

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 multi-lateral 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 predominantly 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 landscape, 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 Organization. Retrieved 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/oeecd1.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., & Alphonse, 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](http://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/NAFSA%20Home/Resource%20Library/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_abc_on_global_challenges_and_the_organizational_ethical_dilemmas_of_universities](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*.