradicate poverty, industrialise their economies and thus become fully active members of the global community. They also provided the know-how that these countries needed to develop their own new institutions of higher learning. Students from Asia were given scholarships to undertake their studies in Europe, with the expectation that they would return to assist in development projects and in building the new institutions of modernity.

Emerging discourses and relationships

When the European Association of International Education (EAIE) was established 25 years ago, this line of thinking was still dominant in Europe,

though major changes were clearly on the horizon. While institutions of higher education in Europe remain committed to helping the development of Asian universities, and providing scholarships to deserving students, there has also been a marked shift in European universities in their imaginary of Asia. With the emergence of the discourses of trade in higher education, Asia has become a major source of fee-paying students. With declining public funds allocated to universities in Europe, Asian students now constitute an important ingredient in the logic of higher education privatisation. The financial sustainability of many European universities now depends on the revenue received from Asian students. This has changed the nature of the relationship between Asia and Europe in higher education towards an increasingly commercial form.

This much is clearly evident in the assumptions underpinning the Bologna Process. In the creation of the European Higher Education Area, the Bologna Process seeks to facilitate greater mobility of students and encourage high quality academic programmes that aim to prepare graduates to participate more effectively in the global knowledge economy. However, the Bologna declaration is equally concerned with the development of a Europe-wide system of higher education that is internationally competitive. Its focus on coordination and comparability of qualifications is arguably informed by its interest in the creation of a European higher education area that can compete effectively in the global market, against other major suppliers of higher education, such as Australia and the US. In this way, the logic of Bologna is entirely consistent with the ideological injunctions of the World Trade Organisation and GATS. It assumes global trade to be fundamental to the sustainability of European systems of higher education.

Over the past 25 years, the idea of internationalisation of higher education has largely been framed in market terms. The global market in higher education has largely re-defined students as clients and academic programmes as services, while new technologies of student recruitment have been established. In these recruitment efforts, Asia has featured prominently. This is hardly surprising since it is the fast growing economies of Asia, such as China and India, which have the potential to supply the largest number of fee-paying international students, and since student demand for international education in Asia has grown rapidly. Within this modality of trade, Europe has cast itself as an exporter of higher education, while assuming Asian countries to be importers.

A new imagery based on equality and reciprocity

The question we now need to ask is whether this imaginary of Asia now needs to be reconsidered – and whether the asymmetry of economic relations that it presupposes is still appropriate. Over the past decade, the scale and pace of Asia's economic, political and social transformation has been remarkable, while Europe has experienced a significant decline. This transformation has been accompanied in Asia by a postcolonial confidence that is unprecedented. Many believe that just as Europe dominated the world in the 19th century and the US dominated in the 20th, we have now entered an Asian century. The Chinese economy, for example, is predicted to become the largest economy in the world before 2030. This transformation has resulted in the emergence of a huge Asian middle class that is deeply interested in investing in higher education and in international experiences.

This might suggest that European higher education stands to derive considerable benefits from the economic growth of Asia, vindicating its commitment to global trade in education. It might suggest new commercial opportunities capable of rescuing the cash-starved European universities. However, this reading of the implications of Asia's economic rise for thinking about European higher education would, in my view, be fundamentally misleading and potentially harmful. This is so because this reading is based on an instrumental view of Asia, which rests on an imaginary of Asia as Europe's others, and assumes that relationships with Asians must be forged in order for Europe to realise its economic and strategic purposes. In this way, this imaginary fails to overcome its colonial origins, and does not recognise the dynamism of Asia's social and cultural institutions, including higher education, nor does it recognise the fast changing attitudes in Asia towards Europe, which desire relationships that are based on assumptions of equality and reciprocity.

Most Asian countries are investing heavily in the development of their own systems of higher education. This investment is designed to meet the growing student demand, but also to position many Asian universities as 'world class'. The National Universities of Singapore, Peking and Hong Kong, for example, are already placed very highly on the various ranking systems. They no longer view themselves as 'developing' but already 'highly developed', matching – if not exceeding – the research output and quality of most European universities. They are also forging regional alliances for student mobility and research links within Asia in much the same way as Bologna has in Europe.

This of course does not mean that leading Asian universities are not interested in international networks, alliances and collaborations. On the contrary, they recognise that internationalisation of higher education is fundamental to their continuing development within the global knowledge economy. However, as they become more confident, they can be expected to refuse the asymmetries of status and power that was assumed in each of colonial, developmental and commercial perspectives on internationalisation. They are likely to insist on new modes of working together as equal partners. A more contemporary agenda for internationalisation of higher education therefore needs to transcend economic instrumentalism, and explore instead by a policy imaginary that views Asian cultures in their own terms and not simply as a means to Europe's economic and strategic ends.

Reference

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing Education Policy.* New York: Routledge.

ESSAY 14

The future of regionalisation of higher education in East Asia

— Futao Huang

Futao Huang is currently Professor at the Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University, Japan. His major research fields are concerned with internationalisation of higher education and a comparative study of curricular reform in China and Japan. Since the late 1990s, he has published widely in Chinese, English and Japanese languages in many international peer-reviewed journals.

"The alignment of various systems, considered as an initial step towards the regionalisation of higher education in East Asia and an early stage in the formation of an East Asian community, will be more significantly sought and strengthened."

Trends in regional mobility

Since the late 1990s, with a rapid expansion of trade and economic activities in the region, and influenced considerably by the Bologna Process, there has been growing personal movement across borders, intra-regional higher education networks and other academic activities in East Asia. To illustrate this, with respect to student mobility within the region, according to UNESCO statistics for 2011, approximately 50% of the students from Asia and the Pacific studying abroad actually do so within the region, compared to 36% in 1999.

In some countries and territories, such as Indonesia, Japan, South Korea, Vietnam, Hong Kong and Macao, students from Asia and the Pacific accounted for more than 90% of the foreign students. In China, Japan and South Korea, the lists of the top five countries of origin of foreign students comprise, in addition to the US, countries of the region, *eg* Vietnam, Thailand, Malaysia, Mongolia, and Taipei, China. Parallel to the rapidly increasing numbers in student mobility, there has been a corresponding growth in regional mobility of academics.

There has especially been a gradual growth in full-time foreign faculty members from neighbouring countries who are recorded as employed in higher education institutions in China, Japan and South Korea in particular. For example, the number of full-time faculty members from Asia at Japanese universities had grown considerably by 2010. Similarly, the number of full-time faculty members from China and Japan at Korean higher education institutions tripled between 2003 and 2008. Related trends are concerned with a quick rise in numbers of inter-university agreements and joint degree programmes in the three countries.

Trends in regional collaboration

In a major sense, compared with what happened in the three countries prior to the early 1990s, North-East Asian countries – typically represented by China, Japan and South Korea – have placed more emphasis on a closer linkage and collaboration with their partners in the region. In addition, at a national level, tremendous endeavours have been made in China, Japan and

South Korea to undertake a wide range of collaborative activities in higher education in more diversified fields. Among which, the most recent effort of this kind was the launch of the Campus Asia Project in April 2010; aiming at facilitating regional mobility of students, faculty and researchers, and developing further collaboration in higher education.

In the framework of this programme, the three countries have formulated national policies and strategies to further integrate their higher education systems. These initiatives include the provision of financial support to build intra-region university networks, to design joint curricula and joint degree programmes that combine the three countries' cultural and academic strengths, and to provide more English-taught degree programmes. Currently, major universities in China, Japan and South Korea expand their English language lectures and degree programmes for undergraduate and graduate studies in order to attract more students from the other North-East Asian countries.

Future trends in regionalisation

Do growing mobility of both students and academics, and increased regional collaboration suggest that a further regionalisation of higher education will appear in East Asia? Will it be possible for countries in East Asia to develop a regional framework of cooperation in higher education with a clear characteristic in the coming 25 years? It is challenging to define the accurate meaning of regionalisation of higher education in the Asian context, and far more difficult to measure how significantly a regionalisation of higher education is taking place and will proceed in East Asia. Based on efforts that have been made in each country, earlier findings from academic research, and ongoing internationalisation of higher education in East Asian countries at the policy, institutional and individual levels, we may foresee major trends towards regionalisation of higher education in the coming 25 years.

First, compared with countries in South-East Asia where a regional or inter-regional cooperation of higher education started as early as in the 1960s, North-East Asian countries developed their policy on strengthening their cooperative relationships with South-East Asian countries and forming regional networks and cooperation of higher education in real earnest as late as the latter part of 1990s. However, apparently, a great deal of progress had been made. For example, studies have indicated that, in accordance with the final report accepted by the ASEAN+ leaders from China, Japan and South Korea in October 2003, 14 recommendations were made in relation to the economic, educational and social/cultural sectors, and working groups were created.

The educational recommendations covered Lifelong Learning programmes; credit transfer systems; scholarships and exchange programmes for students, faculty and staff; cooperation in research and development; centres of excellence, including e-learning; and curricular development as the basis for establishing common regional qualification standards among interested centres and institutions. Therefore, it is predictable that there will be an increasingly closer cooperation of higher education between South-East Asian countries and North-East Asian countries. This will definitely lead to a further regionalisation of higher education in East Asia.

Second, although central governments will continue to maintain a strong regulation and supervision, or even control, over higher education in relation to national policy

on internationalisation or regionalisation of higher education in a vast majority of East Asian countries, there will be a continuous and rapid expansion of intra-regional trade and economic cooperation. This is in addition to efforts at an institutional level to facilitate the pace and scope of regionalisation of higher education in East Asia. The importance of the role to be played by national governments and regional organisations cannot be overestimated. Especially national governments will inevitably become key actors and strong drivers to strengthen regional cooperation of higher education institutions and to create an East Asian higher education dimension.

Third, functional approaches towards strengthening a regional development of higher education will become more emphasised. There will not only be more collaborative efforts made at institutional and individual academic levels in order to stimulate the movement of students, academics, campuses, and academic programmes, but also an increased focus on the establishment of regional university networks, quality assurance frameworks, academic credit systems, qualification recognition systems, labour mobility frameworks, and so forth. In short, the alignment of various systems, considered as an initial step towards the regionalisation of higher education in East Asia and an early stage in the formation of an East Asian community, will be more significantly sought and strengthened.

Finally, with growing cooperation of higher education among countries in the region, a number of centres of excellence and more regional organisations and frameworks specifically designed for cooperation and integration of higher education will be established in East Asia. These centres and organisations will certainly make contributions to an increased collaboration of higher education, particularly in nation-crossing mobility of students and academics, teaching, learning, and research activities within the region. More importantly, along with other political, academic and professional organisations within East Asia, they will be more actively involved in undertaking and stimulating inter-regional collaboration of higher education with Africa, Europe, Latin America and North America. By doing so, a more distinct identity of East Asian higher education will come into existence.

Challenges for regionalisation

Doubtlessly, there will be numerous and complex issues to be addressed. Especially the trilateral collaboration in China, Japan and South Korea will play a decisive role in the regionalisation of East Asia. It is not only because the three countries are economically powerful countries, which will affect the economic development in the region, but also because they own the largest population of students and academics within the region. China, in particular, has built up the largest higher education system in the world.

Other related issues include unbalanced economic development among mature and emerging countries, conflicting political and ideological points of views, diversifying religions and values of culture, marked differences in higher education development ranging from an elite phase of higher education to a near-universal access to higher education, and so on. However, if each individual nation within the region benefits from the regionalisation of higher education, and if these issues can be dealt with, the future of regional cooperation or regionalisation of higher education in East Asia still looks bright and promising.

ESSAY 15

Internationalisation of African higher education: a different approach?[1]

— Goolam Mohamedbhai

Goolam Mohamedbhai, who now operates as an independent higher education consultant, has served as Secretary General of the Association of African Universities, President of the International Association of Universities and Vice Chancellor of the University of Mauritius. He was also Chairman of the Council of the Association of Commonwealth Universities and has been a member and Vice Chair of the Governing Council of the United Nations University, Tokyo, Japan.

"African universities have been grossly disadvantaged by internationalisation of higher education in the North."

Internationalisation is not new to African higher education. Indeed, it was through internationalisation that most African universities were created and developed. The majority of them were patterned on universities in countries of which they were former colonies. Most of their faculty were trained in universities in the North; the institutions with which they had the largest number of exchange programmes were located in the North, the curricula and programme structures of their degrees were similar to those in Northern universities, and all the institutions used a European language for instruction. Whether these universities were appropriate to Africa's social and economic development at the time is debatable. They were alienated from the rural areas where the majority of the population lived and where the development challenges were greatest. It has been argued that this was one of the reasons for the eventual decline of many African universities in the decades that followed.

Four decades later, African universities are going through a major process of revitalisation and European and other Northern countries are again prepared to assist. But the global higher education environment now is very different and a new concept – globalisation – is playing a determining role. Universities in the North, mostly public-funded, are short of local students because of demographic changes, and lack resources because of decreasing state funding. Understandably, these factors are guiding their internationalisation endeavours, which are bordering on globalisation. Higher education is being increasingly regarded as a commercial product, governed essentially by market forces, and has brought in the notion of competitiveness. Commercialisation and competitiveness – concepts which were considered anathemas in the university world – can have a very negative impact on African higher education, as opposed to the favourable effects of internationalisation such as greater academic mobility and mutually beneficial partnerships.

So far, African universities have been grossly disadvantaged by internationalisation of higher education in the North. Academic mobility is grossly skewed; with the exception of South Africa and Egypt, very few foreign students come to Africa, while outward student mobility from Africa is among the highest in the world. There has also been significant brain drain of academic staff to the North. Also, Africa has to cope with an invasion of cross-border higher education providers, in many cases of dubious quality.

Internationalisation strategies impacting Africa

There are two internationalisation strategies currently guiding most universities in the North. First, the universities want to be global, because increasingly their teaching and research activities go beyond their national boundaries. Second, they aim to become world class, stemming from their desire to improve their competitiveness by being ranked high in one of the world university rankings. African universities, prompted by their governments, are also getting seduced by these concepts and many are incorporating them in their strategic plan. But is being global important for African universities at this stage? Surely their priority should be to serve the urgent local and regional development needs. Considering that the criteria for world ranking are heavily biased towards research, publications in international refereed journals and citations, should African universities really aim to be ranked? Their main concern should rather be to undertake relevant developmental research, even if this is not acceptable for publishing in international journals. Of special concern is that by trying to be global and world class, African universities may neglect their important function of community engagement – so vital for their societies. They do, however, need assistance to improve the quality of their teaching provision and their research output. Their aim, and that of their government, should be that they be quality assured, not globally ranked.

The Bologna Process, with the original objective of harmonising European higher education, is another important internationalisation strategy that is having an impact on African higher education. Because African and European universities historically share many similarities, the Bologna Process and its Licence-Master-Doctorate (LMD) reform are being introduced in many African universities, mostly francophone ones. Harmonisation is undeniably important for African higher education but the environment that was prevalent and the extensive consultative process that was used in Europe may not be the same in Africa. Simply replicating the Bologna Process in Africa without adapting it to local conditions and culture may do more harm than good to African higher education. It could, for example, lead to greater brain drain towards the North.

A different, African approach

So, does this mean that African universities should not have an internationalisation strategy? Certainly not, but they should adopt a different approach. They need to contextualise and prioritise their internationalisation activities. Since many African countries share the same development challenges, their universities need to give preference to regional activities, regionalisation being very much a sub-set of internationalisation. Most funding and development agencies are supportive of regional collaboration among African universities. The involvement and commitment of national policy makers in this new approach to internationalisation of higher education is crucial. There is equally a need for dedicated and coordinated efforts regionally to support internationalisation of higher education in Africa, for example by the African Union, the Association of African Universities (AAU), the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA) and the UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Dakar (BREDA). The recently created African Network for International Education (ANIE) will undoubtedly play a catalytic role.

African universities also need to collaborate with institutions in other developing regions such as Asia and Latin America, which have similar development concerns. And they should also maintain their existing collaboration with universities in the North, but gear their activities towards their specific needs. A large number of universities in Europe and North America already have long and fruitful partnerships with African universities, have expertise on the challenges facing Africa and are willing to share them in a collaborative and mutually beneficial way. Above all, in a world that is inevitably globalised, working and collaborating with institutions in all parts of the world, but on agreed terms, can only be enriching for the universities and students in Africa.

With regard to cross-border higher education institutions, they undoubtedly help in increasing access to higher education in Africa, assist in promoting Life Long Learning and professional development and make programmes of foreign universities accessible locally, at a significantly lower cost. However, those universities in the North that genuinely wish to assist African countries in their higher education development by operating on their territories, should do so responsibly and ethically, respecting the local norms and cultures, responding to the needs of the countries they operate in and always ensuring that they do not weaken the existing local institutions.

Endnote

1. This is an updated and edited version of a previous essay with the same title, published in the special issue *'In Focus: Re-Thinking Internationalization'* of IAU Horizon, Volume 17 and Volume 18, Number 1, February/March 2012, pp. 19–20.

ESSAY 16

Science without Borders and other initiatives: international education the Brazilian way

— Rosa Marina de Brito Meyer

Rosa Marina de Brito Meyer has worked at Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio), Brazil for more than 35 years and is currently Associate Professor in the Department of Letters and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, in charge of International Cooperation. She also serves as Academic Coordinator of Portuguese as a Second Language and PUC-Rio's Coordinator for the Science without Borders federal government programme. She has dedicated her professional life to Portuguese as a second language and international cooperation. She currently serves on the board of the Forum on Education Abroad.

"Brazil is a unique case, with a sophisticated higher education system and internationally respected research."

For a number of historical, political and cultural reasons, education in Latin American countries is diverse and therefore cannot be approached as a block. While some Latin American countries have always presented very high levels of literacy, in others a large amount of children are left out of school. The number of years of mandatory schooling differs from country to country. Universities may be centuries old in a few countries, but they tend to be very young in most of them. Graduate programmes are not widely offered in most of the continent. Brazil is a unique case, with a sophisticated higher education system and internationally respected research in many areas of study.

Characteristics of the Brazilian system

The Brazilian system is paradoxical in several aspects but at the same time very successful in other ones, namely the graduate and research level. It comprises public and private institutions. All public institutions, in all levels of education, are totally free of charge, *ie* they are fully maintained by the government and students don't pay any type of tuition or fees. Private institutions can be divided in two types: the for-profit and the not-for-profit; both charge tuition and do not receive any governmental funding. The whole system – both public and private – is ruled, evaluated and accredited by the federal government through the Ministry of Education. In order to attend higher education, students must be approved by passing a mandatory entrance exam, the *vestibular* or the ENEM – the National Secondary Exam.

The Constitution determines how public institutions are to be funded: higher education institutions by the federal government; secondary ones by the states; and primary education by the counties (or districts or municipalities). There lies one of the main problems of our system: the smallest group of students is supported by the richest power, the federal government, while the huge population of children is left under the auspices of the local governments, most of them financially endangered. As a consequence, public primary education tends to be of bad quality, with very few exceptions, and higher education is generally of very good quality.

In the private system there is an almost opposite situation. The best elementary and secondary schools in the country are private, most of them confessional. On the other hand, with very few exceptions, private higher education

institutions tend to be teaching only institutions, many of them of questionable quality. While 75% of the student body is enrolled in private institutions, more than 90% of the research is conducted in public ones. Only a very small number of private universities can be considered graduate research intensive institutions – the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro being one of them.

Developing graduate studies and research through scholarships

In Latin America, Brazil was the pioneer country in developing graduate studies and research as the main goal for higher education. The two main national funding agencies were founded back in 1951: the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) in the Ministry of Education, and the National Counsel of Technological and Scientific Development (CNPq) in the Ministry of Science and Technology. Both these agencies were created with very clear objectives:

- To establish a nationwide higher education programme
- To provide scholarships for higher education faculty members' qualification
- To allow faculty members' participation in scientific events abroad
- To support scientific events in the country
- To facilitate international cooperation between institutions
- To fund the hiring of international professors
- To disclose Brazilian academic and scientific production
- To provide access to international academic and scientific production
- To promote international collaboration

With the support of these agencies, a major programme for the development of a quality higher education system was created back in the 1950s. In a very general approach it can be said that these two agencies funded mainly:

- A massive number of Master and PhD scholarships abroad for faculty members in the 1960s and 1970s
- Master scholarships in Brazil and PhD scholarships abroad in the 1980s
- A few undergraduate scholarships abroad for engineering students mainly, local Master and PhD scholarships, and sandwich PhD and postdoctoral scholarships abroad in the 1990s and 2000s
- The *Ciência sem Fronteiras* - Brazilian Scientific Mobility Programme (BSMP), formerly known as *Science without Borders,* for undergraduate STEM fields students and students of other areas, in the 2010s

The BSMP is not the first nor the only mobility programme promoted by the Brazilian government, as many people wrongly think. The BSMP is an enlargement of a policy that has been successfully enforced in Brazil since the 1950s.

During these decades, the agencies CAPES and CPNq also funded Brazilian faculty members' and graduate students' participation in international conferences, international visiting professors in Brazilian universities, organisation of scientific events, scientific publications, among other activities. And in 1981, CAPES took the responsibility of developing and implementing a nationwide graduate programme evaluation system. All programmes are evaluated every three years by a peer committee and are graded from 0–7, with 0–2 being bad grades that recommend the programme to be cancelled, and 6–7 being excellent grades based on international standards.

The collection of all these initiatives made the difference. Brazil developed a unique, serious and sophisticated higher education system that aims at increasing academic quality and developing state-of-the-art research at all times. With plenty of funding opportunities, faculty members and researchers are urged to continue to evolve and strive for international standards.

Science without Borders: the BSMP

Unfortunately, the creation of a wide system of national graduate programmes, with the consequence that CAPES and CNPq provided fewer scholarships for study and research abroad, resulted in a scenery opposite to the one envisioned in the early times: an extreme regionalisation of our higher education, a vicious look at ourselves and consequently a less international approach. The BSMP was created as a reaction to this situation.

Other motivations and goals also led the federal government to launch the BSMP programme, in particular the urgent need of engineers. Roughly 500 000 are expected to be needed in the next few years due to the demand for renewal energy, and the need of updating the country's infrastructure, among other things. But only 5% of the 30 000 undergraduate degrees awarded annually in Brazil are Engineering degrees. And for that reason, the BSMP focuses primarily on the STEM fields and a small number of other areas, such as Medicine. The BSMP is not the only programme; it is imperative to stress that the other types of scholarships are maintained: for national Master's courses and for international sandwich PhDs, postdoctorates and so on, in other fields of study, including Humanities and Social Sciences. The BSMP represents an increase of the number of scholarships in the STEM fields, not the exemption of funding in the other areas.

In numbers, the BSMP will provide 101 000 scholarships to undergraduate, PhD and postdoctoral students abroad, as well as to new and senior PhDs entering the country. The BSMP funds all activities related to the students' exchange: their airfare, tuition, room and board, an installation stipend as well as a materials/equipment stipend. As of March 2013, 22 646 Brazilian students have been sent abroad, to 39 countries, with the US being the one that hosted the largest number.

All seems perfect – a very well conceived and designed programme that puts Brazil in the spotlight in the international education scene and brings waves of visiting delegations to every campus in the country. But there are a number of challenges to overcome. The programme revealed that Brazil is a monolingual country: universities are having a hard time finding enough students who are capable of passing language proficiency exams. The selection process in Brazil has been confusing, and CAPES and CNPq seem compelled to change the criteria and procedures all the time. The international agencies responsible for placements generally do not consider the students' wishes or the universities' previous linkages. It is mandatory for the universities who adhered to transfer the credits gained abroad, but in many cases there are no compatible courses available. Private universities are struggling with the decision of charging or not charging tuition while the students are abroad.

Nevertheless, it is a magnificent programme that has been widely welcomed by the international academic community. What is to become of the Brazilian education system after the BSMP? Time will tell.

CHAPTER 4

International student mobility yesterday, today and tomorrow: a contrasting view from different corners of the world

— Irina Ferencz, Rajika Bhandari, Melissa Banks and Janet Ilieva

The key role of international student mobility in the internationalisation of higher education institutions and systems around the world is hardly contested. International student mobility, whether for degree or credit purposes, is regarded by many as the most ancient form of internationalisation. It remains the element most closely and fundamentally associated with international education and thus is most widely supported at regional, country and institutional levels. In the first decade of the 21st century, the number of international students nearly doubled from 2.1 million in 2000 to 4.1 million in 2010, growing at an average annual rate of 7.2% (OECD, 2012). Currently:

> Europe is the preferred destination for students studying outside their country, with 41% of all international students. North America has 21% of all international students. Nevertheless, the fastest growing regions of destination are Latin America and the Caribbean, Oceania and Asia, mirroring the internationalisation of universities in an increasing set of countries. (OECD, 2012, 361)

The question is: will this growth continue into the future and if so, how exactly?

In an effort to provide a concise answer to this salient question, important developments in international student mobility throughout the world, both of a policy as well as a purely statistical nature, are described. The analysis focuses primarily on Europe, with the UK, Germany and France at the forefront, and two other important country-level players in international student mobility of the last decade – the US and Australia – as well as on Asia (singling out China, India, North Korea, Malaysia, Singapore and other emergent players). Given the nature of the phenomenon of international student mobility, however, the coverage is in a sense global.

We also look at how the different countries and continents situate themselves *vis-à-vis* the others, and at how recent mobility trends and policy developments, both domestic and global, are expected to impact on the countries'/continents' future international positioning. We briefly cover developments related to transnational education (TNE), *ie* the mobility of programmes and institutions instead of that of students, as a phenomenon that is expected to have a large impact on traditional mobility flows and patterns in the near future.

The hard facts and the reflections are presented by country and continent, respectively. In an attempt to avoid the generic and all-encompassing term 'mobility', we distinguish, whenever possible, between degree mobility and mobility as part of the home degree (short term exchange and study abroad).

EUROPE

Past and present – policy context and trends

Student mobility has remained at the heart of internationalisation efforts in Europe, being almost synonymous to internationalisation in some European countries. For several decades now, Europe has been featuring amongst the frontrunners of international student mobility next to the US and Australia, being both 'home' for a sizeable share of foreign degree-seeking students worldwide (*ie* for incoming students), as well as a major source of study abroad students (*ie* of outgoing and incoming credit mobility). Yet, while Europe shares many similarities with these two other key players, one element singles out the 'old continent' in this international comparison, namely the so far unparalleled attention and support given to this phenomenon at policy level; both at the European level and in the national arenas. Two main developments have triggered this level of support – the Bologna Process and the ever greater, though not always welcomed, involvement of the European Union in the educational matters of its member states through, amongst others, mobility programmes such as Erasmus.

Policy developments in both the EU[1] and the Bologna[2] contexts have upgraded international student mobility into a nearly continent-wide objective, although the actual effect of the two processes on quantitative student mobility trends is still a matter of debate. With very few exceptions, two types of mobility have and continue to be given high priority at the European policy level and in individual European countries – *outgoing credit mobility* and *incoming degree mobility.*

While there are meaningful similarities between European countries in their approach to student mobility, it is equally clear that there is also significant variation in the role individual European countries play on the international student market; in the extent to which they are able to pursue European mobility ambitions and goals, *eg* the 20% mobility benchmark to be reached by 2020[3]; and in the resources they have at their disposal to promote student mobility.

Overall, in 2009, Europe[4] hosted (according to EUROSTAT statistics) close to 1 650 000 foreign degree-seeking students, *ie* almost double the number it received in 1999 (827 000) – the start year of the Bologna Process (Teichler *et al,* 2011).[5] In relative terms, roughly 7% of students enrolled towards a degree in Europe had a foreign nationality. Despite this general ascendant trend, Europe's share of the international student 'market' is decreasing, as is the case with other traditional destinations in recent years; concretely, Europe's share dropped from 50.3% in 1999 to 45% in 2009, and it is expected to further drop in the future.

Only three European countries – the UK, Germany and France – host roughly 60% of all foreign degree-seeking students in Europe, *ie* more than a quarter of international students worldwide. At the other end of the European spectrum are smaller-size countries such as Malta that only receives a few hundred foreign students per year. In relative terms, foreign degree-seekers have the highest presence in Cyprus and the UK, where one in four and one in five students respectively is a foreign national (Eurydice, 2012), while in countries such as Poland they make up for less than 1% of the total student population. Like in many other parts of the world, Chinese students are the largest national group of foreign degree-seekers in Europe, while Indian students show the fastest growth over the past years.

In turn, the number of European nationals that enrol for a full degree abroad is less than half the number of international students within Europe (just above 700 000 students), a reality that makes Europe a net importer continent. In addition, very few of the mobile European students go outside the continent; the very vast majority of them prefer to pursue a degree in another European country. Certainly, the free movement of people between the member states of the European Union has facilitated this recent trend and is good news for European integration processes, but if this tendency is to continue in the long term, the lack of direct contact and knowledge of European graduates about non-European countries will certainly prove counterproductive for the continent (Teichler *et al,* 2011).

Looking at the balance between student inflows and outflows in countries that are members of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) – currently 47 – a recent Eurydice publication groups the European countries into four main categories, showing the degree of country-to-country variation in the European mobility context. Europe is composed of:

- 'Attractive' systems (countries such as the UK, France, Denmark or Sweden that have low outbound mobility and very high incoming mobility)
- 'Open' systems (countries that have, in addition to high inflows also rather high outflows, such as Germany, Austria and Switzerland)
- 'Limited' systems (those in which outflows are high, but inflows are low, including countries such as Estonia, Ireland and Malta)
- 'Closed' systems (encompassing countries such as Turkey, Portugal and Romania, with low inflows and outflows)

As far as credit mobility is concerned, the only cross-national database for this type of mobility available is that for the Erasmus programme. On average, 1% of all students in Europe go abroad every year with this programme for a short stay at a higher education institution or company in another European country. However, according to recent estimates, overall, *ie* including non-Erasmus credit mobility, between 2% of students in Poland and 14% of students in the Netherlands, Finland and Norway have been enrolled abroad for a short stay during their higher education studies (Orr *et al,* 2011).

The policy discourse, as well as recent European mobility trends, perfectly portray the continuous vacillation of Europe, as a whole, between a cooperative and a competitive approach in international education. For example, on the one hand, promoting credit (short-term, exchange type of) student mobility between the European countries (through programmes like Erasmus), and on the other hand, promoting the recruitment – the 'attraction' – of higher numbers of degree-seeking students from abroad, primarily from outside Europe. These 'double standards' are also visible in the tuition fee policies applied by European countries such as the UK, Denmark, Sweden and the Netherlands, to name just few.[6]

The discussion about recent student mobility developments in the European context would be incomplete without a few words on transnational education (TNE), *ie* about the mobility of programmes and institutions, rather than of individuals. Among European countries, the UK is clearly the uncontested leader in TNE engagement, combining a variety of modes of delivery (from branch campuses, to franchising and joint delivery of degrees), while the majority of European countries generally confine themselves, to date, to joint delivery models – their involvement in this kind of collaboration dates back to the early 1990s. To get an idea about the size of this phenomenon in the UK, in 2011 roughly half a million students were recorded to be studying oversees towards a degree, either fully or partly offered by a British institution (British Council, 2012).

The future tense

Forecasting the future is certainly not the easiest of tasks. There are, however, a number of developments that we can safely expect in the coming years. Mobility will continue to be high on the European agenda – recently-set targets and objectives are proof of that. In this context, the European Union, and especially the European Commission, will continue to be an important policy driver, being the only supranational entity in Europe that has, along with some decision-making power (even if limited in the field of higher education), the strings and the financial means to support its policies, unlike the Bologna Process (the EHEA), which is much more voluntary and flexible in character.

In this positive climate, it is, however, clear that degree and credit mobility is no longer seen by all as an uncontested positive factor – as recent debates about the impact and cost of internationalisation in several European countries have shown (see for example the Netherlands, the UK, and Denmark). This means that European, national and institutional decision makers will have to focus more than ever on qualitative aspects of mobility, rather than on quantity, and – very importantly – ensure that mobility support measures bring return on investment. We expect to see – also as a consequence of the current financial turmoil – tuition fees introduced in more European countries.

Furthermore, the increasing need for highly-skilled workers will require a greater focus on attracting more (and smarter) international students, in particular in science and

technology, and at the graduate level, as well as on increasing their stay rates in the host countries. However, as the study *'Mobile Talent? The staying intentions of international students in five EU countries'* – namely Germany, the Netherlands, the UK, France and Sweden – (Sykes, 2012) shows, the focus on international students as a means to increase skilled migration is not without obstacles:

> Although international students do possess a number of qualities that make them an attractive group of skilled migrants, they still require services and support to guarantee their integration. Emerging research findings and the results of this report indicate that simply studying in a country is not sufficient to overcome many of the difficulties migrants face, such as gaps in language proficiency, acculturation, visa insecurity and concerns about family migration and discrimination. (Sykes, 2012: p. 7)

This is a matter that should be addressed by policy-makers in the near future, as the study highlights that almost two out of three international students expressed the intention to stay after their graduation, but only one out of four actually does so.

Moreover, it is clear that while Europe (and specifically a number of individual European countries) will remain an important destination for foreign students worldwide, the continent's share of the global market will continue to shrink, due to the emergence of new destinations, and in particular of China. To what extent this phenomenon will alter traditional mobility patterns remains, however, to be seen.

The pursuit of balance in degree mobility flows will very likely prove untenable in Europe, as long as the principle of free movement of people remains a basic right within the EU and as long as what drives degree mobility patterns are individual choice and the perceived quality of other higher education systems, more than national or European policies – with one exception: individual cases where countries will manage to work bilaterally to correct particularly detrimental imbalances (see, for example, the case of Austria and the French Community of Belgium now working with the European Commission to safeguard their quotas for foreign students in medical and paramedical studies).

Recent analyses also show that short-term credit mobility is starting to be, and will be even more so in the future, a victim of its own success. The increased participation of students in credit mobility makes this less of an exceptional feature, lowering the competitive advantage that formerly mobile graduates used to have on the labour market (Janson et al, 2009). Nevertheless, this does not mean that international experiences will no longer matter towards the employability of graduates. On the contrary, they will move from being an exceptional feature to a normal component, in other words a 'CV requirement' – a must.

THE UNITED STATES (US)

The past and present[7]

International student enrolment at American colleges and universities has been growing steadily over the past five years, increasing by 6% in 2011/12, to reach a record high of 764 495 students. The largest increase came from China, with Chinese student numbers rising by 23% – the fourth consecutive year of double-digit increases. There are now 30% more incoming students studying at US colleges and universities than there were a decade ago. While over 2000 US higher education institutions host international students, the majority are concentrated at a relatively small number of colleges and universities. As a result, international students comprise less than 4% of total higher education enrolment in the US (although they comprise 10% of all graduate students).

The academic quality and research facilities of US universities have typically attracted both undergraduate and graduate students from abroad. In 2011/12, international enrolments at the undergraduate level outnumbered those at the graduate level by a small margin for the first time in twelve years: 41% of all international students are studying at the undergraduate level, 39% at the graduate level, and the remaining are pursuing either non-degree study or Optional Practical Training. Students engaged in undergraduate study increased by 6%, while non-degree study increased by 17.4%. In fact, international student enrolment in non-degree study (such as certificate programmes) has seen rapid growth in the past few years, suggesting that an increasing number of students are seeking short-term, non-degree study overseas.

The most visible trend in international student enrolment in US institutions over the past 2–3 years has been the sharp increase of Chinese students, who now outnumber Indian students on American campuses. Three of the top places of origin are in Asia – China, India, and South Korea – pointing to the continuing predominance of Asian international students in the US. But there have also been some interesting shifts in the origins of international students that are worth noting. Saudi Arabian students in the US have increased steadily ever since the Saudi Arabian government launched a large study abroad scholarship programme in 2004. As a result, Saudi Arabia is now the fourth largest country of origin of international students in the US (with 34 139 students), a growth of 50% over the prior year.

On the other hand, the number of US students seeking an international (credit-type) study experience has risen steadily with 273 996 students studying abroad for academic credit during the 2010/11 academic year. Despite this being an increase of 1.3% over the prior year, the rate of growth is lower than before, primarily due to large drops in numbers of American students going to Mexico and Japan due to safety concerns and natural disasters, respectively. But according to a recent US Study Abroad Snapshot Survey, carried out jointly between IIE and the Forum on Education Abroad, which revealed trends for 2012, the situation is improving and more American students are already returning to Japan.

In addition to the study abroad credit mobility data gathered through Open Doors, a forthcoming IIE/Project Atlas report reveals that 46 000 students were enrolled for full-degree study at overseas institutions in 2010/11, with the UK, Canada, France and Germany being the top destinations.[8] Despite this progress, it is still the case that less than 2% of all US students enrolled in America's colleges and universities study abroad in any given year, and only roughly 14% of those who graduate with a four-year college degree study abroad during their undergraduate careers for a short period.

In an attempt to address barriers to study abroad, US campuses are diversifying their study abroad programme offerings by creating innovative shorter programmes for students whose major and/or personal and family obligations restrict their ability to spend an entire semester or academic year abroad.

American students' interest in studying and in learning about 'non-traditional' destinations has been increasing over the past two decades. Most of these destinations are non-Western and non-Anglophone countries. In 1989/90, eight of the top 20 study abroad destinations were located outside Europe; while a decade later, 14 of the top 25 are located outside Europe. Nevertheless, Europe remains the most popular destination region, with almost 54% of Americans opting for credit mobility in Europe, while Latin America and Asia attract 15% and 12% of the total, respectively. Key US government initiatives, such as President Obama's *100 000 Strong Initiative for China* and the *Passport to India initiative,* have also fuelled students' interest in non-traditional destinations.

There is growing awareness in the field of US education abroad of the importance of applied or work-based learning overseas. Recent studies have identified a pressing need for a US workforce that is more globally aware, more competent in foreign languages and intercultural skills, and more familiar with international business norms and behaviours. This need is most acute in the STEM fields (science, technology, engineering and mathematics), while only few academic programmes provide adequate training and educational preparation in these areas (Donahue and Altaf, 2012). Only 4% of US students who received credit for study or work abroad in 2010/11 were engineers, while mathematics and computer science students made up only 2% of US credit mobile students.

Looking ahead: key issues

The US has seen steady growth over the past few years in the numbers of international students and this trend is likely to continue, although the sending countries might be somewhat unpredictable. The past few years alone have shown some interesting shifts in key sending countries, primarily as a result of national-level policies or initiatives to send students abroad. In terms of the other side of the equation, US students will continue to go out in increasing numbers but will seek more applied experiences, as well as non-credit experiences such as internships, volunteering and research activities.

One of the issues related to mobility for US institutions is the concentration of students from any single country, namely China. While China has been the top country

of origin of international students in the US alone since 2009, some US institutions are already feeling the consequences of the rapidly increasing number of Chinese students on campus. Issues that have been discussed in the field include how to integrate Chinese students with domestic students and non-Chinese international students on campus; how to improve the English language skills of Chinese students who primarily speak Chinese within their on-campus social networks and are unable to participate fully in class discussions, where they may be misunderstood or not be understood by domestic students; how to conduct successful international student orientations when students come primarily from one linguistic group and speak the language with each other during orientation, causing students from other countries to feel marginalised, *etc.*

The US can learn some valuable lessons from the response of the industry and government in Australia. China is the top country of origin of international students in both Australia and the US. Although Chinese students currently comprise 22% of all international students in the US – the highest concentration from one country in the history of Open Doors – compared to Australia, the concentration of Chinese students in the US is quite low. Chinese students comprise roughly 40% of total international students in Australia, *ie* twice their proportion in the US. Some methods that Australian institutions have used to cope with the high concentration are manually assigning Chinese students to different course sections, having instructors assign group work to mixed groups of domestic and international students, *etc.* For more information, see Student Voices: *Enhancing the experience of international students in Australia* (Lawson, C., 2012).

Another issue that US institutions are likely to face in the near future is whether or not to allow the use of agents in the recruitment of international students, a current topic of much debate in the US. Legislation currently bans the use of agents in the recruitment of domestic students at US colleges and universities, as agents are seen as potentially restricting student choice by directing students to the institution that pays the highest price per student rather than to the institution that is the best fit for that student. Currently no legislation governs the use of agents for international recruitment; however, many believe that the same legislation should also apply to international students. Others believe that both students and institutions are placed at a disadvantage if they are not able to access the local expertise of agents as institutions. What is to happen in the future on this issue remains to be seen.

And the US, like Europe, has a shortage of highly-skilled graduates in sciences and engineering. Even though, in comparison, the US has been more successful over the years to attract top scientists, migration laws and regulations have been an increasing obstacle, and there is ongoing pressure from both the education sector and the employers to further open up opportunities for immigration of international students and scholars to the US (see, for instance, Hawthorne, 2012: pp. 424–426).

AUSTRALIA

Today Australian universities are engaging internationally through a multitude of partnerships, collaborations and joint partner initiatives. Inbound student attraction remains important while the policy emphasis is shifting to a desire to attract but also retain PhD students. In parallel, internationalisation of the curriculum and of the student experience continues to gain importance in recognition of the need to build graduate competences for a global knowledge and innovation economy. These shifts exemplify a new era in Australian international education, one of deeper and more sustainable internationalisation, a phase typically referred to as 'the internationalisation phase'.

International engagement in Australian universities

In the late 1980s, a major change to Australia's overseas student policy was introduced, ushering three decades of solid growth in onshore international student enrolments.[9] In a period when funding for higher education was in decline, an export industry in education services emerged that soon rivalled major national exports of coal, iron and tourism. Today there are over 200 000 degree-seeking international students studying onshore in Australia's universities, providing 16% of university revenue and producing over 2.5 million graduates.[10]

For the last 30 years, Australia has been a popular choice for international students, but recently growth has slowed. In the wake of some violent attacks on international students, changes to Australian skilled migration policy, and changes to student visa regulations, commencing enrolments are static. Numbers of private VET and English language providers have been rationalised. Provider closures along with a strong Australian dollar and increased competition from traditional (US, UK and Canada, for example) and non-traditional destinations (including China and Singapore) have left Australia comparatively less attractive than before as a study destination for international students.

Australia's universities are also adjusting to a range of significant system reforms. Following a major review of Australia's higher education system in 2008 (the Bradley Review), the Australian Government has developed a 10 year programme of reforms to the regulatory and financing frameworks for higher education. Targets for higher education participation and completions have been set and a demand-driven funding model introduced, along with a national system of accreditation and quality assurance. The tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) will establish and regulate national benchmarks of quality and performance for the sector. In the international education sector, recent changes to Australia's student visa policy have shifted responsibility from the Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC) to universities in order to assess prospective students against genuine student visa requirements to ensure only genuine students are granted student visas and comply with their visa conditions throughout their studies in Australia. The recent release of the White Paper *Australia in the Asian Century* by the Australian Government has significant implications for

Australia's future engagement in the region.[11] Following the release of this White Paper, the Australian International Education Advisory Council (a representative body formed by the Australian Federal Government in 2011 tasked with providing advice on the challenges and opportunities facing the international education sector in Australia) released its advisory paper *Australia Educating Globally*[1,2]. The paper provides advice on the development of a national international education strategy, building and elaborating on many of the propositions in the Asian century White Paper.

Inbound student attraction remains important for Australian universities but emphasis has shifted to strategies designed to attract high quality research (PhD) students. Research scholarships are used to attract research students with Australian universities reinvesting on average 6.8% of their international student tuition fee revenue into research scholarships for new entrants from abroad (AUIDF, 2011). Growth in research enrolments in recent years has come from international students, with little growth in domestic students. Across Australia, 29% of all postgraduate research students are international students, up from 17% in 2005 (DIISRTE 2005 and 2012).

International research collaborations are proliferating in recognition of the need to build research capacity, co-create value, share resources and infrastructure, maintain research currency and global relevance, and advance institutional global rankings. Australia's research outputs, as measured by publication rates, doubled between 2002 and 2010, while internationally co-authored publications tripled over the same period. The US and Europe remain primary sources of research partners but the greatest rate of growth has occurred in co-authored publications with research partners located in China and India (Office of the Chief Scientist 2012). In just over 20 years, Australian universities have built over 7000 active formal agreements with international institutional partners, almost 3000 of these formed in the last three years (Universities Australia 2012).[13] Most of these (70%) involve a component of academic and research collaborations. Agreements are predominantly with partners in the Americas and Europe (56%), but agreements with Chinese partners have increased by more than 50% in only five years, signalling a shift in focus towards collaborations in Asia.

Outbound student mobility is gaining importance and priority as Australian universities strive to produce graduates capable of thriving in a global knowledge economy. In 2011, the equivalent of 12% of Australian completing undergraduates undertook an international study experience as part of their degree studies, almost triple the mobility rate in 2005 (Olsen 2012). Ninety-four percent of these international study experiences were for academic credit. With almost 14 000 outbound international study experiences for Australian undergraduates, universities now send one student abroad for every four incoming undergraduate students. Europe and North America have been traditional destinations for Australian students but mobility to Asia is increasing and will continue to rise with Australian government and university assistance. The recent Australian government initiatives 'Add China Toolkit' and 'AsianBound Grants Programme', along with the 'Australia China Science Research Fund' and 'Australia India Strategic Research Fund', are illustrative of government commitment to increased

engagement in Asia.[14] Universities will seek to align student and staff mobility with increased engagement in Asia. Institutional collaborations are pivotal to deeper and more sustainable international engagement.

Following a period of rationalisation that coincided with increased regulation by the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) in the mid 2000s, provider and programme mobility is again on the rise for Australian universities. In semester two of 2012, transnational education (TNE) enrolments in Australian universities reached an all-time high at 78 000. This represents 25% of all international student enrolments at 38 universities. Only 6% were enrolled in programmes delivered wholly by distance education or online, demonstrating that the vast majority of students are enrolled in a form of institutional or partner supported delivery (AUIDF, 2012). So far, there are 12 Australian university international branch campuses (IBCs) established in seven locations in Asia and the Middle East (Lawton and Katsomitros, 2012) and 25 Australian universities are involved in partner supported TNE. The vast majority of Australian TNE activity (92%) occurs in Asia.

What the future holds

There is a significant shift occurring in the demand and supply equation of global student mobility. Continued growth in tertiary student numbers, growth in non-traditional destinations for international students, growth in programme and provider mobility, and greater regionalism, will propel Australian universities to rethink their existing approaches to international education and recalibrate towards more comprehensive internationalisation, with deeper and more focused engagement with selected international partners, with increased focus on Asia. Australian universities will increasingly leverage their international partnerships to compete locally and internationally for status, recognition and funding.

Collaborations with university partners in Asia will increasingly generate enrolments. Collaborating universities will each exploit their global connections to attract student enrolments. A variety of delivery modes will be utilised across geographic borders, signalling a shift away from traditional face-to-face delivery. Australian universities will seek to align their research and outbound mobility programmes with inbound mobility and transnational education delivery. This will involve deeper research and educational collaborations and increased student and staff exchanges with institutional partners. Increasingly these partners will be located in Asia, propelled through federal and state government policy and trade initiatives and assistance schemes, and adding to the multitude of partnerships already in existence with universities located in the US and Europe.

With respect to international student recruitment, global competition will be especially fierce for research students. Australian universities will prioritise international PhD student attraction and retention. Federal and State governments and associations of providers (such as Universities Australia) will provide focused support through targeted scholarships. Internationalisation of the curriculum and the student experience will be

more important than ever as employers and professional bodies require that graduates have the global perspectives and intercultural competences deemed essential in a global knowledge and innovation economy. Accordingly, staff and student mobility will continue to gain institutional and government support.

ASIA

The changing education landscape

The stable economic growth and rising wealth across many of the Asian economies over the past few decades have facilitated the rapid expansion of higher education systems across the continent. Domestic capacity building has been a major preoccupation for the majority of the Asian nations, where a significant challenge has been improving the standards of education provision.

Governments across the region are placing increasing priority on their tertiary education systems with the belief they will deliver on national priorities, alleviate poverty and contribute to the growing wealth. The tertiary education sector in Asia now amounts to almost half of the world's tertiary education, with India and China alone accounting for 29% of global enrolment. Among the other big players are Indonesia (4.9 million students), Iran (3.4 million students) and South Korea (3.3 million students) (UNESCO Institute of Statistics data).

Outward student mobility was traditionally viewed by Asian governments as a means to make up for the lack of adequate capacity at home. Generous scholarships were offered to those willing to study abroad (*eg* in China and Malaysia). The 'import' of education through the growing variety of transnational education (TNE) provision was boosted following the East Asia currency crisis in 1997/98, which significantly affected countries' spending power and families' ability to send their children abroad to study. TNE became increasingly popular, initially in countries with high proficiency in English, such as Malaysia, Singapore and Hong Kong. Subsequently, TNE continued to spread across most of East Asia, but also Pakistan, Bangladesh and to a less extent India. However, quality assurance continues to pose challenges for most countries in South and Central Asia, where capacity building is a key preoccupation.

International student mobility: the shift from sending students abroad to education hubs aspirations

In 2009, there were 3.7 million students studying mainly towards a degree outside their home country. Fifty-two percent of these students were from Asia (OECD 2011, p. 318). Against the average global outbound mobility rate, situated at just above 2%, participation in outward degree mobility varies from country to country across Asia, from roughly 0.5% for the Philippines and Indonesia to over 9% for Nepal and Sri Lanka. While India and China are the largest sending countries for students pursuing overseas studies, they are among the countries with lowest outbound mobility ratios in Asia, with 1% and 1.6% respectively.

Countries' growing internationalisation of their student body is also evidenced by the dropping levels of their outward/inward mobility rates. In 2003, South Korea used to send out 11 students to study abroad for every international student opting to study in Korea. In 2009, there were less than three Korean students opting to study abroad for every international student entering. Also, Malaysia, which used to be the top sending country to the UK in the 1990s, now achieved a perfect balance in its inward/outward mobility.

Most internationalisation strategies of Asian governments are focused on student mobility, which is illustrated by ambitious government targets: China – 500 000 students by 2020; Singapore – 150 000 international students by 2015; Malaysia – 200 000 international students by 2020; and South Korea – 200 000 by 2020.

Asia continues to send students abroad, but many of them opt to study somewhere else in the region. Roughly 70% of the foreign students studying in major Asian countries like Japan, South Korea, China, *etc* are from another Asian country. Europe has the closest ratio, with roughly 40%.[15]

In addition, intra-regional mobility is supported by the growing popularity of transnational education provision. The private sector has played an active role in internationalisation of education and as such, TNE has evolved as complementing local education provision in terms of widening access to and choice of education. Lawton and Katsomitros (2012) identified 200 international branch campuses (IBCs) worldwide in 2011. Analyses of their data suggest that just over one third of them (67) are located in Asia. The authors note continuing growth in the South–South IBCs, which in the Asian context was most notable in the number of branch campuses set by Iranian universities (growth from one in 2009 to six in 2011); Malaysian (from four IBCs in 2009 to six in 2011) and Indian institutions (respectively 12 and 17).

A shift from the Middle East to East Asia is currently taking place, with 37 additional IBCs set to open between 2012 and 2014. The majority of those, 81% (30 IBCs), will be based in Asia. In addition, roughly a quarter of all institutions globally opening branch campuses abroad are Asian universities (nine universities). In addition to building capacity, another feature of the emerging branch campuses is their niche remit. Worton (2012) argues that a niche campus:

> […] should operate as a catalyst for change in research thinking, and also in terms of the type of pedagogical delivery offered. It should bring some challenges to local providers, but these will be creative challenges, and precisely because of its deliberately small size, it will never threaten local universities in terms of 'poaching' students or attracting all research grants. […] although small, it can serve as a portal into the host country-region and a platform for further activities there.

Lawton and Katsomitros (2012) explain the growth of international branch campuses in Asia with the governments' drive across some of the major Asian countries to establish themselves as 'education hubs'. Knight (2011, p.2) describes an education hub as:

> a planned effort to building a critical mass of local and international actors strategically engaged in cross-border education, training, knowledge production and innovation initiatives.

The growth of TNE programmes in East Asia has been largely supported by government policies facilitating the recognition of overseas qualifications and the introduction of strict quality assurance practices. Given countries' ambitions to attract international students, foreign degree recognition is becoming easier in the region (with further progress to be made in South Korea, Thailand and Vietnam). However, more is to be done on the quality assurance front. Hong Kong and Malaysia are among the few countries who assure the quality of foreign providers operating in their country. On the other hand, Hong Kong and South Korea are among the very few countries that have legislative provision for monitoring offshore operations of their domestic institutions. Nevertheless, South Korean institutions are still to engage in cross-border delivery through IBCs.

In turn, South Korea has special visas aimed to streamline and ease inbound mobility of international students and academics. This is well balanced with generous funding programmes for teachers and researchers aiming to undertake training/research overseas. Japan and South Korea stand out for their student mobility policies – the two nations offer a comprehensive set of scholarship programmes at undergraduate and postgraduate level. Generous inbound scholarships are also offered by the Thai government to the extent that, in 2010, as many as 40% of the foreign students in the country were funded by the government (British Council, 2011).

The future of student mobility in Asia

The most significant expansion of tertiary education, globally, by 2020 is set to come from Asia, with India taking the lead in the next decade's growth (additional 7.1 million students), followed by China (5.1 million) and Indonesia (2.3 million) (British Council, 2012). Strong economic growth has strengthened higher education and given it priority on governments' agendas. Marginson (2012) attributes to strong economic growth advancements in higher education across East Asia on three fronts: higher participation rates in higher education, high quality of leading universities and "rapidly growing research and development". We expect these developments to continue in the future.

Furthermore, significant boosts to expanding local capacity, strengthening quality assurance practices and increased regional mobility will come from the growing

popularity of TNE in the region. Increasingly, the success of TNE programmes will depend heavily on the high quality of provision, responding to demand in niche subject areas and good student experience. An additional determinant of success will be their responsiveness to the local cultural and political context, echoing Knight's first truth about internationalisation (Knight 2012) that:

> Internationalisation […] builds on national and regional priorities, policies and practices. [It] is intended to complement, harmonise and extend the local dimension – not to dominate it.

De Wit (2013) argues that "the emerging economies and the higher education community in other parts of the world are altering the landscape of internationalisation [and a moving away] from a Western, neo-colonial concept of internationalisation". The concept of internationalisation is certainly becoming broader, with Asia set to play a key role in it.

CONCLUSION

This chapter sketched some of the most important developments in international student mobility of the past decade in Australia, Europe, Asia and the US, trying at the same time to disclose what the future of international student mobility might look like for these regions. Reading these reflections, it becomes immediately clear that the four have important similarities in common, both in their recent past, their current mobility realities and their expectations towards the future.

In policy terms, it is clear that student mobility is gaining new momentum throughout the world, while more and more countries start to reflect more often on the unintended consequences of mobility (from brain drain, to immigration concerns, all the way to the economic implications of educating foreigners), trying to find solutions and remedies. It is clear that Asia already is (and will continue to be) high on mobility policy agendas, both for traditional student mobility flows, but also for TNE and strategic partnerships. It will be impossible to talk about internationalisation in the future without taking into account Asian realities.

In purely numerical terms, the shares of the internationally mobile student population of Europe as a whole and of the US have been constantly decreasing over the past years, while those of many Asian countries are rapidly growing, along with the share of Australia. This trend is expected to continue, although the extent to which the emergence of new players will manage to 'alter' traditional mobility patterns remains uncertain for the moment. How stark the competition and the need for international students will be, as more and more countries aim to become regional education hubs – while expecting significant demographic declines – is also uncertain. It is clear, though, that this depends not only on successful marketing efforts but also on the extent to which different countries will manage to increase their participation rates in higher education (OECD, 2008).

Furthermore, in practical terms, the reality that foreign students create in the host countries is very different, as their share of total enrolment varies greatly from one country to another and from one region to another. Having 4% of students coming from abroad (such is the case in the US), or 20% (such as in Australia and several European countries), are two different realities, which require different levels of policy response, adaptation and support measures. While ambitious targets have been set in many countries, clearly not all will be achieved within the set deadlines. How far beyond current targets the countries will want to go is yet another question without a definite answer. It seems reasonable to expect though that a saturation point might be reached in some systems.

Last but not least, while our analysis has focused on four continents only, one should not forget about Latin America, the Middle East or Africa, all bringing important strengths and opportunities to the global mobility market. The recent Science without Borders programme of Brazil is just one example of initiatives of magnitude that can be undertaken by countries in these regions and which can have a significant impact on mobility developments.

All in all, the future of international student mobility seems promising, but will certainly not be void of the unexpected.

Endnotes

1. The Lisbon Strategy, the Education and Training 2010 Work Programme, the Strategic Framework for Education and Training 2020 and various European Commission communications in the field of student mobility, as well as the EU programmes for (higher) education.
2. The Prague (2001), Berlin (2003), Bergen (2005), London (2007), Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve (2009) and Bucharest (2012) Communiqués and the 2012 EHEA Mobility Strategy.
3. This target was first set in the 2009 Ministerial Communiqué of Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve and was mirrored, two years later, by an EU-level benchmark.
4. The subsequent data refer to the 27 member states of the European Union, together with Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, Switzerland and Turkey.
5. According to recent estimates, roughly three quarters of these actually came to Europe for higher education studies were mobile in the true sense of the word, *ie* they did not study or live in their host country prior their higher education enrolment.
6. While other EU nationals are entitled to the same treatment and thus fee level as domestic students in such countries, non-EU (and EEA) students are charged significantly higher fees.
7. Note: most of the data presented in this section comes from the IIE Open Doors project. www.iie.org/opendoors

8. For the previous year's report, see Belyavina, R., & Bhandari, R. (January, 2012). *U.S. Students in Overseas Degree Programs: Key Destinations and Fields of Study.* New York: Institute of International Education. http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Publications-and-Reports/IIE-Bookstore/US-Students-In-Overseas-Degree-Programs

9. The change to Australia's Overseas Student Policy allowed Australian tertiary providers to charge full fees to overseas students. Previously students had been fully or partially funded by Australian and institutional scholarship schemes. The era of full fee recruitment occurred at a time when the World Trade Organisation was increasingly drawing a connection between trade and higher education that ultimately led to the identification of education as a service in the context of the General Agreement on Trade (GATS) in 1995.

10. This figure is an estimate of total alumni across all providers including English language and VET providers. Refer Banks M and Olsen A. (2011). Australia's International Students: Characteristics and Trends, in Davis D and Mackintosh B (Ed), *Making a Difference: Australian international education*, 2011, UNSW Press, Sydney, NSW, Australia for further analysis.

11. A copy of the White Paper can be accessed at http://asiancentury.dpmc.gov.au/white-paper

12. A copy of Australia Educating Globally can be accessed at https://aei.gov.au/IEAC2/theCouncilsReport/Documents/Australia%20–%20Educating%20Globally%20FINAL%20REPORT.pdf

13. Universities Australia defines formal agreements as institution to institution between Australian universities and overseas higher education institutions. Agreements include cooperation facilitating student exchanges, study abroad arrangements, staff exchanges and academic/research collaborations.

14. Go to https://aei.gov.au/addchina/Documents/AddChinaUndergradToolkit.pdf for more information on the Add China Toolkit, Go to https://aei.gov.au/international-network/australia/asiabound/pages/asiabound-grants-program.aspx for more information on AsiaBound Grants Programme, and for further information on research funds go to http://www.innovation.gov.au/Science/InternationalCollaboration/ACSRF/Pages/default.aspx and https://grants.innovation.gov.au/AISRF/Pages/Home.aspx

15. British Council analysis based on UNESCO Institute for Statistics data.

References

Austrade. (2012). *Monthly Summary of International Student Enrolment Data- Australia- Standard Pivot 2008- December 2011.* Retrieved from www.austrade.gov.au

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2012). *2012 Yearbook of Australia: a comprehensive source of information about Australia.* ABS Catalogue Number 1301.0. Commonwealth of Australia, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra.

Australian Government Office of the Chief Scientist. (2012). *Health of Australian Science May 2012.* Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.

Australian Universities International Directors Forum (AUIDF). (2013). *AUIDF Benchmarking 2012,* April 2012. Unpublished.

Australian Universities International Directors Forum (AUIDF). (2013). *International Student Data Collection.* Unpublished.

Belyavina, R., & Bhandari, R. (January, 2012). *U.S. Students in Overseas Degree Programs: Key Destinations and Fields of Study.* New York: Institute of International Education. Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Publications-and-Reports/IIE-Bookstore/US-Students-In-Overseas-Degree-Programs

British Council. (2011). *Global Gauge: East Asia.* Retrieved from http://ihe.britishcouncil.org/educationintelligence/east-asia

De Wit, H. (2013). Reconsidering the Concept of Internationalization. In *International Higher Education,* Number 70, Winter 2013, (pp. 6–7).

Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education. (2011). *Selected Higher Education Statists Collection: Student 2011 Full Year.* Retrieved from www.deewr.gov.au

Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education, formerly known as Department of Employment, Education and Workplace Relations. (2005). *Selected Higher Education Statists Collection: Student 2005 Full Year.* Retrieved from www.deewr.gov.au

Donahue, D., & Altaf, S. (2012). *Learn by Doing: Expanding International Internships/ Work Abroad Opportunities for U.S. STEM Students.* New York, NY: IIE Center for Academic Mobility Research. Retrievable from: http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Publications-and-Reports/IIE-Bookstore/Learn-by-Doing

Eurydice. (2012). *The European Higher Education Area in 2012: Bologna Process Implementation Report.* Retrievable from http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/138EN.pdf

Hawthorne, L. (2012). Designer Immigrants? International Students and Two-Step Migration. In D. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. Heyl & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of International Education* (pp. 417–435). Los Angeles: Sage.

Institute of International Education. (2010). *Open Doors: Report on International Educational Exchange.* New York, NY: IIE.

Janson, K., Schomburg, H., & Teichler, U. (2009). The professional value of Erasmus mobility. Impact of international experience on former students' and teachers' careers. In *ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education.* Bonn: Lemmens Medien.

Knight, J. (2011, October). Three types of education hubs: student, talent and knowledge. In *The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education report.*

Lawton, W., & Katsomitros, A. (2012). International Branch Campuses: data and developments. In *The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education London.* Retrieved from www.obhe.ac.uk

Marginson, S. (2012). The Rise of Post-Confucian Knowledge Economies. In *International Higher Education,* Number 69, Fall 2012, Boston College Centre for International Higher Education.

OECD. (2008). *Higher education to 2030. Volume 1 – Demography.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2011). *Education at a glance 2011: OECD indicators.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

Olsen, A. (2012). *2012 Research Agenda: Australian Universities Directors' Forum:* Presentation to Australian International Education Conference. Strategy Policy and Research in Education P/L. Presented at AIEC in Adelaide. Retrieved from www.aiec.idp.com

Orr, D., Gwosc, C., & Netz, N. (2011). *Social and economic conditions of student life in Europe. EUROSTUDENT IV 2008-2011.* Bielefeld: W. Bertelsmann Verlag.

Lawson, C. (2012). *Student Voices: Enhancing the experience of international students in Australia.* Australian Education International. Retrieved from https://aei.gov.au/research/Publications/Documents/Student%20voices%20-%20FINAL.pdf

Sykes, B. (2012). *Mobile Talent? The staying intentions of international students in five EU countries.* Berlin: Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration.

Teichler, U., Ferencz, I., & Wächter, B. (Eds.) (2011). *Mapping mobility in European higher education.* Volume I. Bonn: Dok&Mat, DAAD.

UNESCO Institute of Statistics, data retrieved from: http://www.uis.unesco.org/Pages/default.aspx

Universities Australia. (2007, 2009, 2012). *International Links of Australian Universities: formal agreements between Australian universities and higher education institutions overseas,* May 2012. Retrieved from www.universitiesaustralia.edu.au

Worton, M. (2012, April 29). *University College London – Big visions, small overseas campuses.* University World News, Number 219.

About THE AUTHORS

Irina Ferencz is Policy Officer at the Academic Cooperation Association (ACA). At ACA she has been mainly involved in projects and activities related to international student mobility and to the use of indicators for measuring internationalisation at the university level (such as the *IMPI project*). She has also authored several publications and articles on international student mobility, on both statistical and policy trends. Examples of recent publications she co-authored are the studies *Mapping mobility in European higher education* (previously referred to as EURODATA II) of 2011 and the 2012 *European and national policies for academic mobility. Linking rhetoric, practice and mobility trends.*

Rajika Bhandari provides strategic oversight of the Institute of International Education's (IIE) research and evaluation activities and leads two major research projects – Open Doors and Project Atlas – that measure international higher education mobility. She also directs IIE's Center for Academic Mobility Research. Rajika is a frequent speaker and widely published author on global student mobility and has written four books on the subject. She holds a doctoral degree in Psychology from North Carolina State University, US and a BA (Honors) in Psychology from the University of Delhi, India.

Melissa Banks has over 20 years of experience in international education in Australia. She has held senior positions in three Australian universities, including her current role as Director Swinburne International at Swinburne University of Technology. Melissa led major research projects in her capacity as Head of research at IDP Education Pty Ltd. She has contributed to national and international forums and publications on topics including global student mobility, outcomes and impacts of international education in Australia, retention and transition practices in Australian universities, and Australian transnational tertiary education.

Janet Ilieva is an economist with extensive experience in international higher education. She is currently Head of HEFCE Observatory. Janet joined the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) in May 2013. Previously, Janet was based with the British Council in Hong Kong. Janet's area of expertise is policy analysis of higher education systems globally and their openness to international engagement. Her research studies focus on the future shape of the higher education landscape and the impact on university research, innovation, teaching and learning. While in Hong Kong, Janet's research has shaped and informed education policy debates with East Asian leaders of education. Research work carried out by Janet has been featured regularly in the national and international media.

ESSAY 17

Why we need clearer definitions, data and views on mobility

— Ulrich Teichler

Ulrich Teichler has been Professor and Director at the International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER-Kassel), University of Kassel, Germany. He has produced more than 1000 publications on higher education and the world of work, higher education systems, international cooperation and mobility. Formerly he held key positions in the International Academy of Education, Academia Europaea, Consortium of Higher Education Researchers and the EAIR. He is Honorary Doctor of the University of Turku, Finland and gave his name to the Ulrich-Teichler Prize.

"Those participating in student mobility in Europe cannot expect exceptional careers as a rule, but they learn from contrast, they become more competent in handling international work tasks and foreign languages, and they are inclined in higher proportions to be professionally mobile after graduation."

Student mobility has clearly been the core theme for decades in the public discourse about internationalisation of higher education. We tend to believe that student mobility is likely to grow and that this is a desirable trend. We can even argue that the discourse around the Erasmus programme, inaugurated in 1987, has signalled that student mobility is among the top priorities in higher education policy. This was eventually confirmed in 1999 in the Bologna Declaration, when the major operational goal of creating a similar structure of study programmes and degrees all over Europe was justified most strongly with the strategic objective of increasing student mobility. Finally, it was reinforced in the process of assessing the results of the Bologna Declaration, when the ministers involved stated in their 2009 Leuven communiqué that, as a target, 20% of European students graduating in 2020 should have international study experience during the course of their study.

One should assume that significant efforts have been made to gather systematic information on issues so high on the agenda. In fact, we can argue that there has been a wealth of research and possibly less ambitious activities of information collection about student mobility. The *Journal of Studies in International Education,* which emerged from cooperation between associations such as the EAIE and scholars active in this area, is possibly the best source indicating the richness of our knowledge on the rationales, the processes and the impact of student mobility.

Some of the knowledge gathered about student mobility has become conventional wisdom. For example, we estimate that the proportion of students currently mobile across borders has remained more or less stable at around 2%; growth took place in absolute numbers as growth of the overall number of students and the proportion of mobile students grew over the years in economically advanced countries. We know that the role of mobility for the whole study programme is clearly distinct from the role of temporary mobility, and we know that 'vertical' mobility, *ie* from an economically and academically less privileged country to a more favoured country, is clearly a different story than 'horizontal' mobility. We are accustomed to the fact

that student mobility within Europe is politically interpreted as being by and large horizontal mobility, *ie* among institutions on equal terms, and that temporary mobility is most strongly supported and actually most frequent within Europe. Finally, our research on temporary student mobility in Europe suggests that those participating cannot expect exceptional careers as a rule, but they learn from contrast, they become more competent in handling international work tasks and foreign languages, and they are inclined in higher proportions to be professionally mobile after graduation.

Reliability of statistical knowledge on student mobility

It does not mean, however, that we can be satisfied with the state of knowledge provided by available surveys on student mobility. We might strive for improvements regarding the analysis of competences, the impact of various settings of international experiences, the relationships between systematic learning and experiential learning in this domain and many other aspects. There is also room for suspicion that most of those analysing the effects of mobility and internationalisation have such favourable views of the value of mobility that more sceptical approaches are needed. Otherwise, studies such as the one showing a relative decline of the professional value of Erasmus over the years would not have been considered so surprising.

However, the basic statistical information on student mobility has remained in a deplorable state. Notably, 'foreign students' and 'study abroad' continue to shape the international statistics. More refined data, available for a substantial number of European countries, suggest that, on average, 25% of foreign students in European countries are not mobile but have already lived and learnt in the country of study before entry to higher education. In reverse, roughly 10% of mobile students in Europe are not foreign; they might have returned to the country of citizenship for the purpose of study, or they might have become citizens of the country of study over the years. Moreover, international organisations collecting educational statistics recommend not including temporary student mobility. The actual practices of the individual countries vary: possibly half of the temporarily mobile students are excluded.

Therefore, the international statistics can be viewed as a proxy for students with foreign citizenship spending the whole study programme abroad. Accordingly, the rate of students with citizenship from outside of Europe studying in Erasmus-eligible countries has increased from 2.4% in 1999 to 3.7% of all students in 2007, while the respective rate of foreign students with citizenship of European countries has remained more or less stable at slightly more than 3% during this period. As one might have expected, the Bologna Reform made study in Europe more attractive for students from other world regions. According to the available statistics, the Bologna Process might have been more or less irrelevant for intra-European mobility, but we are not certain. The available statistics are more or less useless for estimating the change of intra-European temporary student mobility in the Bologna Process.

The Leuven Communiqué suggests in the policy debate to no longer concentrate on the numbers of students mobile at a certain moment in time, but rather on the event of student mobility during the course of study. This approach was already chosen at the time of the inauguration of the Erasmus programme in 1987, when 2.5% of

annual temporary mobility was viewed as necessary in order to ensure that 10% of European students would be mobile in the course of study. The Leuven Communiqué doubled this target for 2010 without specifying the funding arrangements.

The currently available statistics do not measure such data. Estimates, however, are possible on the basis of student surveys (with a focus on students close to graduation) or graduate surveys. A recent secondary analysis of available graduate surveys of some European countries shows that bachelor graduates in the Netherlands have already surpassed the 20% target and Bachelor graduates in Austria and Norway have come close to that target. In contrast, the respective figures have only been 2% in Poland and 4% in the UK. One wonders what the policy impact of target setting in Europe might be if the target is already surpassed from the outset in some countries, and has no chance of being reached in others.

Student and graduate surveys are not perfect statistical measures. One could imagine that future labour force or household statistics could provide better information. One wonders, though, whether so much attention will really be paid to gathering credible information on student mobility in the framework of labour force or household statistics, since it has turned out to be impossible in the past to improve educational statistics significantly for this purpose.

Lack of definitions and data on academic mobility

Of course, the Bachelor/Master structure requires a more complex data collection: what proportion of students has been mobile during their Bachelor study, between Bachelor and Master study, only in the Master stage, and both in the Bachelor and Master stage? How many were temporarily abroad? How many were abroad for the whole period, and at what stage of the study programmes?

In deploring the low quality of currently available statistics on student mobility, we should not overlook the fact that the available statistics on academic staff mobility are in an even worse situation. An EU expert committee came to the conclusion that the only useful data in student mobility is the proportion of foreigners among all persons recently awarded a Doctoral degree. Various reports on staff mobility refer only to available data on staff mobility in the framework of Erasmus: valuable as these short phases of Erasmus-supported staff mobility might be in some respect, they are only a very small element of the overall mobility of academics.

Statistics in this domain are in bad shape in two ways from the outset. There are no common definitions of ‘teachers’, ‘academic staff’ and ‘researchers’ across all sectors of the higher education and research system. And most data collections have confined themselves to foreigners without any concern about genuine mobility, *ie* moving from one country to the other for professional purposes.

Moreover, the purposes for academic mobility can be viewed as being more diverse than those of student mobility. Available analyses suggest that there are at least three completely different purposes that would require different approaches of data collection: international mobility during the training and early career stages; visits, exchanges and sabbaticals; and international professional mobility during the major career stages.

Linking mobility statistics to analysis of internationalisation

Statistics on international student mobility and international academic mobility are only base-line information. Statistics as such have hardly any explanatory power. But they are certainly a starting point for in-depth analyses. It would provide food for thought if we noted that many students intending to be mobile for a short period actually remain abroad up to graduation, or that hardly any non-mobile academics during the course of study or during their doctoral stage are professionally mobile at later stages, *etc.*

Moreover, both mobility statistics and surveys on rationales, processes and effects of international mobility should be more closely intertwined with the analysis of 'internationality' or 'internationalisation' of higher education. One might assume that international mobility will have a less important role for the internationality of higher education in the future than it has had in the past. Mobility is losing exceptionality, virtual communication across borders becomes more frequent and more effective, internationality 'at home' might become more salient – considerations such as these do not suggest ignoring mobility but considering it as one of various means.

References

Janson, K., Schomburg, H., & Teichler, U. (2009). *The Professional Value of ERASMUS Mobility.* Bonn: Lemmens.

Kelo, M., Teichler, U., & Wächter, B. (Eds.)(2006). EURODATA: *Student Mobility in European Higher Education.* Bonn: Lemmens.

Schomburg, H., & Teichler, U. (Eds.)(2011). *Employability and Mobility of Bachelor Graduates in Europe: Key Results of the Bologna Process.* Rotterdam and Taipei: Sense Publishers.

ESSAY 18

The new internationalisation and student mobility

— Bernd Wächter

Bernd Wächter is Director of the Academic Cooperation Association (ACA). After his work at the University of Kassel, Germany, he joined the British Council, before becoming the Director of international affairs at the Fachhochschule Darmstadt, Germany. In DAAD, he was the head of this organisation's European section. He subsequently was Director of Higher Education (Erasmus) in the Brussels Socrates Office. Bernd has published widely on internationalisation. In 2012, he received the EAIE Constance Meldrum Award.

"As only few realise, the percentage of foreign students amongst all students has globally remained stable in the past decades. Absolute numbers will of course continue to grow, but relative ones are unlikely to do so – it is even probable that they decline."

What will internationalisation of higher education be like in 25 years from now? It is easy to ask this question, but difficult to correctly answer it. For, not only in matters related to higher education, "the future is one of the hardest things to predict", as Woody Allen, Groucho Marx and a few dozen others realised before me. I will try nonetheless. Thematically, I will concentrate on student mobility and, in regional terms, on Europe – but venture beyond these narrow borders here and there.

Will internationalisation simply have a 'new shape' or could it finally come to an end? This is not a rhetorical question: Jane Knight's seminal definition of internationalisation calls it a 'process', from institutions and systems which are essentially nationally focused towards such which are – finally – going to be truly international. Accepting Knight's definition, one must assume that internationalisation is a transition phase and that higher education will one day either be fully international, or relapse into its earlier national outlook. Of course, this is a purist's reading. Practically, the development will probably be open-ended; not because of a failure of internationalisation to reach its aims and objectives, but because of its changing forms, objectives and framework conditions over time.

International student mobility

Will international student mobility grow? Let us look at *degree mobility* first. The study of foreign nationals has, over the past 40 years, more than quadrupled, but so has total global enrolment. As only few realise, the percentage of foreign students among all students has globally remained stable in the past decades. Absolute numbers will of course continue to grow, but relative ones are unlikely to do so – it is even probable that they decline. This is because most degree mobility is not fuelled by the desire for an international experience, but by the lack of quantitatively and/or qualitatively sufficient supply of tertiary education in large parts of the world. With globalisation advancing further, and the developing world catching up (as well as the 'developed' losing out in relative terms), the major 'push factor' for international degree mobility will weaken. I therefore believe that growth will be flatter in

the future than it has been up to now. What I expect to change in a major way are the main directions of student movements. In 2007, the last year for which we have quality-assured comparable data, Europe (meaning the EU and EFTA countries) still attracted slightly over half of all foreign students worldwide. And, together with the US and Australia, it enrolled three out of four international students worldwide. This is not going to remain like this. With the rise of parts of the 'third world', the West will lose market share, and other regions, especially in Asia (and possibly the Gulf), will grow in importance.

How about *temporary (credit) mobility*? Credit mobility is a 'luxury phenomenon'. From all we know, it mainly happens out of countries with a developed higher education system, and it is driven by the desire for cultural and linguistic learning. North-Western Europe might already have seen the peak in growth (the UK aside), with little potential for further increase. Other parts of Europe, but more so, again, the emerging economies, have much more potential. In 25 years, quite a few of them are likely to have qualitatively and quantitatively developed their tertiary systems to a point where the luxury of a study abroad phase will no longer be out of reach for sizeable numbers of students.

The big question is, however, how central international student mobility – for degree as for credit – will remain for internationalisation in 25 years from now. Ulrich Teichler once remarked only half-jokingly that physical mobility was the most primitive form of knowledge transfer. Since higher education was apparently unable to *teach* students internationally-relevant knowledge and skills, it had to resort to the rather archaic practice of sending them out to foreign lands to *learn by immersion.* This admittedly cumbersome method might be replaced due to the influence of four phenomena: truly international universities that provide Internationalisation at Home, virtual mobility, transnational education, and severe limitations to mass travel.

Virtual mobility

Will *virtual mobility* – forms of online learning – have replaced physical mobility in 25 years? This is what many expect. Living in 'the year of the MOOCs', this might sound like a plausible scenario. On the other hand, the end of the 'brick and mortar university' has already often been announced – and still not come. I expect that online learning will partially replace international physical mobility in undergraduate studies. If at all, a parallel development in graduate studies will take more time. It is likely that the trend towards online education will be stronger in degree mobility than in credit mobility, where cultural learning is at the centre.

The trend towards virtual mobility is also likely to be fuelled by the *end of mass travel,* or anyway severe limitations to it. With a still growing world population and the limited supply of traditional energy, it is inconceivable that we will get to grips with global warming and fuelling the world unless we seriously cut down on energy consumption. This will make travel at today's levels difficult, if not impossible. The reorientation will have to be drastic – with consequences on higher education as on everything else. Physical mobility will become rarer – with an impact on international student mobility, and with an even earlier impact on international conferences.

Transnational education

Further, I expect *transnational education,* where the teacher moves to the students rather than the other way round, to further grow. This form of education provision is admittedly not at all problem-free and fraught with risk – for the providers as for the students. But it is a much more efficient mode of the provision of good-quality education than physical student mobility.

Internationalisation at Home

A fourth influence to limit physical mobility could be the late triumph of *Internationalisation at Home.* Our universities and colleges might finally manage to teach internationally relevant qualifications – instead of sending students out to learn by immersion. Admittedly, this is a daring hope. The concept of Internationalisation at Home is close to 15 years old, and it has so far been rather a rhetorical than a real success. But demand for training in this area has recently grown palpably.

The role of European and international associations and the EAIE

What will be the role of European and international associations in the future? The 'habitat' for such entities will have changed drastically, I am sure. Many of today's organisations will be no more in 25 years. The limitations described earlier (on travel) will lead to the end of a number of associations and networks, as will the issue of relevance in a changed world. However, I am convinced that the EAIE will not be among the casualties given its ability to innovate and re-invent.

ESSAY 19

Mobility – *Quo vadis?*

— Emanuel Alfranseder

Emanuel Alfranseder is President of the Erasmus Student Network, the key student organisation in international higher education in Europe, present in more than 420 sections in 36 countries with around 12 000 volunteers. Emanuel is an expert in issues concerning higher education policies connected to mobility and has profound knowledge of the Erasmus programme from a student perspective. He has a BA and MA in economics and is currently studying for his PhD in economics at Lund University, Sweden.

"The economic crisis has slowed down some internationalisation processes; it has not, however, reversed the overall trend."

When we try to predict the future we usually start from the current state, use information about the near future that we consider a safe bet and extrapolate this information. It is quite a safe bet to predict that internationalisation of higher education will continue to play an even more central role in higher education than it already does today. However, it is more interesting to reflect upon how far internationalisation will go and what consequences we should be prepared for.

It is most likely that the Life Long Learning programme of the European Commission will be scaled up and that intra-European mobility will increase. Additionally, at the European level there will be facilitation of mobility towards third countries. This trend will continue over the next 25 years. History has shown us that globalisation is not always uninterrupted, but comes in waves. The economic crisis has slowed down some internationalisation processes; it has not, however, reversed the overall trend. In this essay, I point out some of the particularly relevant future developments and resultant consequences.

Student choice

First, students will have more choices and education will become a global choice for an increasing number of students. More choices also mean more challenges. While theory tells us that intercultural adaption is a process that goes through different stages, the initial challenges are certainly higher when spending a period in South-East Asia compared to a different European country. Additional social support mechanisms are needed to allow students to cope with the often inevitable culture shock.

Student support

Second, through the promotion of intra-European mobility, the European higher education landscape has developed substantial expertise and infrastructure when it comes to the social integration of international students. International offices, teachers and administrative staff have learnt to deal with international students and developed the flexibility and intercultural awareness needed to welcome students from all over the world. A phenomenon such as the Erasmus Student Network, which dedicates itself to the integration of international students, is an additional sign of the advancements in

this area. This is a real competitive advantage for the European Higher Education Area. Some students will always base their choices purely on academic reasons such as university rankings and salary expectations, but many take into account the quality of life, of which social integration and acceptance by society is an integral part.

Language policy

Third, language policies will be a central question of European education. We have seen the crowding out of minor European languages in education systems. The predominant language of education is English and economic arguments are often brought forward to strengthen this role. However, multilingualism has values of its own – preserving the rich cultural history of Europe, promoting diversity and fostering cognitive abilities are just some of them. Today, it has become perfectly possible to study in some countries without ever learning the local language. European education policy makers will need to decide whether to invest resources to reverse this trend.

Added value of mobility

Fourth, studies have shown that mobility itself is not always valued by employers. On the one hand, as mobility becomes accessible to a wider audience, the economic added value for the individual decreases. While this is true for the individual, this does not hold true for the economic effects as a whole. More mobile, more interculturally aware and flexible individuals contribute to a strengthened internal European market. On the other hand, many of the reported beneficial effects from mobility derive from gaining transversal and language skills. In particular, intercultural competences will become an even more important asset in the future. This raises the question of the quality of mobility. The added value from mobility is only exploited to its fullest if students actually gain something from being abroad. Social integration and language learning are indispensable prerequisites in this process. Informal support mechanisms such as peer support to facilitate the contact with the local community will need to be further strengthened in order not to lose the added value.

Balancing harmonisation and diversity

Fifth, the extent to which Europe is going to strive for harmonisation will be crucial. Problems such as the lack of recognition of exchange studies are largely due to the very diverse systems that still exist in Europe. Systems will tend to become more uniform in some areas. Significant resistance, as already observed during the Bologna process, is to be expected in other areas. In particular, when the reforms do not bear fruit rapidly enough, old traditions might re-emerge. While the goal cannot be to lose Europe's traditions and diversity, European education systems must find a balance that enables students to enjoy diversity without suffering drawbacks in terms of lack of recognition of their studies undertaken in other parts of Europe.

Financial consequences of mass mobility

Lastly, if the current trends continue, mobility will become a mass phenomenon. As described, some of the added value for individuals (such as developing intercultural skills), will diminish or become harder to achieve. Mass mobility also means allocating more financial resources, which are drawn traditionally from taxpayers' money in European education. The political debate will become more intense and the usefulness of mobility as such will be questioned. Mobility is in many ways an answer

to dealing with globalisation and internationalisation and preparing individuals. Globalisation itself is by no means seen positively by all actors in society. Similarly, voices criticising the resources spent on mobility might become louder.

Mobility as a tool for European understanding

We have to prepare for this debate and show the undoubtedly positive effects of mobility. Mobility will help to make European economies more dynamic and flexible. Only mobility enables the common market to live up to its full potential. The positive effects for personal development might not be enough to convince politicians not to cut spending in dire times; these arguments are usually ignored when spending on education, training and youth is one of the first to be slashed in a recession. This does not mean we should not continue to ensure our voices are heard. The European Union winning the Nobel Peace Prize has once more underlined the most central reason for mobility in the long term: creating lasting peace. The Euro crisis has shown that Europe has come a long way, but nationalism is still quick to re-emerge. We cannot become complacent in our efforts to create mutual understanding and peace in Europe. I cannot imagine a better way for people to experience different cultures first-hand than through mobility.

ESSAY 20

The future of transnational higher education: what role for international branch campuses?

— Stephen Wilkins

Stephen Wilkins is a lecturer in International Management Learning at Plymouth University in the UK. He holds a PhD in Management (International Higher Education) from the University of Bath, UK. He has authored/co-authored many articles on international higher education and was winner of the first EAIE Tony Adams Award for Excellence in Research, in 2011.

"Since the turn of the century, the international branch campus has become the fastest growing form of transnational higher education."

The last two decades saw a dramatic increase in the provision of transnational higher education. Instead of international students having to travel abroad for higher education, institutions found various ways to provide their educational services closer to students' homes. Transnational education refers to programmes where learners are located in a country other than the one in which the awarding institution is based. In the early 1990s, there was a wide-held belief that web-based distance education would become the dominant form of transnational education by the start of the 21st century, but, in the end, programme delivery through partner institutions offering franchised or collaborative/joint programmes proved more popular. For students, the sense of place in higher education is very strong; students value and enjoy the routine of visiting a campus regularly to meet and interact with faculty and other students. Many students believe that they learn more effectively in a classroom environment. Usually, study on campuses also offers students opportunities for social interaction and participation in leisure activities.

The rise of the international branch campus

Since the turn of the century, the international branch campus has become the fastest growing form of transnational higher education. An international branch campus is an educational facility where students receive face-to-face instruction in a country different to that of its parent institution. The branch operates under the name of the parent institution and offers qualifications bearing the name of the parent institution. At the start of 2012, there were over 200 international branch campuses globally and, based on public announcements by institutions of branches currently planned or under development, this number is likely to grow by another 40 by the start of 2014. In predicting the future role of international branch campuses in transnational higher education, it is useful to start by identifying the factors that have led to the international branch campus becoming so popular with institutions, students and governments worldwide in the first place.

First, it can be argued that the international branch campus is a product of globalisation and the neo-liberal ideology. Neo-liberalism assumes that markets, and market-like approaches, are the most efficient and effective forms of governance, rule and control in all spheres of social life, including the

provision of higher education. As neo-liberal ideology has become embraced and adopted globally, governments have introduced policies that promote competition among institutions and reduce institutions' reliance on public funding, which has encouraged the marketisation and commodification of higher education. International branch campuses have been regarded by many institutions as just another possible income stream to exploit, given that the students at nearly all of these campuses pay full-cost tuition fees. These campuses also give institutions an international presence, which can improve institutional image and prestige.

Second, although the demand for higher education has increased dramatically in virtually every developed or developing nation globally, there are many students who cannot go abroad for higher education because of work, family, or social, religious or financial reasons, and for these people the international branch campus offers an alternative and viable route to a high quality Western education. Branch campuses can provide a higher education to students who might otherwise not be able to participate in higher education.

Third, governments around the world have seen the international branch campus as a means to expand higher education capacity at no, or relatively little, cost to the public budget. In host countries, governments and national economies benefit in a multitude of ways, such as: increased participation in higher education due to the increased capacity provided by international branch campuses, a reduction in currency outflows caused by nationals studying overseas, an increase in demand and spending in the economy resulting from incoming foreign students, improvements in skills levels of the labour force and reductions in youth unemployment. Attracting world-class universities to establish branch campuses can raise the profile and prestige of host countries and these institutions can contribute to innovation and the development of knowledge economies. Countries such as Malaysia, Singapore and the United Arab Emirates already act as regional higher education hubs, hosting international branch campuses that attract international students. Several other countries, such as Hong Kong, South Korea and Sri Lanka, have announced their intention to adopt a similar strategy.

Prospects of international branch campuses

The international branch campus is not yet a fully proven model, as there have been failures as well as successes. Failures can be expensive for institutions not only financially but also in terms of damage to their brands and reputations. To date, at least 18 international branch campuses have closed. The international branch campus is a highly risky growth strategy for institutions; it requires a great deal of time and resources before students can be enrolled and then it typically takes several years just to break even. That said, the international branch campus may be more resilient than many commentators have claimed, given that the majority of branches have survived – even thrived – during one of the biggest post-war global recessions, and institutions that previously went through a period of retrenchment – such as Michigan State University in Dubai, which closed all of its undergraduate programmes in 2010 – are now once again expanding.

So, what are the threats facing international branch campuses over the next 25 years? Now that universities have proven their ability to operate successfully in marketised and commoditised systems of higher education with significantly reduced public funding, it is difficult to see governments in the future rejecting the

neo-liberal ideology. In the countries that already host international branch campuses, most governments are likely to continue relying on these institutions to provide competition, capacity, world-class education and research. Institutions have various motives for establishing branch campuses outside their home countries but the most important seem to involve money, influence and status (building a global brand). A handful of universities operate overseas campuses as aid projects, particularly in the African continent, but the institutions still benefit through favourable publicity and positive organisational images. As long as institutions continue to determine that they are achieving their objectives and deriving benefits from operating branch campuses abroad, and as long as students and host governments want them, international branch campuses are likely to remain in existence.

In 2009, the largest source countries of international branch campuses were the US, Australia and the UK. English is the *lingua franca* in science, and international higher education undoubtedly benefits these three countries but increasingly, institutions in non-English speaking countries, such as the Netherlands, are establishing branches overseas with programmes delivered in English. In 25 years' time, Spanish and Mandarin could be real challengers to the dominance of English in higher education, and Spanish institutions might establish branches in Latin America and Chinese institutions in East Asia. In fact, Chinese institutions are already venturing outside Asia; for example, in 2012, Ningbo University announced its plan to establish a branch in Florence, Italy.

At present, high ability students and those from high income families generally favour prestigious home campuses in Western countries over international branch campuses. But as home campuses continue to price themselves out of the market with ever increasing tuition fees, and as branch campuses improve their quality and reputations, more students might start to favour branches. Of course, geo-political events and natural disasters will always have an impact on international student choices, as seen in the US after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, which caused an immediate decline in incoming international students. Also, if public/federal institutions expand and improve quality, students may prefer these institutions over international branch campuses. This could happen very quickly in countries such as China and Singapore, where governments are investing heavily in higher education development.

The fact that most branch campuses are intended to produce profit, or are expected at least to cover their costs, means that their fees will always be relatively high. Currently, these campuses tend to cater for students from higher socio-economic backgrounds who can afford the tuition fees, but future growth might be hindered by the inability of students from lower socio-economic backgrounds to pay the required level of fees. Also, in a future environment in which students can find cheaper alternatives of equal or higher quality, branch campuses could face lower demand.

Recently, Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) have received a lot of publicity, due in part to the fact that they are offered by elite universities such as Harvard, Stanford and Yale. MOOCs are educational programmes that are available online, free of charge, to an unlimited number of learners worldwide. Although MOOCs have the potential to increase participation in higher education globally, they do not – and are unlikely to in future – lead to degrees. Prestigious universities are unlikely to ever award degrees for completing MOOCs because that would surely threaten the attractiveness and viability of the programmes delivered on campus.

As the governments of host countries strive to improve educational quality and the international competitiveness of their higher education hubs, weaker and lower quality institutions might be forced out through tighter regulation. Some branch campuses, such as New York University and Paris-Sorbonne in Abu Dhabi, have been financed by host governments but these institutions cannot assume that governments will continue to provide funding in the long term. It is possible that some governments might even try to nationalise branch campuses. Since May 2011, the six American universities that operate at Education City in Qatar (which have been fully funded by the Qatar Foundation) have collectively become known as Hamad Bin Khalifa University, which might eventually be revealed as the first step towards nationalisation.

In conclusion

In conclusion, it would appear that international branch campuses will continue to be a key form of transnational higher education as long as they are attractive and provide benefits to each of the main stakeholder groups (*ie* students, institutions and governments) and as long as the global demand for higher education exceeds the total supply of places. New variants of the international branch campus have already emerged, typically involving partnerships or collaborative arrangements, which are modes of operation preferred by prestigious institutions such as Yale University and Imperial College London. These alternatives to the international branch campus are likely to increase in popularity, which will result in diverse forms of institutions operating in the international higher education marketplace.

CHAPTER 5

Internationalisation of the curriculum: international approaches and perspectives

— Betty Leask, Jos Beelen and Loveness Kaunda

Internationalisation in higher education includes international, intercultural and global domains (Knight, 2004). It is a process of worldwide scope requiring ongoing and continuing effort (de Wit, 2012). Internationalisation of the curriculum includes all three domains of internationalisation. It is an essential component of the internationalisation agenda of higher education institutions. Internationalisation of the curriculum is highly context dependant and may look different in different disciplines, in different regions, in different nations and in different institutions (Leask and Bridge, 2013). Despite this, several common themes have emerged in its development over the past 25 years. In this chapter we discuss these themes and approaches to and interpretations of internationalisation of the curriculum across the world. The chapter then concludes with a brief discussion of some possible future directions and priorities in the global agenda around internationalisation of the curriculum.

COMMON THEMES

There is an ongoing global conversation on internationalisation of the curriculum, of which this chapter is but one small part. Rationales and drivers for internationalisation of the curriculum vary across nations and regions and have changed over time. Different types of activities have been emphasised in different contexts at different times and a diversity of beliefs about and approaches to internationalisation of the curriculum are evident. The concept and the practices associated with internationalisation of the curriculum continue to evolve and take on their own distinctive character in different regions. However, a number of common themes are evident. These are not discrete. Rather they are interconnected and related.

1. Preparing graduates for a globalised world

The rationale for internationalisation of the curriculum has been repeatedly associated with preparing graduates to live and work locally in a 'globalised' world. This is not a recent phenomenon. It was 20 years ago that Harari (1992) connected internationalisation of the curriculum with the need to prepare graduates for "the highly interdependent and multicultural world in which they live and (will) have to function in the future" (p. 53). In 1995, the OECD definition similarly connected internationalisation of the curriculum with preparation for life in 'national, multi-cultural' contexts through an 'international orientation in content'. In 2005, Webb said that internationalisation of the curriculum in Australia "helps students to develop an understanding of the global nature of scientific, economic, political and cultural exchange" (p. 111). In South Africa, in 2007, Ogude argued that internationalisation of the curriculum "is all about producing globally competitive graduates, and generating new knowledge". In Canada, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada suggested that an internationalised curriculum is "a means for Canadian students to develop global perspectives and skills at home" (AUCC 2009, p. 5). Today, "this notion of global citizenship has become part of the internationalisation discourse in higher education around the world" (Deardorff and Jones 2012, p. 295).

There is, however, less agreement on what we actually mean by 'global citizenship' and the scope and nature of the learning outcomes necessary for graduates to be global citizens. Not surprisingly, the most effective means to develop these outcomes and how to assess them, also remains elusive. Some argue that it is important that "content […] does not arise out of a single cultural base but engages with global plurality in terms of sources of knowledge" and that teachers encourage students "to explore how knowledge is produced, distributed and utilised globally" helping them to "develop an understanding of the global nature of scientific, economic, political and cultural exchange" (Webb, 2005, p. 111). Some argue for a strong emphasis on pedagogy and on managing cross-cultural encounters within the classroom and on campus, with carefully structured and designed interactive and collaborative learning activities (de Vita, 2002; Leask, 2003: 2009; Volet and Ang, 1998). Some emphasise the need to incorporate a variety of activities into the curriculum including "international studies, language learning, international exchanges for students and faculty members, as well as student-led educational activities" (AUCC, 2009, p. 5).

In practice, local settings significantly influence interpretation and priorities (Lee, 2000). Time has also altered national approaches, priorities and perspectives. Huang (2003; 2006) describes the similarities and differences in approach to internationalisation of the university curricula in China and Japan, both unique from each other because of their distinctive national histories and characters. Precisely because national context exerts an influence on approaches to internationalisation of the curriculum, it must be said that despite general agreement around the role of universities in preparing graduates for a globalised world, and the importance of the internationalised curriculum in that, in practice how this is approached may look very different in different parts of the world. Approaches in the same place have also changed over time, as scholarly activity has raised questions around the effectiveness of different strategies and national and regional priorities have changed.

2. Developing intercultural competence

The second theme to emerge in the literature is that the development of intercultural competence is a central focus and a key outcome of an internationalised curriculum (Leask, 2009; Deardorff and Jones, 2012). A number of definitions of internationalisation have been elaborated (see, for example, Knight, 2004; van der Wende, 1997; Hamilton, 1998; Teichler, 2004). A common element in these definitions is to link internationalisation in universities with globalisation and with 'the intercultural' – the interface of different cultures and the need for appropriate and effective communication and behaviour at these sites of interaction (Deardorff, 2009; Spencer-Oatey and Franklin, 2009). The development of intercultural competence is identified in graduate attributes related to global citizenship and preparation of graduates for both life and work in a globalised world (see, for example, Leask 2001; Jones and Killick, 2013). It is closely associated with the ability to communicate effectively in social and professional situations and the ability to work in teams. Much research into the knowledge, skills

and attitudes that comprise intercultural competence has been conducted in the US over more than 50 years, although terminology and definition still vary across disciplines (Deardorff, 2006).

Amidst ongoing debate over the meaning of the term 'intercultural competence' as well as how to assess the knowledge, skills and attitudes associated with it, integrating its development into academic programmes and campus activities is increasingly a focus of the process of internationalisation of the curriculum. This occurs against a background of growing concern at the small percentage of students participating in study abroad programmes and challenges to bold assumptions about the extent to which those students who did participate in study abroad actually developed intercultural competence (Bennett, 2008; Paige, 1993).

3. Engaging academic staff

The third theme to emerge is the importance of engaging academic staff (or 'faculty') in the process of internationalisation of the curriculum. This theme is related to the first two. A focus on preparing all graduates for life in a globalised world through embedding the development of international and intercultural knowledge, skills and attitudes into the learning programme locates internationalisation of the curriculum in the academic as well as the administrative domain of universities. International office staff have a role in working with academic staff to organise and manage study abroad and exchange for a small percentage of students, but academic coordinators and their teaching teams control the formal curriculum within their disciplines and programmes; they define it and manage it. This includes selecting content as well as organising and assessing interactive group work. It is essential that they are engaged in the process of internationalisation of the curriculum. The complexity of the process and the challenges and frustrations associated with engaging academic staff in it have been noted frequently in the literature (Stohl, 2007; Knight, 2006; Egron-Polak and Hudson, 2010; Leask and Beelen, 2010; Childress, 2010). Indeed it seems that "if we want to internationalise the university, we have to internationalise the faculty" whilst recognising "the differing cultures among different scholarly fields with respect to internationalisation" (Stohl, 2007, p. 368). Yet many academic staff are either uncertain what internationalisation of the curriculum means within their disciplinary and institutional contexts or do not think it has anything to do with them (Knight, 2006; Stohl, 2007). Bartell (2003) found that "some disciplines tend to perpetuate a relatively narrow focus impoverished by an absence of intercultural and international perspectives, conceptualisations and data" precisely at a time when the need for international and intercultural perspectives has become "a generalised necessity rather than an option" (p. 49). However, even academic staff who are interested in engaging in the development and delivery of international education, will not necessarily have the required skills, knowledge and attitudes to do so effectively (Childress, 2010).

4. Internationalisation at Home

The term 'Internationalisation at Home' (IaH) has been increasingly associated with internationalisation of the curriculum, although it has been interpreted in different ways in different places and has thus developed as a concept and in practice. The term was first used in 1999 at Malmö University. Bengt Nilsson, newly appointed Senior International Manager, was faced with the fact that this newly established university did not have an international network yet, so that it could not offer its students the traditional study abroad experience. Therefore, opportunities had to be found 'at home' for students to gain these experiences. The newly established university also had a social mission. The composition of the student population had to reflect the diversity of the city and engage with the local community. A characteristic element of the Malmö approach at this time was the Nightingale Project in which students mentored children of recent immigrants (Sild Lönroth & Nilsson, 2007).

While the value of students developing international and intercultural knowledge, skills and attitudes as part of their formal study programme is evident in the literature before this time, the focus in Europe, as in the US, had traditionally been on short periods of study abroad and exchange as the primary means of achieving this goal. In his situation at Malmo, Nilsson recognised his immediate need to change the way people thought about internationalisation, and the broader benefits such a change in thinking could have for students in other institutions in Europe, given the persistently low number of mobile students and the difficulty of assessing what they had learnt from their experiences. He coined the term 'Internationalisation at Home' as a way to signal a new way of thinking about internationalisation. It was adopted by others in Europe and a Special Interest Group for IaH was established within the EAIE in 1999. The concept has been adopted and adapted by others since.

The original concept of IaH had a strong focus on intercultural issues and on diversity. It used a fairly short definition: "Any internationally related activity with the exception of outbound student and staff mobility." (Crowther *et al,* 2001, p. 8) This definition led to numerous questions. It implied that IaH was a phenomenon that could be detached from outgoing mobility. Could an international experience at home promote outgoing mobility and enhance the quality of a study related stay abroad? Could it equip students with skills that would allow them to make more of their study or placement abroad? Despite these questions, IaH has been a useful way to shift the focus onto what teachers and learners do in their local classrooms and communities rather than on relying solely on sending students abroad to develop their international perspectives (Beelen and Leask, 2011).

REGIONAL AND NATIONAL VARIATIONS IN APPROACH

The four themes described here are prominent in the literature describing and critiquing approaches to internationalisation of the curriculum in different parts of the world over the past 10 years. In a globalised world it is not surprising that a concept emerging in one national and regional context is adapted to other contexts. Hence the activities associated with internationalisation of the curriculum are both similar and different across regions of the world. This is in part due to the influence of political, economic and socio-cultural drivers within the local context (Leask and Bridge, 2013). There is also variation with the same region at the same time, and over time.

For example, while IaH in Europe has developed strongly over the last 10 years, there are still widely different approaches across the continent. The scope differs from country to country, university to university and discipline to discipline. The tools for IaH have also evolved over time resulting in new approaches. Technology now makes new tools available to those who want to internationalise curricula at home. Virtual mobility enables students to study at a university abroad without physically leaving home. Lecturers can teach to an international audience, supervise students and collaborate with colleagues, all without leaving their office. Somewhat paradoxically, virtual mobility in Europe is leading to a revival of traditional mobility. Students from different European countries, working together virtually, enhance their collaboration with short term physical mobility. It may be that the availability of low cost flights between cities becomes an important factor in forming partnerships. Existing short term mobility is made more effective by complementing it with longer term virtual collaboration between students and lecturers. As this type of short term mobility is part of the formal curriculum and its outcomes are being assessed within the curriculum, they can be considered elements of IaH. They fall outside the original definition of IaH and highlight a conceptual shift in response to changing conditions. IaH has changed its focus and character slightly in response to the changing environment and diversity of contexts within Europe itself.

UK and Australian universities are well known for their focus on the recruitment of fee-paying international students. This strategy has obvious economic benefits for institutions and national economies. For some time it was a commonly held belief that by increasing the diversity of students on campus, bridges of tolerance and understanding and life-long friendships between international and local students would be formed, transforming the learning of all. Bringing the world to the classroom was seen as a key strategy for internationalisation of the curriculum. It has become increasingly clear, however, that this is not the case. International students in both the UK and Australia have reported difficulties in connecting with local students, returning home after extended periods of study without having made any local friends (although they had made many international friends). UK and Australian students report both willingness and reluctance to engage with international students. Outbound mobility numbers have not improved as rapidly as had been hoped. Concerns have emerged that policy-makers, managers and curriculum designers, as well as teachers, have been too narrowly focussed on international students as the primary means of internationalisation of the curriculum

(Leask, 2003). Responses to this situation have varied across Australia and the UK, and within institutions in the same country.

Today all Australian universities, and some UK universities, include international perspectives and global citizenship in general statements of the qualities of their graduates. At the same time that IaH was developing as a concept in Europe, in Australia there was an attempt to refocus internationalisation of the curriculum on the deliberate and strategic use of what were often termed 'graduate attributes' as a driver for embedding the development of international and intercultural knowledge skills and attitudes into the curriculum (Leask, 2001). Their focus was on all students and they became a catalyst for a shift in emphasis in internationalisation of the curriculum. Universities began developing their own statements of generic graduate attributes, including such things as communication skills, the ability to work in groups, solve problems *etc* that would be developed alongside disciplinary-based knowledge. While there is some variation in the exact nature and scope of these statements, most included a graduate attribute that refers to preparing students for life in an increasingly globalised, interconnected world, global citizenship and/or international professions and careers. Increasing diversity in the classroom, resulting from both international student recruitment and the increasingly multicultural nature of the local student population, is viewed as a valuable resource for developing these graduate attributes. Preparing and supporting students to work in multicultural groups in class is increasingly associated with internationalisation of the curriculum.

However, in the first decade of the new century, amidst increasing concern in the UK as well as Australia about the extent to which international and domestic students really learnt from and with each other, and the realisation that generic skills are always taught and assessed within the context of the programme of study, greater attention was paid to engaging academic staff in the meaning of internationalisation within their disciplines. Discipline communities are to some degree constricted in thought and action by the paradigms within which they work. Thus critical decisions about what to include in the curriculum, how to teach and assess learning are often decided with little if any consideration being given to alternative models and ways of developing and disseminating knowledge, practising a profession or viewing the world. An important part of the process of internationalisation of the curriculum is to think beyond dominant paradigms, to explore emerging paradigms and imagine new possibilities and new ways of thinking and doing (Leask, 2013). This is an intellectually challenging task. It requires examination of the assumptions underlying dominant paradigms, consideration of the changing conditions, challenging the 'taken-for-granted' and an openness to alternative ways of viewing the world beyond the obvious and the dominant.

In the US, internationalisation of the curriculum is identified as an essential component of Comprehensive Internationalisation (Hudzik, 2010). Furthermore, while study abroad and exchange and internationalisation of the campus remain key focuses of activity for internationalisation of the curriculum, there is also growing interest in and awareness

of the need to develop new strategies to develop all students' international perspectives. The influence of scholars such as Mestenhauser (1998; 2007) in raising awareness of the need to challenge both the nature of the curriculum and the paradigms on which it is based in order to do this, and to focus attention on all students rather than just a few, has had impact internationally. Again, however, there are variations in approach in different universities within the region. Increased interest in the recruitment of fee-paying international students in some universities in the US may result in strategies to modify curriculum content as well as pedagogy in order to utilise this diversity to internationalise the learning outcomes of local students. If this is the case there is much to be learnt from the efforts of those in Australia, the UK and Canada who have sought to do the same.

An understanding of the concept of internationalisation of the curriculum and the trends and phases observed in Europe, Australia and the US have to some extent informed the discourse around the possible meaning of internationalisation in South Africa. The context in South Africa is, however, quite different. Globalisation has contributed to the dominance of Western educational models formulated in the developed world (Marginson, 2003). These models reflect significant similarity to Eurocentric practices, programmes and paradigms.

This hegemony of Western perspectives from the developed world is of direct relevance to the process of internationalisation of South African higher education, which has been affected by different considerations than those described above in Europe and Australia (Zeleza, 2012). Zeleza argues that internationalisation that is not grounded and nourished by African epistemic roots is likely to reproduce and reinforce the production of mimic knowledges; pale copies of Western knowledges of little value to Africa and no consequence to world scholarship (Zeleza, 2012). Higher education institutions in South Africa remain challenged by questions of the relevance and value of the knowledge produced by scholars in their institutions and the fairness with which this is disseminated and utilised by students and scholars worldwide.

Commentators in other parts of the developing world have also cautioned against re-colonisation and a continuation of oppression through the reproduction of Western policies and practices in developing countries seeking to internationalise their higher education systems (Mok, 2007). Debates about internationalisation often evoke nationalist reactions akin to those against colonialism as scholars search for alternative and legitimate knowledge regimes and paradigms. One of the challenges facing higher education institutions in the developing world seeking to internationalise is resolving the tension between the competing needs of local versus global development, on achieving an appropriate balance between developing the skills, knowledge and mindsets needed to support national development and those required for the successful participation of individuals and the country in a globalised world.

At a time when it is increasingly recognised that all students need to have access to global learning, world views and perspectives, student mobility is even more of a privilege in some countries of the world than in others. Simultaneously, the need for graduates

from these countries to develop the skills, knowledge and attitudes to work effectively in a globalised world, to be heard and have influence in this world, is both more urgent yet more difficult to achieve. The critical question for universities in the developing world today is how to define internationalisation within their particular national and regional context, given the socio-political, economic and academic conditions. Determining what internationalisation means for national and institutional policies and procedures as well as for the curriculum and the activities that support its enactment is not a simple task. Generally accepted definitions of internationalisation in higher education and related concepts such as internationalisation of the curriculum need to be unpacked and adapted to local conditions and interpreted in context.

In 2007 it was concluded that in Latin America "few institutions integrate international, global, intercultural or comparative topics in their curricula" and that the concept of Internationalisation at Home is "unknown" (Gacel Avila, 2007, p. 404). Since then, a range of national policies and institutional activities focused on internationalisation have emerged across the region. At a national level, in Colombia, one of the major economies of the Latin American and Caribbean region, internationalisation was identified as a priority in the National Policy on Education 2011 to 2014. A review of tertiary education in Columbia (OECD and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, 2012) makes recommendations for change to the current status of several components of comprehensive internationalisation in Columbian tertiary education. One of the recommendations is the inclusion of a global dimension into the curriculum as an integral part of academic programmes in all institutions, supported by training and incentives for faculty members and the incorporation of internationalisation into accreditation processes and programme approval and review (p 212). This signals a move away from internationalisation for a very small fraction of the overall student population to an approach focused on internationalisation for all. It is consistent with the government's aims for social and economic development, which are dependant on human capital development. How this might play out at an institutional level is evident at the Universidad Regiomontana in Monterrey in Mexico, which has developed an institution-wide approach to IaH. Similar approaches are evident in many other universities in Latin America.

In Asia, as in other regions of the world, there are both similarities and differences in approach to internationalisation. In Japan, internationalisation of university curricula is a highly valued and significant component of higher education. A key focus of activity has been on providing increasing numbers of programmes taught in English, but the recruitment of international students to study in Japan and sending Japanese students abroad to study have also been important (Huang, 2006). In China, the focus has also shifted. From 1978 to 1992, the focus was on sending academic staff, scholars and students abroad to study, inviting foreign scholars and experts to China and teaching and learning foreign languages, especially English. From 1993, the focus has been on encouraging Chinese scholars to return to China, attracting foreign students to come to China and ensuring staff and students have access within China to the most recent original English textbooks used in universities such as Harvard, Stanford and MIT (Huang, 2003).

There are many other approaches and regions of the world not covered here. However, the point made by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC, 2009) is evident in the above examples. In their practical guide to internationalisation of the curriculum for Canadian universities, the Association observed that while internationalisation of the curriculum has been linked for some time to the development of the international knowledge, perspective and skills students will need to excel in an increasingly globalised economy and society, a single definition of 'internationalisation' and 'internationalisation of the curriculum' is, "by no means universally applied by universities in Canada and abroad" (p.5).

We conclude that approaches to internationalisation of the curriculum are determined to some extent by national political and social conditions, and as with the parent concept of internationalisation in higher education, variations are also evident across institutions in the same nations. A relatively recent, emerging phenomenon is the focus on the difference between approaches to internationalisation of the curriculum in different disciplines (Clifford, 2009; Leask and Bridge, 2013). Studies of the nature of an internationalised curriculum in different disciplines are more common now than in the past.

FUTURE PRIORITIES

The above discussion highlights points of similarity as well as points of difference. Policies, accepted practice, values and priorities within the disciplines, the institution, local communities, the nation, the region and the world all influence approaches to internationalisation of the curriculum (Leask and Bridge, 2013). Internationalisation of the curriculum will continue to emerge and develop as a concept in context. We propose some priorities for future action as this occurs.

Priority 1: Engaging academic staff in the internationalisation agenda

The curriculum is linked to issues of social power and social control. World society is not one in which global resources and power are shared equally – "globalisation is being experienced as a discriminatory and even oppressive force in many places" (Soudien, 2005, 501). It has contributed to increasing the gap between the rich and the poor of the world, and the exploitation of the South by the North. This domination is not only economic. It is also intellectual; the dominance of Western educational models defining "what is knowledge and who is qualified to understand and apply that knowledge" (Goodman, 1984, p. 13), what research questions are asked, who will investigate them, and if and how the results will be applied (Carter, 2008). Globalisation has contributed to the dominance of Western educational models (Marginson, 2003).

Academic staff are key players in addressing this issue. They are the link between knowledge in the disciplines and student learning. They are responsible for the research that creates knowledge, and the curriculum that disseminates that knowledge and trains the next generation of researchers. Knowledge in and across the disciplines is the centre of the very concept of internationalisation of the curriculum.

Supporting academic staff to challenge dominant knowledge paradigms is an important part of the process of internationalisation of the curriculum (Leask, 2013).

Successive Global Survey Reports of the International Association of Universities (Knight, 2006; Egron-Polak and Hudson, 2010) have, however, found that issues related to staff involvement and expertise ranked high on the list of obstacles to the achievement of institutional internationalisation goals. In the 2nd Global Survey they even outranked the perceived lack of resources for internationalisation (Knight, 2006). Sanderson (2008) notes the importance of the internationalisation of the academic self. Others have noted that some disciplines are more open to internationalisation than others. Some believe that by their very nature their discipline is international; that it is based on 'universal knowledge', ignoring the fact that decisions about what does and doesn't count as knowledge are value-laden decisions that usually reflect dominant paradigms.

Increasing the engagement of academic staff in the internationalisation agenda of universities and other institutions of higher education must remain a priority for the future.

Priority 2: Preparing students to be members of an interconnected world community

Internationalisation of the curriculum is concerned with preparation for life as a citizen as well as life as a professional. It should not just be about training for the performance demands of professional practice in a globalised world. It should also prepare students to be ethical and responsible citizens; human and social beings in this globalised world. A number of scholars call for such an approach with urgency. Bennett (2003) argues that the development of global souls who "see themselves as members of a world community, knowing that they share the future with others" should be at the heart of education (p. 13). Nussbaum (2010) argues that the recognition of fellow citizens as having equal rights regardless of difference in race, gender, religion, sexuality; concern for the lives of others and the ability to imagine well and see one's own nation and life as part of a complicated world order are important skills in a globalised world. Rizvi and Lingard (2010) urge us to move away from the dominant neoliberal imaginary towards a new and blended imaginary which "recognises that students are social and cultural beings as well as economic ones" and the need to develop their ability to think locally, nationally and globally (p. 201). This curriculum would "seek to work with a different moral sense of people's situatedness in the world" (Rizvi and Lingard, 2010, p. 201).

However, when a programme is accredited by a local external professional body, the requirements of professional practice frequently dominate the curriculum. Academic staff will frequently argue that the curriculum is too full to do anything other than fulfil the requirements of the accreditation bodies upon which they depend for academic survival. In this situation, developing students' capacities to meet the moral responsibilities of an increasingly connected world, in which the benefits of globalisation are not equally shared, may be disregarded.

It is important to achieve the right balance in the higher education curriculum between the local and the global; between training students to work locally in a globalised world and educating them as ethical and responsible human beings and social actors in this world. This is an important priority for the future.

Priority 3: Assessing the development of intercultural competence

Brewer and Leask (2012) argue that the learning outcomes of an internationalised curriculum must be assessable and assessed, providing evidence that graduates are in fact "able to succeed personally and professionally in an internationalised and globalised world" (p. 261). As discussed earlier, the development of intercultural competence is assuming greater importance in the internationalised curriculum. While much work has been done on defining the skills, knowledge and attitudes that comprise intercultural competence, there is still no agreement on exactly what combination is appropriate and required in different situations, although Deardorff (2009), in a study based in the US, has at least developed a consensus definition of intercultural competence, as "effective and appropriate behaviour and communication in intercultural situations" (Deardorff, 2009, p. 33). A few concrete examples are available of the embedding of the development of intercultural competence into disciplinary based programmes (see, for example, Freeman *et al,* 2009; Barker and Mak, forthcoming). These Australian studies discuss strategies and resources that have been used to describe, develop and assess learning outcomes related to the development of intercultural competence across programmes of study. More examples are needed in different disciplines and contexts.

Priority 4: Sustaining and building inclusive global networks

As approaches to internationalisation of the curriculum develop across the world in coming years, and the concept is further developed, there will be much to be gained from ensuring that the perspectives of the developing as well as the developed world are recognised. Lessons learnt in one context may assist those facing similar issues at different times and in different contexts. To some extent this can be achieved through collaboration between established networks such as the EAIE SIG *Internationalisation at Home* (IaH), the Internationalisation of the Curriculum (IoC) SIG in the International Education Association of Australia (IEAA), the newly formed IoC SIG in the International Education Association of South Africa and the Teaching, Learning and Scholarship Knowledge Community of NAFSA. Open sharing of resources and ideas have enriched the contributions of all in joint presentations at annual conferences and collaboratively developed and delivered workshops for academic staff on practical matters associated with internationalisation of the curriculum. As global communities of practice, networks facilitate the sharing of expertise and multiple perspectives resulting in multiple benefits for all involved. They utilise expertise and engage members in areas of interest to them and importance to the sector. By doing so, each one offers its members and the broader global community of international educators and the students they work with an important service. Nurturing, sustaining, deepening and extending these relationships to include groups in other parts of the world can only lead to increased understanding of the international and intercultural issues embedded

within approaches to internationalisation in the core area of teaching and learning. It is critical that discussion, debate and action in these areas do not occur in isolation in a world that is increasingly interdependent and connected in all other areas. Our shared future depends on such understanding and international and intercultural communities of practice have an increasingly important role to play in shaping the future landscape of internationalisation and student learning.

Sustaining and expanding these networks, ensuring that these communities are truly global, is important because the inclusion of diverse perspectives is at the core of internationalisation of the curriculum. It also has the potential to enrich conceptual and practical developments.

CONCLUSION

Increasingly, internationalisation of the curriculum is being considered in the context of the disciplines in a globalising, interconnected world. This allows the internationalisation of teaching and learning to take on a different dimension. An internationalised curriculum for all students is a way of engaging those who might otherwise not have the opportunity to develop critical skills, knowledge and attitudes for life and work in a globalised world. This is a matter of equity and as such, also a matter of necessity.

Taking account of the diversity in classrooms, the global nature of scholarship and the global value placed on collaborative teaching and research, as well as the graduate attributes that business and industry are calling for amidst a rapidly changing national environment, requires considerable intellectual and physical effort. This is where international networks and partnerships can be a good mechanism for engaging faculty.

As approaches to internationalisation of the curriculum continue to develop in the 21st century, it is essential that we ensure that the discourse around internationalisation of the curriculum is itself inclusive of diverse perspectives. Of all of the themes and priorities identified in this chapter, this is perhaps the most important. It alone will ensure that all other goals are achieved.

References

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC)(2009). *Internationalization of the curriculum: A practical guide to support Canadian universities' efforts.* Retrieved February 4, 2013, from http://www.aucc.ca/_pdf/english/publications/curriculum-primer_e.pdf

Barker, M.C., & Mak, A. S. (in press). From classroom to boardroom and ward: Developing generic intercultural skills competencies Business and Health students and professionals. In *Journal of Studies in International Education.*

Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalisation of universities: A university culture-based framework. In *Higher Education,* Volume 45, Number 1 (pp. 43–70).

Beelen, J., & Leask, B. (2011). Internationalisation at Home on the Move. In *Raabe Handbook Internationalisation of European Higher Education.* Berlin: Raabe Academic Publishers. Retrievable from http://www.raabe.de/go/?action=ProdDetails&product_uuid=HGMNC44Z8JSL4E6WV5D3DFYOEYBLIAUP

Bennet, J. (2008). On becoming a global soul: A path to engagement during study abroad. In V. Savicki (Ed.), *Developing intercultural competence and transformation* (pp. 13–31). Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing.

Brewer, B., & Leask, B. (2012). Internationalization of the Curriculum. In D. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Internationalisation* (pp 245–266). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

Carter, L. (2008). Globalization and science education: The implications of science in the new economy. In *Journal of Research in Science Teaching,* Volume 45, Number 5, (pp. 617–633).

Childress, L. (2010). *The twenty-first century university: Developing faculty engagement in internationalisation.* New York: Peter Lang.

Clifford, V. (2009). Engaging the disciplines in internationalising the curriculum. In *International Journal for Academic Development,* Volume 14, Number 2, (pp. 133–143).

Crowther, P., Joris, M., Otten, M., Nilsson, B., Teekens, H., & Wächter, B. (2001). *Internationalisation at home; A position paper.* Amsterdam: EAIE.

Deardorff, D. (2006). The identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization at institutions of higher education in the United States. In *Journal of Studies in International Education,* Volume 10, Number 3, (pp. 241–266).

Deardorff, D. (2009). *The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

Deardorff, D., & Jones, E. (2012). Intercultural competence: an emerging focus. In D. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Internationalisation* (Chapter 16, pp. 283–304). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

De Vita, G. (2002). Does assessed multi-cultural group work really pull UK students' average down? In *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,* Volume 27, Number 2, (pp. 153–161).

De Wit, H., & Beelen, J. (2012). Socrates in the Low Countries: Designing, implementing, and facilitating internationalisation of the curriculum at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences (HvA). In J. Ryan (Ed.), *Cross-cultural teaching and learning for home and international students. Internationalisation of pedagogy and curriculum in higher education.* London: Routledge.

Egron-Polak, E., & Hudson, R. (2010). *Internationalization of higher education: Global trends, regional perspectives.* (IAU 3rd Global Survey Report). Paris: IAU.

Freeman, M., Treleaven L., Ramburuth, P., Leask, B., Caulfield, N., Simpson, L., Ridings, S., & Sykes, C. (2009). *Embedding the development of intercultural competence in Business education.* Canberra: Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching. Retrievable from http://www.olt.gov.au/project-embedding-development-intercultural-sydney-2006

Gacel-Ávila, J. (2007). The process of internationalization of Latin American higher education. In *Journal of Studies in International Education,* Volume 11, Number 3/4, (pp. 400–409).

Goodman, J. (1984). Reflection and teacher education: A case study and theoretical analysis. In *Interchange,* Volume 15, Number 3, (pp. 9–26).

Hamilton, S. (1998). Setting the foundations for internationalization of Australian higher education. In *Education '98: the Industry Practitioners' Forum,* 17–19 March 1998, Sydney.

Harari, M. (1992). The internationalization of the curriculum. In C. B. Klasek (Ed.), *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education* (pp. 52–79). Carbondale, IL: Association of International Education Administrators.

Huang, F. (2003). Policy and Practice of the Internationalization of Higher Education in China. In *Journal of Studies in International Education,* Volume 7, (pp. 225–240).

Huang, F. (2006). Internationalization of University Curricula in Japan: Major Policies and Practice Since the 1980s. In *Journal of Studies in International Education,* Volume 10, (pp. 102–118).

Hudzik, J.K. (2010). *Comprehensive Internationalisation: From Concept to Action.* A NAFSA Report. Retrievable from www.nafsa.org/cizn

Jones, E., & Killick, D. (2013). Graduate attributes and the internationalised curriculum: embedding a global outlook in disciplinary learning outcomes. In *Journal of Studies in International Education,* Volume 17, (pp.165–182).

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization Remodeled: Definition, Approaches, and Rationales. In *Journal of Studies in International Education,* Volume 8, (pp. 5–31).

Knight, J. (2006). *Internationalization of higher education: New directions, new challenges.* IAU 2nd Global Survey Report. Paris: IAU.

Leask, B. (2003). Beyond the numbers - levels and layers of internationalisation to utilise and support growth and diversity. Refereed Paper presented at the *17th IDP Australian International Education Conference,* 21–24 October, 2003, Melbourne, Australia. Retrievable from http://www.aiec.idp.com/pdf/LeaskWed1635_p.pdf

Leask, B. (2001). Bridging the Gap: Internationalising University Curricula. In *Journal of Studies in International Education,* Volume 5, Number. 2, (pp. 100–115). Retrievable from http://jsi.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/5/2/100

Leask, B. (2009). Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students. In *Journal of Studies in International Education,* Volume 13, Number 2, (pp. 205–221)

Leask, B. (2012). *Internationalisation of the curriculum (IoC) in action, A guide.* Adelaide: University of South Australia.

Leask, B. (2013). Internationalising the curriculum in the disciplines – imagining new possibilities. In *Journal of Studies in International Education,* Volume 17, Number 2, (pp. 103-118).

Leask, B., & Beelen, J. (2010). Enhancing the engagement of academic staff in international education. In *Proceedings of a Joint IEAA-EAIE Symposium* (pp. 28-40). Melbourne: International Education Association of Australia.

Leask, B., & Bridge, C. (2013). Comparing internationalisation of the curriculum across the disciplines: theoretical and practical perspectives. In *Compare: a journal of comparative and international education Special Issue: Contemporary issues on the internationalisation of higher education: critical and comparative perspectives,* Volume 43, Number 1, (pp. 79–101).

Lee, M. (2000). The impacts of globalisation on education in Malaysia. In N. P. Stromqvist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globlaisation and education; Integratin and contestatin across cultures* (pp. 315–332). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Marginson, S. (2003). *Markets in higher education: National and global competition.* Radford Lecture at NZARE/AARE Joint Conference. Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved May 21, 2013 from http://publications.aare.edu.au/03pap/mar03831.pdf

Mestenhauser, J. (2007). Internationalization at home: A brilliant idea awaiting implementation. In H. Teekens (Ed.), *Internationalisation at home: Ideas and ideals. EAIE Occasional Paper 20.* Amsterdam: EAIE.

Mestenhauser, J. (1998). Portraits of an internationalized curriculum. In J. Mestenhauser & B. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the Higher Education Curriculum* (pp. 3–35). Phoenix, Arizona: Oryx.

Mok, K. (2007). Questing for internationalisation of universities in Asia: Critical reflections. In *Journal of Studies in International Education,* Volume 11, Number 3/4, (pp. 433–454).

Nussbaum, M. (2010). *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

OECD & the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank (2012). *Reviews of National Policies for Education: Tertiary Education in Columbia 2012.* OECD Publishing.

Ogude, N. (2007). Internationalising the Curriculum. In N. Jooste, & M. Neale-Shutte *Volume 2 Internationalising the Curriculum.* Port Elizabeth: Nelson Mandela University.

Paige, M.R. (1993). Chapter 1, On the nature of intercultural experiences and intercultural education. In M.R. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience.* Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy.* Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Sanderson, G. (2008). A foundation for the internationalisation of the academic self. In *Journal of Studies in International Education,* Volume 12, Number 3, (pp. 276–307).

Sild Lönroth, C., & Nilsson, B. (2007). A nightingale sang in Malmö Square. The story of the Nightingale programme at Malmö University, Sweden. In H. Teekens (Ed.), *Internationalisation at home: Ideas and ideals. EAIE Occasional Paper 20* (pp.61–68). Amsterdam: EAIE.

Soudien, C. (2005). Inside but below: The puzzle of education in the global order. In J. Zajda (Ed.), *International handbook on globalisation, education and policy research* (pp. 501–516). Dordrecht: Springer.

Spencer-Oatey, H., & Franklin, P. (2009). Intercultural interaction : a multidisciplinary approach to intercultural communication (9781403986313). Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stohl, M. (2007). We have met the enemy and he is us: The role of the faculty in the internationlization of higher education in the coming decade. In *Journal of Studies in International Education,* Volume 11, Number 3-4, (pp. 359–372).

Teekens, H. (Ed.)(2006). *Internationalization at home: A global perspective.* The Hague: Nuffic.

Teekens, H. (Ed.)(2007). *Internationalisation at home: Ideas and ideals. EAIE Occasional Paper 20.* Amsterdam: EAIE.

Teichler, U. (2004). The changing debate on internationalisation of higher education. In *Higher Education,* Volume 48, Number 1, (pp. 5–26).

Van der Wende, M. (1997). Missing Links. In T. Kalvemark & M. van der Wende (Eds.), *National policies for the internationalisation of higher education in Europe.* Stockholm: National Agency for Higher Education.

Volet, S., & Ang, G. (1998). Culturally mixed groups on international campuses: An opportunity for inter-cultural learning. In *Higher Education Research and Development,* Volume 17, Number 1, (pp. 5–23).

Webb, G. (2005). Internationalisation of curriculum: An institutional approach. In J. Carroll & J. Ryan (Eds.), *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all.* London: Routledge.

Zeleza, P.T. (2012). *Internationalisation in Higher Education: Opportunities and Challenges for the Knowledge Project in the Global South.* Paper presented at the SARUA Vice Chancellors Leadership Dialogue on Internationalisation in Higher Education: Implications for the Knowledge Project in the Global South, Maputo, Mozambique, June 22–23, 2012. Retrieved from www.sarua.org

About THE AUTHORS

Betty Leask is Professor and Executive Director Learning and Teaching at La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia. She has extensive experience as a senior leader in internationalisation, teaching and learning at both faculty and university level. The focus of Betty's research is on linking theory, policy and practice in internationalisation, teaching and learning. She has published extensively in these areas. In 2010 she was awarded an Australian National Teaching Fellowship focused on internationalisation of the curriculum in different disciplinary and institutional contexts. She is Co-Editor, with Hans de Wit, of the *Journal of Studies in International Education*, and holds a number of honorary positions including Visiting Fellow at the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation at the Universita Cattolica del Sacre Cuore in Milan, Italy. Betty has been an elected member of the International Education Association of Australia (IEAA) Board since 2006.

Jos Beelen is a researcher and consultant on internationalisation of the curriculum based at the Centre for Applied Research on Economics and Management at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, the Netherlands. He chairs the EAIE SIG *Internationalisation at Home* (IaH) and is a visiting fellow at Leeds Metropolitan University's Centre for Academic Practice and Research in Internationalisation (CAPRI), UK. His current research is focused on the implementation of the international dimension into higher education curricula from a global perspective, in close cooperation with researchers from Europe and Australia. Jos has facilitated numerous training courses on IaH for the EAIE and is a certificated EAIE trainer. He edited *Implementing Internationalisation at Home* (2007) and has written a number of articles on the same topic as well as contributing to numerous workshops, training sessions and conferences on all continents.

Loveness Kaunda is a Malawian-born South African. She recently retired from the University of Cape Town where she spent over 20 years in various capacities, including Dean of Students and Director of Internationalisation. Her university career spanned three universities in three countries, Malawi, Lesotho and South Africa. She has published numerous language and science education research papers and presented numerous papers at local and international conferences on internationalisation. She has also served on numerous academic, administrative, student and university-wide committees as well as professional associations, boards and Ministerial Task Teams. She is currently Assistant Manager: Research & Innovation at Higher Education South Africa (HESA). Loveness is a founding member of the Internationalisation of the Curriculum Special Interest Group of the International Education Association of South Africa (IEASA).

ESSAY 21

Internationalisation and the student of the future

— Elspeth Jones

Elspeth Jones is Professor Emerita of the Internationalisation of Higher Education and International Education Consultant. She was previously International Dean at Leeds Metropolitan University, UK. She has published widely on comprehensive and value-driven internationalisation and is Series Editor of *Internationalization in Higher Education* (Routledge). Her principal fields of research include transformational learning through international and intercultural experiences, the link between curriculum internationalisation and multiculturalism, and the role of internationalisation in enhancing student employability.

"Students should be seen as the main beneficiaries of internationalisation efforts in spite of an increasing trend to view internationalisation as a marker of institutional reputation or as a proxy for quality."

The 25 years since the EAIE began have seen immense changes in the internationalisation of higher education, so forecasting the next 25 years is a hugely difficult task. Much has been written about the purpose of internationalisation and what it means for universities, for students and for staff. My standpoint is that if internationalisation aims to enhance institutional and academic quality, the ultimate beneficiaries will be students and they should be at the heart of our efforts. We can do this, in part, through internationalising the curriculum.

Diverse classrooms and learning spaces as a resource for internationalisation

Curriculum internationalisation is a response to the need to prepare our graduates for work in the new reality of a globally interconnected world. Whether or not they plan to work overseas, today's graduates, let alone those of the future, will be faced with increasingly international contexts and intercultural challenges as migration and a mobile workforce result in diverse, multicultural workplaces. To prepare graduates effectively we must therefore incorporate global disciplinary perspectives into our curricula and seek to develop students' intercultural competence. It is acknowledged that the intercultural competence required to operate effectively in global contexts is equally important for increasingly diverse and multicultural local communities. Thus the kind of diverse classrooms and learning spaces found in today's universities are a resource that can be used purposefully to help develop the intercultural skills of all students. Helping students to challenge their own identity, values, assumptions and stereotypes requires us to adopt an inclusive approach to curriculum and pedagogy, and to recognise and value the cultural insights that our students (and staff) can offer and which might otherwise be overlooked.

This is difficult enough in a traditional, campus-based environment but in the rapidly evolving and dynamic world of international education, different learning contexts introduce still greater complexity. Even those students who are essentially campus-based are studying in a range of modes or contexts.

Firstly, they may be either full- or part-time, possibly with some online, blended or distributed learning in addition to attendance on campus. Furthermore, students themselves may be:

- Studying in their home country for the whole programme
- Studying in the home country with a period of work/study placement or volunteering abroad
- Studying abroad for their whole programme
- Following an international programme in a country different from the accrediting university (either at home or in a third country), *eg* on a branch campus or through collaborative arrangements with a local institution

Impact of online programmes and challenges for internationalisation

Recent years have seen changes to the global flow of students. Although Western and English speaking countries still predominate, countries in East and South-East Asia, the Middle East, Latin America and Southern Africa are progressively seen as recruiting countries. At the same time, universities across Europe are delivering programmes in English to facilitate mobility and their numbers look set to grow. Global student mobility is becoming ever more complex and this trend is likely to continue. However, other learning contexts are also becoming prevalent with students following fully (or largely) online programmes:

- Studying fully-accredited and assessed online programmes
- Studying entirely online without assessment, *eg* MOOCs

And finally there are those who are only looking for accreditation of their learning, not following a formal programme of study at all, *eg* through the University of London external awards.

Each of these learning contexts brings its own challenge for curriculum internationalisation, which – while it has seen increased emphasis as the student experience takes centre stage – is not fully embedded even on home soil. How much more difficult then to incorporate internationalisation of the curriculum into emerging forms of learning? When there is no 'campus' to 'internationalise', how can online programmes offer cultural insights or transform students' global perspectives? When student mobility might mean travelling from your own country to Vietnam to study for an Australian degree, what does 'study abroad' mean?

Yet distance and flexible learning programmes delivered online can be of significant advantage to those students unable to attend standard programmes, as the success of the UK's Open University attests – along with equivalent institutions around the globe. With technological innovations, new pedagogies and approaches to learning will make the online offer more attractive, particularly for niche undergraduate programmes or more specialised courses at postgraduate level. This will provide greater flexibility for those unable to attend a campus-based programme, including those who work or who have caring responsibilities. Internationalising the online curriculum will thus bring new challenges for creative minds to address.

Much has been written about MOOCs and how they will change the future of learning. They differ from other forms of online learning in potentially providing mass,

free education, which is largely uncertificated. It remains to be seen whether this kind of approach will prompt the demise of campus-based learning. One key issue is whether following such programmes will become recognised by employers as an equivalent to fully-certificated degree programmes. We came a step closer to this in early December 2012, with the announcement of Coursera Career Services – only eight months after Coursera (one of the major MOOC providers) launched as a company in April 2012. The service claims to match committed students with companies and positions in line with their skills and interests. If merely following a programme becomes valued by employers, as opposed to the requirement of evidencing achievement through assessment, then surely the face of learning may well be changed.

Internationalisation and the new learning technologies

This will leave those of us interested in curriculum internationalisation with bigger dilemmas. In fact, what would internationalisation mean for a programme with students from all corners of the world, who have little or no interaction with each other or anything but a one-way relationship with the teacher? If programmes with thousands of students worldwide are to retain the interest of their adherents, we must assume that questions of cultural bias or dominance will be addressed and that alternative perspectives on the subject at hand will be built in. But can this be assumed? Do such programmes run the risk of reinforcing stereotypes rather than challenging them, or perpetuating western cultural values and norms? In contrast, if they can tap into the diversity of the learner population for the benefit of all, perhaps there is the potential for some genuine intercultural learning.

The same can be said for campus-based programmes. The student benefits of international mobility or a fully-overseas education have been repeatedly reported in studies in recent years. An example of this is in respect to future employability. Study, work or volunteering abroad has been demonstrated to enhance the transferable employability skills valued by employers. We have yet to see reported evidence of similar benefits for non-mobile students through curriculum internationalisation, even though there are many innovative approaches underway in different parts of the world. Again, using the resources of a diverse student- and staff population can be of considerable benefit for enhancing intercultural competence and the development of transferable skills. While this is challenging enough on a domestic campus, it will be all the more difficult for offshore branch campuses or collaborative delivery with overseas partners. The students in these and future kinds of learning contexts will have enhanced expectations of an internationalised curriculum to facilitate their transition into global work environments.

One means by which pedagogy could respond to these challenges in the next 25 years is by taking advantage of technological advances, which are likely to increase rather than decrease in pace. By the end of that period, students will be communicating with each other in ways we cannot currently predict. The world wide web was not in widespread use when the EAIE was founded. At that time, who would have anticipated mobile phones in every pocket, tablet computers, social networking and continuous communication? It will be interesting to see what technological advances in the coming years will mean for internationalisation, how changing approaches to communication will help to redefine curriculum and pedagogy, and how group work and student collaboration will be facilitated in ways we can only imagine.

I have argued that students should be seen as the main beneficiaries of internationalisation efforts in spite of an increasing trend to view internationalisation as a marker of institutional reputation or as a proxy for quality. It will be interesting to observe whether the next 25 years will see us making the most of technological advancement and changing communication patterns to enhance the internationalisation of curricula, the student experience and learning outcomes for students.

Internationalisation is a means to an end, not an end result. Students of the future will expect higher education to equip them with the tools to operate effectively in a globalised world, and international/intercultural competence will be one of those tools. Perhaps in another 25 years this will be so ingrained in curricula and pedagogy that we will no longer need to agonise over such issues. Perhaps, perhaps, perhaps.

ESSAY 22

Internationalisation at Home: as important as mobility for the achievement of internationalisation policy goals

— Guy Haug

Guy Haug is an expert on the European Higher Education Area. He was associated with the early days of the Erasmus programme and the EAIE. He was also instrumental in shaping and initiating the Bologna Process and later the EU's Agenda for the Modernisation of Higher Education and is therefore considered one of the 'brain fathers' of the European Higher Education Area. Over the last decade, he has devoted a growing proportion of his work to the development of Spanish and Latin American higher education systems and institutions. He received the EAIE Constance Meldrum Award for his work in 2009.

"What used to work fine for a limited number of students, between a limited number of countries, will not continue to deliver (proportionally) the same benefits when numbers explode, the differences between the host and home systems are much bigger and the number of languages involved increases tremendously."

A pot of many flavours

It was just like when Obelix fell into a pot of magic potion as a child, except that mine was called 'internationalisation'. It started with a French-German taste, then added the flavour of a few more countries (notably the UK and Spain) and then took on the seasoning of the EU as it grew from 12 to 15, then 25 and 27 countries, with a foretaste of a few more newcomers. At the same time, new fragrances and flavours started to come in from all over the world through recently opened windows: from the eastern half of Europe and soon afterwards from the former Soviet Union, from the US, then from Asia and Latin America. I fell into a small pot of bilateral mobility, which later looked like a series of ever larger pots for multilateral exchange schemes, internationalisation for non-mobile students, whole programmes, universities, countries and continents.

The EAIE has followed a similar itinerary, starting with the promotion of and support for organised mobility between a limited range of western European countries and reaching now into large-scale, multilateral mobility and into a whole range of internationalisation activities that reach far beyond sending students abroad and hosting students sent by foreign partner institutions. I would like to dedicate this essay to these 'other' activities, focusing on non-mobile students, which may be gathered under the name 'Internationalisation at Home' (IaH).

The values and challenges of mobility

In order to not be misunderstood, let me state clearly that mobility is a key aspect of internationalisation and will remain an indispensable dimension of it in the coming decades. The sudden explosion of cross-border student mobility made possible through the Erasmus programme at the end of the 1980s is at the origin of anything else that followed in the development of European higher education over the past two decades. The feedback brought back by students after an Erasmus stay abroad could not

be ignored, neither by higher education institutions nor by national ministries. It underpinned the development of comparisons, not all of them favourable to local systems and practices.

Comparisons were soon supported by statistical data and contributed to spreading the awareness that maybe the others were doing something right, possibly even better than 'we'. It should, however, be recalled that Erasmus mobility at that time was significant but not generalised. It usually required the integration of host students into home courses, usually in the local language, and practical arrangements could usually be customised by the home and host institution.

I am fundamentally convinced of the virtues of such mobility, which I also see as a cost-effective means to set in motion sometimes ossified higher education programmes and structures. I am less convinced that what used to work fine for a limited number of students, between a limited number of countries, will continue to deliver (proportionally) the same benefits when numbers explode, the differences between the host and home systems are much bigger and the number of languages involved increases tremendously.

The possibilities of real integration into the host system become scarcer, customised attention to students more difficult, English for all tends to substitute most other languages, and exchange students tend at some institutions to become a separate group taking separate courses. Overall, this means that it becomes more important to watch qualitative aspects of mobility than to plan its numerical expansion or geographical diversification.

This attention to all the various aspects that contribute to 'higher quality' study abroad has grown over the past decade or so, but in my view the too rapid increase in mobility in too many directions has come with increased risks of lower quality for some – in my view a significant proportion – of exchange students. I am, therefore, far from convinced that the main objective of the proposed new 'Erasmus for All' – *ie* a huge numerical expansion of mobile students – is adequate and realistically achievable without a commensurate loss of control about the quality of the learning process abroad.

Internationalisation as a core dimension of all higher education

In spite of the importance of mobility, it seems to be obvious that its function in internationalisation is more that of a trigger than an instrument for all. Mobility has its limits; academic ones, but also physical and economic ones. Internationalisation needs to find other ways if it is to produce its impact on non-mobile students and teachers, on institutions, campuses and whole systems of higher education. IaH is the second pillar of internationalisation, without which the whole process cannot achieve its goals. What matters is to conceive of internationalisation as a dimension of all higher education, making students aware of the huge transformations in progress in the world (the so-called globalisation and its consequences, which reach every institution's and every student's courtyard) and developing in them the attitudes, skills and competences (including with respect to languages and intercultural aspects) needed to live and work in this different world. This brings us to the heart of internationalisation, which has – or should have – at its centre the education of local students – even though other dimensions, like the search for international prestige, talent and resources may have a bearing on this main goal.

In concrete terms, this requires an in-depth renovation of curricula, a profound rethinking and reorganisation of the teaching–learning chain (in line with the principles of Life Long Learning and the development of digital learning, together with significant changes in learners' attitudes towards learning), and an adequate level of internationalisation of universities' teaching and administrative staff, of management and of campus life. Incoming and outgoing mobility of students and staff needs to be intertwined with this much broader effort for internationalisation, underpinning it and being supported by it at the same time.

Hence, internationalisation is a medium-term, comprehensive strategy that needs to be conducted at the institutional as well as national and European level. This strategy usually combines cooperative and competitive aspects. It tends to focus on a number of geographical areas and key partner institutions and countries. It requires both a high degree of attention to what is changing in the world and a high degree of discernment to identify suitable and realistic avenues into the future. It needs networking at all levels and decision making capacities. It ought not to forget that internationalisation is not a goal in itself, but a strategy aimed at achieving specific local/national goals such as increasing the international competences of students and graduates.

The birth and growth of Internationalisation at Home

It was far from obvious that the EAIE, as an association of international officers of higher education institutions, would be among the first bodies to acknowledge the importance of IaH. Yet, the Association set up a Special Interest Group dedicated specifically to IaH in 1999. Good, useful work came out of it and it may require ever more attention in the current situation of Europe with respect to its economic, social and higher education systems. Obviously, this development at the EAIE did not happen in isolation. It was encouraged by development in similar directions in the broader environment: the Bologna Process as well as the Tuning Project have acknowledged the importance of internationalisation beyond mobility (in particular by means of curriculum development based on international/comparative aspects), the same as the EU's Agenda for the Modernisation of Higher Education. Both Tuning and the European Higher Education Area moved from their initial focus on Europe to the development of a strong 'external' dimension extending in all geographical dimensions. Many countries have adopted national strategies for the development of their own higher education system and institutions in view of the major world trends affecting higher education, the economy and labour markets, and, explicitly or not, such strategies include internationalisation aspects – some of them related to mobility (*eg* with the aim of promoting their attractiveness among foreign postgraduate students and faculty), many others belonging to the sphere of IaH.

Quality higher education and the international dimension

Concluding, I would therefore like to invite the EAIE as well as all policy makers in higher education, and those who advise them, to strengthen this crucial dimension in every respect. I would invite them to have regard for the changes implied by IaH in related areas, such as the place and methods of language learning, the socio-economic relevance of curricula, and the emphasis on employability at home and abroad. This should also have a bearing on quality assurance, both internal – is it still possible to deliver quality higher education without an international dimension? – and external – how should the need for quality in mobility and IaH be reflected in

the criteria and procedures used by quality assurance agencies? In helping members and their institutions to further broaden and deepen their international dimensions, for the benefit of their constituencies and stakeholders, the EAIE should do so knowing that some of the major challenges they will have to address and overcome will be related to Internationalisation at Home.

ESSAY 23

Students want to feel employable

— Will Archer and Nannette Ripmeester

Will Archer is CEO and Founder of the International Graduate Insight Group (since January 2013 part of Tribal Group plc). Previously, Will worked for 15 years as an adviser to multinational corporations on international recruitment, researching and recruiting talent across Asia, Africa, North America and Europe. In 2005 he founded i-graduate, with the goal of improving the education experience for students and educators worldwide.

Nannette Ripmeester is Founder and Director of Expertise in Labour Mobility (ELM). She is considered an expert on global mobility trends and an acknowledged trainer in enhancing global corporate success. She is also Director of Client Services Europe, International Graduate Insight Group.

"What do students want? In fact the answer is simple: graduates want a job."

From the earliest days of Europe's grand Erasmus plan for student mobility, the pioneers of the EAIE pushed back the borders of learning and clocked up more air miles than ever before. Their legacy is a pan-European and global network of exchange and partnership, study abroad and reciprocal research. The challenge is to understand what today's students want and expect from their international education, and use this to stir the internationalisation agenda of tomorrow.

Hence the key question needs to be: What do students want? In fact the answer is simple: Graduates want a job. Research shows that only 11% want to travel after graduation, most students want a job and, if possible, a career. And they expect higher education to provide them with this job and access to the job market. We have seen this shift in emphasis from the pursuit of knowledge to the pursuit of employment – and whether we like this change or not, it seems here to stay.

Students nowadays want to feel employable. They want to understand what possibilities they have in the job market and what career paths lie ahead of them. Research from i-graduate among 209 422 students in 16 countries shows that 29% of international students are unsatisfied with their own employability on the basis of the education they are receiving at their host institution. This insecurity about their employability is even further increased by the need international students express when it comes to career advice. Over 50% of international students express a need for more career advice. Not fully understanding their own market value, plus being in doubt about what skills employers are looking for, puts international students in particular at risk of being unsuccessful in the labour market of their host country.

Incorporating employability into the curriculum

For higher education institutions (HEIs), the employability of their students is of eminent importance. Foremost because it shows that the academic knowledge gained has paid off. However, the career success of current students has an impact on the stream of future applications as well. If international students fail to find work after graduation, this reflects on the overall picture of their international study experience. No matter how hard education professionals try to recruit international students, if we cannot meet the promise of a career path afterwards, we have failed in the eyes of the international students.

The current debate in academia is very much focussed on how to incorporate employability into the curriculum. At the third ASEM Rectors' Conference (ARC3) 'Universities, Businesses and You: For a Sustainable Future' in September 2012 in Groningen, much of the discussion centred on the need for universities to create more opportunities for students to acquire competences for the workplace. "There is a gap between theory being taught in the universities and the practical requirements of the job market," said Vicki Baars, Vice President for Union Development at the National Union of Students in the UK. The other international students who participated in this conference confirmed the view suggesting that 'soft skills', such as intercultural communication skills, should be integrated in the curriculum. The few employers present underlined the importance of the ability to communicate and work across borders.

Internationalisation and maximising career potential

One can argue that asking employers for their opinion and advice is preaching to the converted. This is true, to a large extent. Nonetheless, when setting the internationalisation agenda for the next 25 years, it does make sense to involve employers as stakeholders. We do need to listen to their needs and requirements, but we should not 'develop' students solely to fit their needs as this would limit the scope of an academic training. But we should 'grow' international talent; students able to work in different cultural settings and meet the requirements of an ever globalising labour market. Higher education should strengthen the international component, as an international experience is likely to instil exactly those skills the job market requires from graduates: the ability and skills to maximise their own career potential.

If students signal such a clear gap in their education, universities need to consider action. It is our belief that the group most appropriate to provide an insight into the learning experience at any institution is the student body itself. For this reason student surveys, such as the International Student Barometer, ask international students what they anticipate, what they experience and how satisfied they are with the experience in the areas of learning, living and support services. This means that results are derived from those directly affected by the institution and its methods of education provision, rather than, for instance, using the opinions of those on the outside, looking in.

Students are in the driving seat and the new shape of internationalisation in higher education seems to be inward-looking, necessarily introspective. The focus of internationalisation has turned to the student, and over the years the debate on the university's role with regards to employment has changed. "In the past, universities prepared students for a career for life. Nowadays, we develop students for a lifetime of careers," says Professor Tan Tai Yong, Vice Provost for Student Life from the National University of Singapore.

The challenge for the future is to keep a finger on the pulse of changing attitudes and motivations. Ultimately, if we are not there for the student, we have to ask ourselves whether we and our university will be there at all in the next 25 years.

ESSAY 24

Joint degrees: a hallmark for successful international academic cooperation

— Jordi Curell

Jordi Curell has a Law background and since 1986 has worked in different positions in the European Commission, including in DG Employment, where he was responsible for coordinating the preparation and implementation of the European Social Agenda. He is presently the director responsible for Higher Education and international affairs in the European Commission, DG Education and Culture, running policies and programmes such as Erasmus, Erasmus Mundus and Marie Curie Actions, and supporting the long-term development of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT).

"Erasmus has changed the lives of all who participated and it has also changed the way HEIs relate to and cooperate with each other."

From bilateral...

International cooperation between higher education institutions (HEIs) within the European Union (EU) started with the exchange of students on the basis of bilateral agreements. Since 1987, the EU has been instrumental in developing this form of cooperation through mobility. The Erasmus programme has played a fundamental role and to date has allowed more than 2.7 million people to benefit from a mobility experience within Europe over the past 25 years. Erasmus has changed the lives of all who participated and it has also changed the way HEIs relate to and cooperate with each other. The widespread use of learning outcomes, transferability of credits (in particular through the European Credit System Transfer, ECTS, and the diploma supplement), the use of EU-wide transparency and recognition tools have contributed to better understanding and mutual trust between institutions across Europe. The programme's success has had an impact beyond students and institutions. It helped to shape a new European higher education landscape and led to the launch of the Bologna Process and many of its distinctive features including comparable and compatible study programmes.

To joint programmes...

The development of individual credit mobility led to innovative types of partnerships, requiring more structured cooperation between HEIs. Since the late 1990s, HEIs, particularly those in Europe, went one step further in terms of collaboration: *joint programmes.* The Prague Bologna Ministerial Conference conclusions (2001) included a call for more modules, courses and curricula offered in partnership with HEIs from other countries. While the exact definition is open to debate, a programme is joint when offered by two or more institutions in different countries with a jointly developed curriculum, and a clear agreement on credit recognition. Within this framework, there are different levels of integration. One particularly integrated example was introduced in 2004 by a European programme, Erasmus Mundus. In this programme, consortia have to develop a joint curriculum and joint student application, selection, admission and examination criteria. They must offer students a recognised mobility period in at least two of the HEIs involved in the course and guarantee the delivery of a joint or double degree, or multiple degrees, to all successful students. Joint degrees brought to life the

principles promoted through the Bologna Process (increased mobility, comparable degree structures and quality assurance procedures).

With their difficulties…

Higher education institutions deciding to embark upon this new form of cooperation face difficulties stemming from both institutional regulations (such as grading systems, examination regulations and enrolment procedures), as well as national legislation (particularly related to the delivery of joint degrees). Mutual trust between institutions (or between the people more directly involved in the coordination of the programmes) is key to overcoming these barriers. This type of cooperation works best when the HEIs involved have clear international strategies. Strategies which acknowledge the important role that joint programmes can play within the institution and which build in flexibility in programme management, allowing for smoother implementation. These strategies have led to a steady increase in the number of countries and institutions, including outside the EU, participating in joint programmes, as the latest Bologna implementation reports show.

And their benefits for institutions, students and systems

Higher education institutions reap clear benefits from joint degree programmes. Two or more institutions joining forces to offer a joint degree results in higher academic standards than the institutions would have achieved separately. Offering joint programmes raises an HEI's international profile, allows the development of international 'niches', stimulates international collaboration on teaching, and enhances an institution's ability to adapt swiftly to emerging needs. Through these programmes, HEIs offer their students excellent courses with embedded, structured mobility, which allow the mobile participants to develop new types of transversal skills that are particularly appreciated by employers. Joint degree programmes also contribute to increasing transparency between educational systems and have catalysed changes in national legislations regarding the award of joint degrees.

The EU contribution: from Erasmus Mundus to Erasmus for All

Since 2004, the EU has funded 138 Erasmus Mundus joint Master courses and 43 joint doctoral programmes involving over 16 000 students, doctoral candidates and scholars. Independent evaluations have concluded that these joint degrees have had a considerable added value for programme alumni when searching for future employment. International experience and intercultural competence are regarded as important assets that distinguish Erasmus Mundus participants from other graduates. Thanks to Erasmus Mundus, Europe offers participants the chance to study or conduct research in different countries, systems and cultures and obtain a recognised degree at the end of the education and training process, which contributes to the worldwide attractiveness of Europe as a first-class study and research destination.

Higher education institutions have also benefited from their participation in Erasmus Mundus joint degrees. Beyond their more easy-to-establish cooperation in research, the programme helped HEIs to develop a student-centred cooperation with joint teaching and supervision, which brings scholars together and results in complementary activities and opportunities for participants to create networks at the beginning of their careers. This cooperation has modified the attitude and disposition of those

participating in joint degrees towards the Bologna Process and some of its main elements such as the application of the credit system, mutual recognition, promotion of mobility and, most importantly, European cooperation in quality assurance. It has contributed to the adaptation of national legislation, particularly in the area of the recognition of joint degrees in the participant countries. Finally, it has had a positive effect on the recognition of the Bologna Process beyond the EU by contributing significantly to the adoption of a common credit and mobility recognition system and of joint quality assurance mechanisms, notably in the European Neighbourhood countries.

For the period of 2014 to 2020, the Commission has proposed an integrated programme for education and training, youth and sport. The most important novelty in the area of higher education is the integration of all intra-EU (Erasmus) and international programmes (Erasmus Mundus, Tempus, Edulink and Alfa). The Commission intends to continue funding joint Master's programmes leading to joint- or multiple degrees, and around 34 000 students will benefit from EU funding to participate in these joint programmes.

ESSAY 25

Internationalisation at Home: which way does the compass point on the journey home?

— Hanneke Teekens

Hanneke Teekens is a member of the board of directors of Nuffic (the Netherlands organisation for international cooperation in higher education). Within Nuffic, she is responsible for the directorate Information Services, overseeing all aspects of communications, including the Netherlands Education Support Offices in 10 different countries (NESOs). Currently she is Chair of the board of the Association for Studies in International Education (ASIE); a group of organisations with the mission to encourage international education and research, and which publishes the *Journal of Studies in International Education*.

"At most universities in this part of the world, life without the international classroom is now inconceivable. This benefits everyone, students and institutions alike."

In any consideration of internationalisation, it is not unusual for the discussion to run aground on an all-embracing ultimate definition. In addition, often – implicitly rather than explicitly – the debate comes down to student mobility. In 1999, a discussion arose within the EAIE on a topic that came to be known as Internationalisation at Home (IaH). It drew massive interest. In 2007, an *EAIE Occasional Paper* concerning IaH (Teekens, 2007) and an *EAIE 'Toolkit'* on the implementation of IaH (Beelen, 2007) were published at the same time. The intention was to broaden the debate and to identify a number of specific activities that could be regarded as independent of student mobility. How can we give students from all walks of life a place in a learning experience of relevance to *all* students? Moreover, the questions generated in this way should not be thought of as problems, but rather as positive added value from which everyone can learn.

The addition 'at Home' was an attempt to acknowledge the changing social context of the discussion. After all, the contours of a new society are evident in many European countries. It is no longer necessary to go abroad to learn to deal with cultural differences. Yet, while diversity and internationalism are important aspects of our present society, it is evidently difficult to bring them together in the day-to-day reality of 'the' internationalisation of higher education. Unfortunately, since 1999, it is clear that little progress has been made on this point. There is a lot of work to do, because the concerning issues have only become more relevant and imminent.

By contrast, important steps have been made in respect of another discussion point relating to IaH. The aim of international education has always been to offer students a learning environment that fosters intercultural learning and develops respect for those who hold differing opinions to our own. The first step here is bringing together students from different backgrounds. By involving native – non-mobile – students in the learning experiences of international students, scope is created for those 'at home' to benefit from cultural differences within an academic setting. The sharp rise in the range of English-taught study programmes in Europe has led to the strong growth of a phenomenon known as 'the international classroom'. At most universities in this part of the world, life without the international classroom is now inconceivable. This benefits everyone, students and institutions alike.

The curriculum

Much has now been written about the internationalisation of the curriculum. On many points we see an overlap with the arguments being used in the debate on IaH, or (in the US) in the debate on the internationalisation of the campus. In addition, there are many views of what exactly a curriculum involves. In my view, this is primarily a matter for formal academic education. How do we furnish the study process and what role in that process do the lecturer and student have? This concerns the content and delivery of the material. That much is clear. But the social context is also relevant and that doesn't stop at the threshold of the international classroom. The process outside the classroom, however, can no longer be managed by any individual lecturer. Moreover, the lecturer cannot be given sole responsibility for it because it concerns a matter for the entire university. The extent to which institutions are investing in this lags behind need and necessity. But students, too, have their own responsibility. Are you going abroad purely to get a diploma, or are you personally going to actively invest in extra activities and social relations with your fellow students – and not only those who share your country of origin?

Yet the debate around IaH aspires to go even further than this; it includes the interaction of home and international students with the multicultural society – beyond the university – in a learning environment, for instance through social work and internships. But as stated above, to bring together the local community and university life is difficult and not many universities invest.

But communities blend in different ways. Why, for example, do students from various countries have a fondness for city locations where, independently of the university, they will meet people of different nationalities who are not necessarily their fellow students? For many people, their own cuisine is another important factor. You feel at home where you can choose to eat the food you like, listen to the music you want to hear and share the stories you like to tell and listen to. Society offers what universities often look away from.

The ageing population is a fact in most European countries, as are the shrinking workforce and economic malaise. Beyond the Western world, by contrast, the population is increasingly youthful, and we can see both extremely rapid urbanisation and strong economic growth. For the first time in history, more people live in urban environments worldwide than in the countryside. As an ever-growing phenomenon, students are joining the diaspora of many nationalities within the large metropolises. In this way, international students and researchers are becoming part of the diversity of urban knowledge communities that are no longer a simple reflection of a national tradition. Accordingly, studying in the Netherlands or France, or wherever, is no longer a question of having a typically Dutch or French experience, but rather an interplay of various cultural influences on the student.

The need for good education

The need for good education remains – in particular in higher education. Students from emerging economies departed for foreign universities *en masse,* but now these mobility streams are beginning to reverse. The countries that supplied the largest numbers of students are now themselves starting to internationalise their higher education and, in their turn, are attracting international students – primarily

students from the region, but increasingly from all over the world. The most important example is China, which will soon be drawing the largest share of the international student market. The international activities of European universities are as yet insufficiently prepared for this development. Growing numbers are disguising the underlying shifts and the consequences over the medium term.

Everywhere, diversity of all kinds is on the increase: ethnic, religious, cultural and socio-economic. More and more, contrasts and tensions concern disputes *within* countries rather than *between* countries. *Inter*national politics, concerning as it does relations *between* nations, is not yet sufficiently geared to this. Neither is higher education.

Increasingly, students wish to be at home in several places, both physically and virtually – all the more reason to consider the interconnections between international mobility, an internationalised curriculum, a multicultural society and an increasingly digital learning environment. As far as I am concerned, the overpowering question remains: how can we offer a student environment that is relevant to *all* students, one that prepares them for working and living in a world of increasing complexity and in which the concept of 'home' is defined by a different concept of time and place than it was in the past. Universities are charged with the important task of teaching students to deal with this complexity so that, as graduates, they can contribute to creating a sustainable world, a place in which people are at home.

References

Beelen, J. (Ed.)(2007). *Implementing Internationalisation at Home. EAIE Professional Development Series for International Educators, 2.* Amsterdam: EAIE.

Teekens, H. (Ed.)(2007). *Internationalisation at Home: Ideas and Ideals, EAIE Occasional Paper 20.* Amsterdam: EAIE.

CHAPTER 6

The new dimensions of internationalisation of higher education: an epilogue by the editors

— Hans de Wit, Fiona Hunter, Linda Johnson and Hans-Georg van Liempd

The context in which our authors have written their contributions is one of severe financial and economic crisis in much of Europe, with the resulting competing claims for ever-scarcer funds and calls for reform of just about everything, including higher education. During the period in which this publication was put together, a number of reports with relevance to our topic were published. We would like to mention a few of them here. There are many organisations working to develop answers to the challenges identified in this volume and it is important that we bring the findings and the ideas to a common table so that we can pool the ideas, knowledge and information from a multitude of sources.

The reports we have chosen to highlight here are: *The International Student Mobility Charter* (EAIE, 2012); *Realising the Future we want for all* (UNDP, 2012); *Better Skills, Better Jobs, Better Lives* (OECD, 2012); *Affirming Academic Values in Internationalization of Higher Education: A Call for Action* (IAU, 2012); *An Avalanche is Coming: Higher Education and the Revolution Ahead* (Institute for Public Policy Research, 2013); *University of the Future: a thousand-year old industry on the cusp of profound change* (Ernst and Young for the Association of Australian Universities, 2012); *Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs): A Primer for University and College Board Members* (AGB, 2013); *The European Higher Education Area in 2012: Bologna Process Implementation Report* (Eurydice, 2012); *Erasmus for All Proposal* (European Commission, 2013); and *Internationalisation in European Higher Education: European policies, institutional strategies and EUA support* (EUA, 2013).

These reports, diverse in nature and wide-ranging in perspective, seem to be illustrative of the importance of our topic in the global arena. The list is certainly not exhaustive; rather, it gives a sense of the policy context which has coloured the thinking of our authors.

We find it heartening that the focus finally seems to be switching from international education as a 'set of activities' (Marginson), to internationalisation as a process and a concept, which is broader and altogether more meaningful and more important both to society and to the individual than a set of activities ever could be, however useful each of the activities might be in itself. The 2013 EUA survey report seems at first glance to confirm this shift, given that a large majority of the institutions that responded, indicate that they already have developed, or are in the process of developing, an internationalisation strategy. But on closer examination, a different picture emerges. We often find a number of fragmented, rather unrelated activities listed as priorities. Such activities include development of partnerships, outgoing student mobility, teaching in English, attraction of international students and opportunities for staff mobility. There is an evident gap between the 'espoused' strategy and the coherence of many of the so-called strategies in practice.

There are very clear signs, however, that deeper thinking is gaining ground over the instrumental approach that has been somewhat dominant in the global discourse about

international higher education for a long period of time. Hazelkorn makes precisely this point in quoting Sursock and Morgan, in what she calls "the missed opportunity to talk about what education is about", which is one way of viewing the Bologna Process. The relationship between the context and the instruments seems to be beginning to receive the attention it deserves. If we are to succeed in using the internationalisation of higher education as a means of improving the quality of university curricula around the globe, then the 'why' must surely come before the 'how', just as the impact and outcomes of what we are doing should follow the 'what'.

Our authors write about the philosophical underpinnings of internationalisation. The 'global moral economy' (Scott) vies to some extent with the 'info-tainment industry' for dominance within the paradigm governing international education. The 'internationalisation of the mind' (Ritzen) is posited as 'a boost to tolerance and peace'. The term 'appreciative openness' (Egon-Polak) is used when describing what the purpose of internationalisation might be. We are encouraged to give more attention to issues of probity. What can we do to deal effectively with dubious practices (Altbach) in a context where the right to make a profit seems sometimes to be safeguarded more assiduously than the need to ensure quality. What role do rankings play in all of this?

Issues of equity also feature frequently among the contributions in this Anniversary Publication. There is reflection on whether the forces of globalisation (with an emphasis on 'commercialisation and competitiveness' (Mohamedbhai)) might not impact negatively on African higher education as opposed to the principles of internationalisation (with an emphasis on 'mutually beneficial partnerships'), which are viewed by many as likely to be of benefit if adopted widely. The key point about equity is convincingly argued as follows:

> An internationalised curriculum for all students is a way of engaging those who might otherwise not have the opportunity to develop critical skills, knowledge and attitudes for life in a globalised world. This is a matter of equity and as such, also a matter of necessity. (Leask *et al*)

The tension between cooperation and competition is related to this theme and we see this reflected in a number of papers. Is higher education a global public good or is it a tradable commodity? Is it perhaps both of these things? What might this double identity mean for the way universities interact with society over the coming decades? Will the 'university DNA' (Beerkens) be sufficient to ensure that the core academic values that we associate with universities remain intact? The question of sustainability is clearly linked to any discussion of equity and we find this point in several essays. Cheap travel and budget airlines have had their effect on mobility patterns (making short-term mobility easier to finance for some) but so-called budget travel is still only accessible to a global minority. Moreover, what stance should educators take on the longer-term concerns related to the effect of deepening the global footprint by promoting more short-term mobility and increasing carbon emissions as a result? Demographics are also

of importance as we look at the shape of things to come. There is an evident mismatch between current university locations and student population. The Western world's population is shrinking, while Asia and Africa are growing. A shift is underway as emerging middle classes in those regions drive student demand. Governments in Asia are starting to invest significantly in higher education, leading to a major shift in the locations of intellectual power. Regionalisation and clustering are taking on new forms and new groupings are emerging, as our authors make abundantly clear to us. The IAU Call for Action (2012) makes a clear appeal to address these issues. It addresses internationalisation as an evolving process, changing in the context of globalisation. It points to the potentially adverse consequences, risks, uneven benefits and asymmetrical power relations, which have to be mitigated and where possible avoided. It:

> acknowledges the substantial benefits of the internationalisation of higher education but also draws attention to potentially adverse unintended consequences, with a view to alerting higher education institutions to the need to act to ensure that the outcomes of internationalisation are positive and of reciprocal benefit to the higher education institutions and the countries concerned. (IAU Call for Action, 2012)

Knowledge creation forms a theme to which our contributors return in a gamut of guises. Who decides what counts as knowledge and who is qualified to dispense and apply this knowledge? Is there not a danger of a global skewing in how we answer this seminal question? How and where and by whom is knowledge created and disseminated and valorised? The walls of the university are becoming increasingly flexible and ever more permeable thanks to the advent of MOOCs and the rise of the branch campus (where will they pop up next and will they metamorphose into fully-fledged institutions in their own right over time?). The attendant modalities of virtual course offerings, in a huge variety of blended and distributed modes of teaching and learning, perplex, tantalise, amaze and baffle us by turns. Can we find a way of moving closer to a 'peer-to-peer co-creation of knowledge' in a 'glocal' learning environment that is culturally sensitive and context-specific? Our contributors provoke us to think further along this trajectory.

We cite two documents that point to a revolution in higher education. The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges in the US wisely draws attention to what we regard as a key point: "This revolution is not about IT. It is about teaching and learning." (AGB, 2013, 1) We would advocate taking the point further: it is about teaching and learning in a global and intercultural context. Although it is still too early to predict the longer-term impact of MOOCs, the phenomenon has undoubtedly captured our authors' imagination. What we cannot ignore is that change is happening, not only in the technologies available but in the way our students learn, in and beyond the university. What we need to try and grasp is how these changes will affect the direction and the scope of the further internationalisation of higher education, so as to align what we do as international educators with the emerging technologies

and behaviours. The IIPR publication, *An avalanche is coming,* makes the point of the revolution afoot even more strongly than the AGB. Its message is to 'ponder the new', as the certainties of the past disappear:

> Given the state of the global economy, tensions in international relations, massive gaps between wealth and poverty, the deepening threat of climate change and the ubiquity of weapons of mass destruction, our contention is that we need a generation better educated, in the broadest and most profound sense of that word, than ever before. […] We need citizens ready to take personal responsibility both for themselves and for the world around them: citizens who have, and seize, the opportunity to learn and relearn throughout their lives. We need citizens who are ready and able to take their knowledge of the best that has been thought and said and done and to apply it to the problems of the present and the future. (IPPR, 2013)

Similar sentiments can be found in the UNDP and the OECD reports as well as in the University of the Future Report of 2012. Many of our authors wrestle with the challenge of revolutionary change in the essays in this publication.

The need to enhance the quality and impact of the more traditional instruments of internationalisation also give some of our authors pause for thought. Some of these instruments, such as the study abroad and mobility schemes for students and staff (Alfranseder and Teichler), have been part of institutional practice for many years and some of them have emerged on the scene more recently, such as Joint Degrees (Cordell) and how to integrate mobility into the curriculum (Haug).

Internationalisation is by no means an exclusively European process, but as many of our authors make clear, it is a global phenomenon, with different regional accents. As Rizvi states, this implies that a future agenda for internationalisation in Europe needs to encompass "a policy imaginary that views Asian cultures in their own terms and not simply as a means to Europe's economic and strategic ends". We would argue the need for a 'political imaginary' to view African, Latin American and North American cultures in their own terms too, as we believe the sum total of the offerings in this publication makes clear.

The needs and demands of the student recur throughout this publication. How do students see themselves? Are they primarily customers or are they simply learners with more choice than ever before as to where and how to engage in the complex business of learning? Has the element of choice blinded us to the primacy of learning in the equation? Have we been caught unaware because we are so used to regarding choice as the exclusive domain of customers? Is the student of today perhaps a hybrid with elements of both the learner and the customer? A picture emerges of a global student who wants a career (Archer and Ripmeester) and who needs the skills to deal with both 'predictable and unpredictable futures' (Jones) in order to achieve this aim.

On a related note, where do employers fit into all of this? How do they define employability? If there is a noticeable gap in what our contributors offer as food for thought, then it is perhaps the fact that there is only cursory attention to this part of the landscape. There is, of course, nothing to prevent us from giving employers more of a voice in the global conversation on the trends and developments in the internationalisation of higher education over the next quarter of a century. In doing so, we cannot dodge the thorny question as to who drives the choices made in higher education, and how we ensure the appropriate balance between academic values and societal needs.

The dimensions of social responsibility and employability are two of the key messages that resonate throughout this publication. The aim of higher education based on a truly internationalised curriculum is to prepare students to become both Global Citizens and Global Professionals, able to combine their own careers with accepting social responsibility as citizens of a global community. That is a lofty ambition and it is right to ask ourselves what this ambition implies for the further internationalisation of higher education. In the context of this Anniversary Publication, we should also pause to consider what the EAIE contribution could be to its achievement.

What might higher education look like 25 years from now? That is a dificult question to answer. We live in a world of increasing complexity and volatility, in which we are all connected by the same global issues. These common issues differ in their impact from region to region and from institution to institution. What might we wish from internationalisation? In a certain sense, the big questions facing higher education today – how do you manage disruptive change; how do you guarantee quality, ensure access and contain cost; and most importantly, how do you educate in such an environment – go beyond internationalisation, but it can also be argued that many of the answers lie in a conscious choice to become a truly international university. Our authors have provided us with ideas, expressed views, raised questions and concerns, each from his or her own perspective and experience. This volume was never intended to provide answers, nor could it do so. It draws upon the richness built up over many decades of experience in a diversity of settings. We hope that it poses questions that will challenge you to think deeply about the future of internationalisation of higher education.

Each university has (or should have) its own distinctive mission and purpose but there are general directions of development that we might consider valid for all. In the new environment, no institution can survive alone and therefore it becomes essential to strengthen current strategies for international cooperation through networks and partnerships that provide access to the exchange of ideas and people. It is essential to ensure that knowledge and experience is shared with all through an internationalised curriculum that sees the classroom as an example of the new globalised, interconnected world, where teachers and students are active resources for one another. It is a space where new educational models urgently need to be developed, making the best use of all available technologies to impart knowledge and nurture global citizens with ‘fine minds’ able to create and innovate, to analyse and understand, but also to respect and empathise. The bigger issues of the planet concern us all and we must enhance the

connections between research and education and take our share of the responsibility for sustainable growth and peace. In a world of rapid technological development, universities should embrace the opportunities new technologies create whilst remaining true to their own values of education for the whole person, strengthening these values where necessary. All institutions would do well to remind themselves that a university education should prepare people for life, not just for a career.

These are big questions with which each university must grapple in order to find meaningful answers in terms that are relevant to its own stated purpose.

If the future of internationalisation lies in developing global citizenship, have we come full circle, returning to the original ideas and aspirations of the EAIE's founding fathers and mothers? Is it through capturing the spirit and values expressed 25 years ago about the role of international education in making a difference to people and society that internationalisation can help higher education re-shape its identity and role over the next 25 years? We like to think so, and it is in that direction that we would encourage the new generations of the EAIE Leadership to channel their energies and plot their course for the next quarter of a century.

About THE EDITORS

Hans de Wit is Director of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation at the Università Cattolica Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy, and Professor of Internationalisation of Higher Education at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, the Netherlands. He is Co-Editor of the *Journal of Studies in International Education* and has published several books and articles on internationalisation of higher education. He is a founding member and Past President of the EAIE, and currently Co-Chair of the EAIE SIG *Researchers in International Education* (RIE). He received the EAIE Constance Meldrum Award in 2008.

Fiona Hunter is a higher education consultant who has worked in internationalisation of higher education for the last 20 years, and until recently was International Director at the Università Carlo Cattaneo, Italy. She is also a Past President of the EAIE and currently Co-Chair of the EAIE SIG *Researchers in International Education* (RIE). Currently she is a member of the Editorial Board of the *Journal for Studies in International Education* and of the Scientific Committee of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation in Milan as well as Chair of the Board of Directors at Education Credential Evaluators Inc. in the US.

Linda Johnson is Executive Secretary of the International Institute of Social Studies (ISS), and Secretary to the Curatorium of the Prince Claus Chair in the Netherlands. She has been involved in the internationalisation of higher education since 1988. She has worked for a number of Dutch and German institutions of higher education and also for the Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences. She is a Past President of the EAIE and speaks and writes regularly on matters pertaining to international education. She currently serves on the Fulbright social sciences jury in the Netherlands. She is Series Editor for the *EAIE Occasional Paper* series on International Education and also serves on the EAIE Publications Committee.

Hans-Georg van Liempd is International Strategist at Tilburg University in the Netherlands. He is the current President of the EAIE. In 2005, he set up the Tilburg University International Office and served as Director until mid 2010, when he was elected Vice-President of the EAIE. Hans-Georg is a frequent presenter at institutions and conferences around the world and is also an EAIE trainer. He was a member of the ISEP Council of Advisors in Washington DC from 2002 to 2006. He is currently Chair of the Editorial Board of the EAIE's *Internationalisation of European Higher Education Handbook.* He is a member of many advisory boards in higher education and culture in the Netherlands.

Possible FUTURES

THE NEXT 25 YEARS OF THE INTERNATIONALISATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The European Association for International Education (EAIE) is 25 years old. Over the past 25 years, drastic changes and innovations have taken place in international higher education and the concept has expanded to embrace both cooperative and competitive dimensions.

Five chapters by authors from different parts of the world place the key dimensions of this evolution in perspective: its conceptual development, the cooperation with other world regions, degree and credit mobility, curriculum (Internationalisation at Home), as well as the development of the EAIE itself.

There are also 25 essays by key actors (scholars, professionals, leaders) in international higher education which look ahead to the next 25 years: What will be the next innovations of internationalisation in higher education? What will be the future benefits, risks and potential consequences of the rapid evolution that international education has seen over the past 25 years and in the years to come? *Possible futures* contemplates these key questions.

EAIE
European Association for International Education