

BRIDGES TO THE FUTURE

The Global Landscape of International Higher Education

DARLA K. DEARDORFF, HANS DE WIT, AND JOHN D. HEYL

This volume has explored wide-ranging issues in international higher education, from an analysis of concepts and strategies to internationalize higher education to internationalization in a broad array of contexts. In examining the emerging themes from these discussions, several are especially salient for the future. These issues include the concept of internationalization itself, the notion of global citizenship, varieties of global engagement, the impact of technology on internationalization (e.g., the notion of virtual mobility), new dimensions in study abroad, and the role of internationalization in the broader higher education field. These themes, which have been highlighted in other chapters in this volume, will provide the focus for the first part of this concluding chapter as keys—or bridges—to future developments in international higher education. This concluding chapter, together with Chapters 1 and 24 of this Handbook, intend to bring a comparative and comprehensive perspective to the rich analysis and information discussed in the other chapters.

Given that the examples in this volume, through the inclusion of specific textboxes, are predominantly from Australia, Europe, and the United States, the second part of this chapter provides a summary of internationalization efforts in various countries and regions in other parts of the world: Africa, Latin America, Asia, and the Middle East. Concluding this volume with voices from key regions/countries is a fitting way to look to the future. Through these discussions, trends, issues, and challenges emerge in the global view of international higher education.

As discussed in the first section of this Handbook, the concept of internationalization has emerged initially from North American and European perspectives. In recent years, Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom have contributed a more competitive perspective on international education. The developing countries in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America have traditionally played roles mainly as senders of students, recipients of capacity-building funds, and more recently as locations of franchise operations, branch campuses, and other

forms of cross-border delivery (as discussed in the fourth section of this handbook). This is all changing. The globalization of the world's knowledge economies and societies dramatically impacts the role of higher education and its international dimensions in the regions, as highlighted in this chapter. One can speak of a global higher education environment in which these countries and their institutions of higher education become competitors, equal partners, and key actors.

The consequences of these new developments for the way internationalization as a concept and as a process will evolve are not yet clear. For the moment, internationalization is still primarily driven by rationales, strategies, approaches, and activities from the traditional regions of North America, Europe, and Australia. A future edition of this Handbook will surely see a more prominent role of other regions in international higher education. It would have been negligent, however, not to address the increasingly proactive role these regions and countries play in international higher education.

International higher education is at a turning point, and the concept of internationalization itself requires rethinking to take into account the emerging new world and higher education realignments. Other important developments in international higher education as described below relate to this pivotal juncture. Throughout these brief discussions of thematic and regional directions in higher education, relevant questions will be raised that invite further exploration as international higher education moves into the future. Indeed, continued research and exploration of these and other questions will continue to propel the field forward and possibly even transform the nature of higher education itself.

THEMATIC ISSUES AND TRENDS

Higher Education Institutions as Global Citizens

In terms of global citizenship, institutions are increasingly stating the need for their students to become global citizens. Yet, what does it mean for an *institution* to be a global citizen? What responsibilities does an institution need to address within a larger global context? One example in guiding this discussion is the United

Nations Global Compact, a strategic policy initiative in which companies, organizations, and universities embrace 10 universally accepted principles related to human rights, labor, environment, and anticorruption (<http://www.unglobalcompact.org/>). Another example is the attention that institutions increasingly give to tackling global issues, particularly through research that may lead to innovative solutions to complex problems, especially if institutions are able to engage in truly interdisciplinary research and collaboration. Even within this attention to global issues, however, institutions must guard against the “expert syndrome” of providing answers rather than seeking to learn. Recent developments also caution universities’ intent on establishing a global brand around the world, particularly through branch campuses. Given some of the criticisms of the more colonialist tendencies of some internationalization abroad efforts—as well as some well-publicized branch campus forays and closures—institutions and programs need to more closely examine and monitor such efforts in collaboration with a wide variety of stakeholders. Sutton and Dearnorff (2012) suggest that institutions engage as global citizens through partnership, collaboration, and authentic dialogue, “measuring success in terms of mutual benefit and global action,” with internationalization becoming a “process of increasing synergies among scholars, deepening student and institutional engagement in the world, and creating ever larger networks of discovery,” which could transform the very nature of higher education (p. 17).

Key questions emerge in this area: Will institutions remain institution-centric or move to become more global-centric? How do global efforts align with institutional mission? How can institutions work more closely together on global efforts? Which partners do institutions need to engage in their global efforts to be more global-centric? What competencies are needed for institutions to engage as global citizens in the world? What (and whose) ethical standards are to be used to guide global engagement? What might happen if institutions understood their actions as functioning within an emerging global system of higher education? These are issues that should engage not only senior international officers (SIOs) but university presidents as well. For example, Chancellor Victor

Boschini (2011) of Texas Christian University reflects the views of many of his peers when he says, “By thinking differently, planning more strategically and utilizing and integrating the many resources already available on our campuses and in our larger communities, global education can remain at the core of the institutional mission.” Through integration of leadership, strategic planning, and resources, higher education institutions will emerge as global citizens as they engage more broadly in the world.

Students as Global Citizens

As institutions explore their role in the larger global context, they are simultaneously also focused on their students’ development as global citizens, which is increasingly reflected in institutional mission statements (Green, 2012). Yet, even as more universities state the desire to graduate global citizens, debates arise around terminology, definitions, and assumptions inherent in this movement. These include whether one can indeed be a citizen of the world and whether being a global citizen is a right to be enjoyed only by the privileged who have access to higher education. Furthermore, whose values, morals, and ethics are to be used to guide one’s global citizenship, and is it possible and desirable to reach commonly agreed upon foundational principles? Thus, many ethical dimensions are surfacing within this more traditionally academic discourse. Other discourse centers around how institutions develop global citizens, with university curricula and programs supporting this aspiration (see Chapters 14 and 15, this volume).

Other questions that institutions need to address around students as global citizens include the following: What are the assumptions made in the pursuit of developing global citizenship in students? What specific knowledge, skills, and attitudes are desired in global citizens—and according to whom? With competencies frequently emerging in literature on global citizenship, are there generic competencies that should be addressed by every program, or are there also competencies specific to each discipline that impact students as global citizens in their future professions? (See Chapter 16, this volume.) How is global citizenship to be assessed in students? Is global citizenship more about responsibility and

engagement in the world and developing a lifestyle conducive to sustainability of the planet? These questions, increasingly put to international educators as well as to other key players in higher education, will be further debated in the years to come. In addition, institutions will need to more closely examine what it means for faculty and staff to be global citizens.

Redefining Study Abroad

Study abroad is a generic term with different meanings to different people and in different regions. Regardless of terminology, the landscape of study abroad is changing as a consequence of developments in international higher education in several different ways:

- First, possible destinations for study abroad have dramatically expanded in recent decades. The end of the Cold War, the commercialization of study abroad as a higher education business, the growth of the Internet, and the diversity of program providers have extended realistic study abroad opportunities far beyond traditional destinations in the developed world.
- Second, due to the surge in global migration in recent decades, there is a stronger relation between local and global, between intercultural and international (see Chapter 17, this volume). One encounters intercultural and international not only by crossing national borders but increasingly around the corner in one’s own country and neighborhood. Developing intercultural and international competencies may be as possible in communities, companies, and one’s own university as in other parts of the world (as discussed in Chapter 16).
- Third, technological developments such as the Worldwide Web, Internet, and social media make interactions between different cultures and regions possible without moving across borders. The notion of virtual mobility is entering international higher education. In recent years, more students and faculty from different parts of the world are interacting online in classrooms, projects, and assignments and learning from each other’s different cultural, international, and didactic views directly and interactively in a way that physical mobility may not always accomplish.

- Fourth, internationalization and study abroad have moved into primary and secondary education by classroom exchanges and online interactions, as well as by individual social media contacts. In addition, “gap year” experiences between secondary and postsecondary experiences are becoming increasingly common. Students of the current and future generations entering universities and colleges are often more internationally connected than previous ones. University-level study abroad can build on these experiences.

- Fifth, study abroad is no longer solely an undergraduate experience but increasingly takes place at the master’s and doctoral levels, beyond research abroad.

- Sixth, study abroad, or education abroad, no longer means only *academic* study in another location. Increasingly, students are seeking other intercultural and international experiences, such as those involving internships, research, volunteerism, and service learning abroad.

- Seventh, study abroad is no longer an isolated activity but is integrated into the curriculum and teaching and learning process (see Chapters 14 & 15). This emphasis has stimulated efforts to assess study abroad outcomes, in terms of learning, personal growth, and self-development (see Chapter 10).

- Eighth, the demographics of those who study abroad have been changing beyond the traditional white females to represent the increased diversity of backgrounds, ages, and experiences of students in higher education. These programs now need to adapt and change to accommodate these changing demographics and needs.

- Ninth, the provider landscape for study abroad has changed dramatically in recent decades. Nonprofit and for-profit providers not directly associated with universities—and sometimes developing university-level accreditation themselves—account for a significant portion of study abroad activity. This sector represents a newly competitive environment for university-based study abroad (Heyl, 2011).

- Tenth, given the accessibility of students to direct-enroll into higher education institutions in countries abroad and given increased ease of access to many other international opportunities

outside of higher education, traditional study abroad programs offered through higher education institutions may no longer seem as relevant to students of the future. Frost (2009) suggests that innovative leaders of the future will have engaged in an international experience characterized by going solo, going long, and going deep—meaning they may often obtain these experiences outside of a traditional study abroad experience.

- Eleventh, given the trend to shorter lengths abroad, universities will need to explore innovative, cutting edge models beyond summer programs to accommodate and support students in their academic and intercultural learning beyond simply getting students abroad. This could include rethinking the semester system entirely and engaging students in ways thus far not explored in learning experiences in other cultures, including in their own countries.

As a consequence of all of the above, study abroad is evolving from a one-time experience of a semester or a year in undergraduate education to a palette of intercultural and international experiences in education, even beyond what the university offers. Given these numerous trends and changes within study abroad, international higher education will need to continue to innovate study abroad offerings to meet the increasingly diverse needs and experiences of students. Questions for the future include the following: How will study abroad adapt to the rapidly changing landscape? Will there continue to be a need for traditional study abroad programs offered through higher education institutions, especially given an emerging global system of higher education? How will institutions respond to and support students who no longer come through traditional study abroad programs? What other players will emerge to provide international opportunities for students to gain knowledge and skills for a global economy? It’s time to rethink traditional study abroad programs and re-imagine these programs for a rapidly changing global landscape.

Changing Rules of Institutional Engagement

Another issue moving forward is that of institutional engagement. In the current higher

education environment, there is no shortage of rhetoric about being “internationally engaged.” Indeed, quite a number of new positions in the United States even include this term in senior administrators’ titles, such as vice president for global engagement. But what does this mean? The answer, of course, is that *engagement* can mean many different things. For some institutions, it means nothing less than winning multi-million-dollar technical assistance grants for faculty to work in the developing world or to collaborate with partners in the developed world on complex research projects. For some, it means improving the institution’s position in global rankings or joining regional or global consortia and associations of like-minded institutions. For others, it means linking the Language Across the Curriculum program to appropriate study/service learning/internship opportunities abroad. For still others, it will mean offering dual degrees with partner universities abroad or having numerous overseas universities as partners through various signed agreements. New rules for engagement are emerging, including new partners, some outside higher education, such as corporations, governments, advocacy groups, and civil society organizations. Regardless of how institutional engagement takes shape, one surety is that “active engagement with the rest of the world has become fundamental to a high quality education, one that prepares students and their communities for the larger world in which they will live and work” (American Council on Education [ACE], 2011, p. 6). The job of those in senior-level administration at higher education institutions is to determine—taking into account all resources available—what kind and level of engagement would strengthen the international ethos of the institution and enhance the quality of education it offers. That is, whatever the choice of particular international initiatives, partnerships, or assessment tools, the overall effort should be mission-driven. Furthermore, strategic global institutional engagement “must take place within the framework of an overarching institutional strategy that aligns closely with the institution’s mission, history, and values,” versus the more ad hoc approach of many institutional engagement efforts currently (ACE, 2011, p. 19). In the end, such strategic global engagement can result in an institution that provides a higher

quality education in preparing students for the future.

Declining Public Support for Higher Education

Declining public support for higher education globally, but particularly in the United States, the United Kingdom, and parts of Europe, will force many senior-level administrators to focus on resources in the coming decade. As was noted earlier in this volume,

Presented with a world of opportunities but only limited resources. . . [international educators face] a most daunting task. Making informed and creative choices about internationalization—with a clear sense of the interplay between risks and benefits, opportunities, and imperatives, obstacles and resources—requires unique skills and talents, real vision, and sustained commitment. (Chapter 1, p. 24)

The issue of resources—not just financial resources but also those associated with the institution’s faculty, student, and alumni profile and with the institution’s location and history—is leading many SIOs and administrators to think in increasingly entrepreneurial ways, such as increased recruitment of students, use of agents, and franchising. Some consider this a move toward the commercialization of international education. Some may also see this commercialization as reinforcing neocolonial mind-sets. Others embrace the challenge enthusiastically. In any case, this trend toward trying to maximize resources raises important ethical issues, such as those addressed by Knight (2008, 2011a) and de Wit (2011a). Specifically, the declining public support for higher education, has forced international educators to embrace entrepreneurial approaches to increase resources from whatever source: student tuition/fees, grants, gifts from alumni and private donors, and commercial partnerships with for-profit vendors. As noted in several chapters in this volume, collaboration is becoming a prominent pathway to maximize resources (both financial and human capital) in a period of constrained resources. When the partners are private entities, however, there will be inherent challenges, including tension over proprietary ownership, that will limit transparency and openness. There may also be a clash of business and educational cultures,

which creates further tensions in overall mission and operational mandates and exacerbates questions around quality of education.

Global Competition

Another recurring issue in this Handbook is that of global rankings of higher education institutions, which has raised the stakes for institutions to compete against international entities and among each other. (See Chapter 24 for more discussion on global rankings.) This process encourages institutions to attempt to link with more prestigious ones to elevate their visibility and brand. One can question the methodologies of the various ranking agencies, but what institution would not tout its placement (in relation to “peer” institutions) if doing so put it in a stronger competitive position? The rise of global rankings exacerbates the already competitive field of higher education and escalates the tensions around competition versus collaboration.

Ben Wildavsky’s (2010) *The Great Brain Race: How Global Universities Are Reshaping the World* is an important case in point. Wildavsky’s title itself implies a competition in international higher education that is certainly not new but one that has increased in recent years due to several developments. First, positioning higher education as a global export service (as designated by the General Agreement on Trade in Services [GATS] in 1995) implies that it is a traded, fungible activity—not quite on the level of consumer electronics, but somehow more real than financial services. To be successful, a traded good requires competitor research, packaging, and marketing. U.S. colleges and universities, even very prestigious institutions, have done this kind of branding for a very long time, mainly in search of an ever more qualified and diverse entering class of domestic students. That competition has now become global, both for the growing cohorts of internationally mobile students and faculty and for establishing branded entities abroad (see the fourth section of this Handbook). The reality that the clear majority of the highest-ranking institutions are U.S.- and European-based—all with colonizing pasts—raises the question of whether global competition (via rankings) is resulting in a new wave of cultural imperialism. Koehn and Obama (Chapter 23, this volume) address this matter directly in their discussion of a new era

of authentic partnerships where mutual advantage is the key to success and sustainability. Yet, given the global competition generated through rankings, it is important for institutions to also recognize that “to be competitive . . . virtually all institutions will have to collaborate to leverage scarce resources, broaden possibilities, and extend impact” (ACE, 2011, p. 7). Pol (2012) concurs by stating that “cooperation in all its dimensions, between disciplines, institutions, countries, sectors, . . . represents a competitive advantage” (p. 30). Thus, competition and collaboration sometimes represent two sides of the same coin. This new reality leads to numerous questions including the following: How do global rankings address quality? What is the end result of global rankings? How do institutional collaboration, international engagement, and global responsibilities fit with global competition, given that “collaboration is this century’s necessity” (ACE, 2011, p. 7)? The answers to these questions may result in a paradigm shift in the future for international higher education.

Diversification of Higher Education

Returning to the themes from Chapter 1 of this volume, it is important to place internationalization within the larger context of global education. In the future, students will gain their education not only in postsecondary institutions but also through a wide variety of providers including not-for-profit organizations, corporations, and online venues such as Khan Academy (www.khanacademy.org), Udacity (www.udacity.com), edX (www.edexonline.org), online providers of free education, or the British Open University, one of the world’s largest universities with more than 250,000 students, all enrolled in distance education modules that lead to degrees. Arthur Levine (2010, n.d.), president of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, predicts that, in the future, such diverse providers will result in colleges and universities losing their monopoly on education. As a result, he suggests that degrees will become less important; educational outcomes, in particular skills, will grow in prominence to the point of students having “educational passports” documenting their lifelong learning and outcomes achieved (http://education.gsu.edu/ctl/Programs/Future_Colleges.htm). This means traditional functions of postsecondary educations will become “unbundled,”

according to Levine, and students, not institutions, will drive the educational agenda as they consume an à la carte version of education from multiple providers that best meet their needs as well as the needs of a global society, given that higher education is currently preparing many students for jobs that still do not exist. In this kind of future, international education will need to innovate as more diverse providers emerge. Even now, this is occurring, with private companies providing a myriad of services including credential evaluation, recruitment, pathway programs, education abroad programs and assessment platforms. Other experts have envisioned a future where “faculty, students, research activity, teaching models, and ideas will travel freely” (ACE, 2011, p. 7). Implications of this kind of future are immense: How will postsecondary institutions change to meet the “unbundled” education pursued by students in the future? How will institutions compete with other educational providers? In other words, what will be the value-added for continued institutional internationalization? How will programs change to truly meet the needs of students? What quality assurance mechanisms can be introduced to ensure the quality of the education being provided, especially beyond traditional mechanisms that are solely within a higher education context? These developments will dramatically change international higher education.

Access to Education

With only 10% of the world’s population having access to secondary education and 1% with access to higher education, access to education is a little discussed but increasingly crucial issue within the global landscape (Bhandari, 2012). How will higher education address the increasing divide between those with access to education and those with little or no access? Furthermore, given that in the United States alone, the secondary incompleteness rate (i.e., high school dropout rate) is 25% annually (which nears 50%, in some urban areas), meaning one million Americans do not complete high school each year, what responsibilities do postsecondary institutions have in addressing this issue (Sanchez & Wertheimer, 2011)? How will higher education mitigate the ever-growing divide between the “haves and have-nots,” especially in regard to access? How will global

migration flows impact access to higher education? And how will the disconnect between secondary and postsecondary education be addressed, even within international education? For example, Asia Society, based in the United States, has been working on global education and global competence within U.S. primary and secondary schools, developing intercultural learning outcomes similar to those in postsecondary literature. How can the various sectors work more closely together to ensure the seamless education—and access to education—of students in regard to achieving global learning outcomes?

Other Elements

Several elements of what has hitherto been understood to comprise international higher education are clearly in motion as the 21st century unfolds. One of the certain realities in coming decades is that student and faculty mobility will increase, perhaps dramatically, which leads to the notion of a more integrated mobility approach, including integration not only of individuals, but also of curricula and ideas. Another very likely reality is that faculty, students, and institutions will find ways to use technology to expand their teaching, learning, and research networks. A third likely reality, as noted above, will be the increasing role of private entities—academic, commercial, and non-profit/charitable—in changing the resource mix and research priorities of higher education. A fourth one is the shifting regional centers of attention and leadership in higher education. Finally, and perhaps more darkly, critical global problems—environmental degradation, sustainable energy alternatives, poverty, the future of the welfare state, infectious disease and global health issues, violence arising from economic, religious and demographic tensions, and terrorism—will likely become even more urgent. And looking more broadly at the trends that will impact the world in the next 20 to 25 years, seven have been identified by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (Aughenbaugh, Falk, Moss, & Shapiro, 2010) as being the following: (1) population; (2) resource management and climate change; (3) technological innovation and diffusion; (4) the development and dissemination of information and knowledge; (5) economics; (6) the nature and

mode of security; and (7) the challenge of governance. These seven trends can serve as the basis of further discussion on how higher education will respond and adapt. The internationalization of higher education, to be fully relevant to the educational mission of institutions and to the wishes of the citizenry on which those institutions rely, will have to address these larger issues and trends.

REGIONAL TRENDS

The thematic trends and issues with respect to internationalization as described in this chapter are one important element. Regional trends are also important. As mentioned at the start of this chapter, the concept of internationalization, as well as its main actors, were for a long time shaped by North American and European experience, with a gradually increasing role for Australia and New Zealand. Given that “the rise of other systems of higher education and research, especially in Asia and to a certain extent in Latin America, is associated with the

spread of modernization” (ACE, 2011, p. 15), the global landscape continues to evolve in terms of players and partners. Thus, the second part of this chapter highlights challenges and trends in internationalization in various countries and regions in those other parts of the world: Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East, as viewed by experts in those regions. Given the limited space devoted here to these regional and country discussions, it is important to recognize the challenges inherent in summarizing key trends and issues.

Africa

Africa is emerging as a player in international higher education. Given the combination of capacity-building initiatives, an emerging private sector, economic development, and presence of other global players like the Middle East and China, African higher education is on the rise. One expert provides an overview of trends, challenges, and the future of internationalization within African higher education.

BOX 25.1 In Africa: Emerging Trends, Realities, and the Unknown

James Otieno Jowi

Coordinator, African Network for Internationalization of Education, Moi University (Kenya)

Internationalization is a widely discussed phenomenon that is also shaping the higher education sector across the world in unprecedented and different ways. At the same time, it is one of the main drivers of change in higher education, including in Africa (Kishun, 2006), and is increasingly gaining a central position within the education sector. From the beginning, higher education in Africa has encountered internationalization in various ways and amid myriad challenges. Over the years, it has presented several challenges, risks, and opportunities to the sector. It continues to be a major force determining reforms in higher education in the continent.

Main Rationales

The growing influence of internationalization on higher education is not in much doubt. However, it is becoming more evident that the rationales that drive the process vary between regions, countries, and even institutions. Africa, like other parts of the world, responds to internationalization in ways peculiar to its circumstances and context. According to the International Association of Universities (IAU), *3rd Global Survey on Internationalization* (IAU, 2010), institutions in Africa consider strengthening research and knowledge production and internationalizing curricula as the

major rationales for internationalization. Other recent studies have documented the same conclusion (Oyewole, 2009; Teferra & Knight, 2008). The academic rationale includes strengthening research capacity and knowledge production, internationalizing curricula, enhancing academic quality, developing human resource capacity, and increasing competitiveness (Oyewole, 2009). This is mainly to enhance the weak research and institutional academic capacities of African universities.

Emerging Trends and New Realities

In recent years, there have been new occurrences in the international dimension of higher education in Africa. Intra-Africa university cooperation is an emerging phenomenon that has led to increased mobility of students and staff (Mulumba, Obaje, Kagiso, & Kishun, 2008) and more collaborations between and among African universities. This new development could contribute to the regionalization of internationalization in Africa. It is expected to contribute to reducing the scale of brain drain as it provides new mobility alternatives within Africa. It could also strengthen capacities within African institutions and bring some local relevance in academic engagements.

Development partners are also showing renewed interest in Africa's higher education, creating more opportunities for internationalization. For example, new initiatives have emerged within the African Higher Education and Research Space (AHERS) and the Arusha Convention, modelled along the lines of the Bologna Process in Europe. Several African countries are witnessing improvements in information and communication technology infrastructure. The development of regional quality assurance frameworks and ongoing harmonization of education systems could soon begin to contribute to more internationalization within Africa.

Apart from the intra-Africa initiatives, growing opportunities must be noted for collaborations and partnerships with other parts of the world. Collaborations with Asian countries have continued to grow, surpassing those with U.S. institutions (Jowi, 2009).

Challenges, Opportunities, and Risks

Internationalization presents several opportunities to the higher education sector in Africa. The renewed interest in Africa's higher education by African organizations, governments, and development partners enhances prospects for increased internationalization. It could also play an important role in enlarging Africa's research capacity and knowledge production, which is quite marginal (Teferra, 2008) and heavily dependent on external resources.

However, institutional challenges and drawbacks render most institutions unable to respond to the demands of internationalization. Quality still remains a major concern and will continue to hinder broader internationalization efforts. The coordination of the regional frameworks and the discordance that they have with respective country policies and systems are still problematic.

Internationalization also comes with attendant risks, especially for higher education systems in developing countries. The main risk for Africa is the now perennial issue of brain drain, which has had serious consequences for the capacities of African institutions (Altbach, 2002; Mohamedbhai, 2003; Salmi, 2003). It has resulted in further marginalization of Africa in global knowledge production as it depletes the already scanty capacity. The other risk is commodification and commercialization aggravated by the privatization of the sector and the influx of foreign providers. Internationalization is also still largely rooted in the historical dominance of the global North and based on junior and senior partner relations (Jowi, Kiamba, & Some, 2008).

(Continued)

(Continued)

Contemplating the Future

Internationalization presents a mixed future for higher education in Africa. The opportunities, if well utilized, could turn around Africa's higher education. At the same time, lacking a creative response, the challenges and risks could lead to serious consequences for the already weak sector. These consequences have critical implications for policy-making in African universities. The gains that have been made through national and regional frameworks need facilitation through supportive strategies and policies. Developments in key drivers of internationalization such as funding, quality assurance, and information communication technology could play a role in ameliorating the isolation of Africa from the fast-growing knowledge society. The need to strengthen institutional capacities for research and knowledge production will remain important for future internationalization.

As internationalization grows to be one of the powerful forces in Africa's higher education, questions still abound about what it portends for the future. While the benefits are many and varied, so are the risks. It is still unclear what the long-term benefits and risks will be for Africa. It is also difficult now to foresee the type of higher education institutions that Africa will develop as a result of increased internationalization. The unfolding scene is one of greater complexity, exacerbated by the many challenges and weaknesses facing the higher education sector in Africa.

Asia

Asia is increasingly emerging as a key actor in international higher education, and in particular, three countries are taking lead roles—China, India, and Japan—although one should

not ignore the higher education evolution occurring in other countries such as Korea, Singapore, Vietnam, Malaysia, and Indonesia. The following three country sections are written by experts from the region and present their views.

BOX 25.2 China: Key Issues and Trends of Internationalization of Higher Education

Futao Huang

Professor, Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University (Japan)

Context and Rationales

Although the meaning of internationalization of higher education has changed significantly in China over different periods, it has played a very important role in China's higher education reforms since the latter part of the 19th century. For example, China's first modern university, Peking University, was established in 1898 based on Western models. More important, the basic structure of the current higher educational systems was also essentially influenced by the former Soviet Union's patterns, when the People's Republic of China was established in 1949. Prior to 1978, when the implementation of the open-door policy and economic reforms were implemented, the

internationalization of China's higher education had been shaped by political and ideological factors, which viewed a modern national higher education system as a key instrument for economic development. Thus, from the late 1970s to the early 1990s, a key motivation was a desire for implementing the open-door policy and economic reforms. After 1992, market mechanisms and international competition emerged as driving forces in the development of China's higher education. Internationalization of higher education in China, driven by challenges from globalization and worldwide competition, has meant focused priorities on academic quality and standards and on efforts to build world-class universities.

Changes and Current Situation

In response to increasingly complicated challenges, the internationalization of China's higher education has undergone considerable and progressively striking changes in recent years. First, given an increased number of Chinese students going abroad for their advanced studies at their own expense since the 1990s, in particular, the Chinese government developed a national strategy to fund 5,000 university students every year from 2007 to 2011 to study in leading foreign universities. The vast majority of Chinese students still select institutions in the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and Germany; recently, however, there has been rapid growth in numbers of Chinese students flowing into more diverse countries, including Australia, Canada, Japan, Singapore, Hong Kong, and South Korea. In addition, the Chinese government has continued to send both young and senior researchers, faculty members, and visiting scholars, including postdoctoral researchers, to foreign universities and research institutes through various nationally funded programs. It is estimated that every year, the highly selective central government dispatches nearly 10,000 faculty members and researchers to conduct their research abroad.

Second, the integration of an international dimension into university teaching and learning, including development of both English programs and bilingual programs (Chinese and English), has been greatly encouraged. This is especially evident in leading research-oriented universities in China. Regulated and facilitated by the Ministry of Education, more and more of these universities have been able to provide from 10% to 15% of their curricula entirely in English and bilingually at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

Third, since the mid-1990s, both the Chinese government and individual institutions have made great efforts to undertake the joint operation of higher education institutions and collaborative delivery of academic programs with foreign partners. Joint efforts include two aspects: on the one side, incoming foreign programs that are jointly provided by local universities and foreign partners in Chinese universities; on the other side, outgoing programs offered by Chinese universities in other countries, in particular via the Confucius Institutes. In addition to joint educational programs on Chinese campuses, two universities have been established by local institutions and foreign universities and approved by the Ministry of Education of China. The University of Nottingham, Ningbo, China, was established in 2004 by the UK University of Nottingham in partnership with Zhejiang Wanli University, a nongovernment institution. New York University, Shanghai, is being established by the U.S. New York University in collaboration with East China Normal University, one of the leading national universities in China. The agreement was signed in 2011, and operations will start in September 2013. In both cases, a majority of programs are imported and taught by faculty members from the United States, United Kingdom, and other countries. More important, the internal governance and management arrangements in the two jointly operated universities are

(Continued)

(Continued)

modelled on UK and U.S. patterns. These institutions and programs have constituted a highly important component of the Chinese higher education system, and the government regards them as an effective means of internationalizing China's higher education and improving academic quality and standards.

Finally, since the mid-1990s, another important strategy for promoting the internationalization of higher education in China is to introduce international academic standards and to financially support several universities with the aim of becoming world-class universities.

Issues and Trends

Like many emerging countries in Asia, China faces numerous problems with the internationalization of Chinese higher education. These include the increasing brain drain; the quality assurance of incoming foreign educational services; the regulation of joint degree programs at an institutional level; the tension in conflicting policies between foreign and Chinese institutions and governments, especially with regard to unrestricted use of the Internet; and the integration of an international orientation into teaching and learning activities without affecting traditional culture and national identity. Moreover, although both the government and individual institutions have been attempting to realize mutual communication and exchange in the internationalization of higher education in China, it is still largely being undertaken as a one-way process, overwhelmingly dominated by major English-speaking countries with relation to personal mobility, provision of educational programs, utilization of academic norm and conventions, and so on. An added problem is that only a few leading universities—all belonging to the national sector—typically advocate for the policy of internationalization. This means that internationalization is restricted to a few selected key institutions with the primary goal of training elite students. In the future, individual institutions will be encouraged to play a more active role in the internationalization of China's higher education.

However, as internationalization has become one of the most effective means to improve the quality of China's higher education, it is evident that much effort will continue to be made at both national and institutional levels. China's central government will still maintain its strong leadership in stimulating the internationalization of higher education by developing relevant policies and strategies that are responsive and adaptable to new challenges.

BOX 25.3 Internationalization of Indian Higher Education: From Intentions to Actions

Rahul Choudaha

Director of development and innovation, World Education Services (USA)

Indian higher education has recently been receiving significant interest from foreign institutions. This interest gained a big boost in March 2010 with the Cabinet approval of a bill to allow entry of foreign education providers in India. Although the bill is still awaiting approval by the Parliament, it has already created a sense of excitement and confusion at the same time for many institutions

in India and abroad. About the same time, an India-U.S. Higher Education Summit supported by the U.S. Department of State indicated interest of government on both sides to promote partnerships in higher education. Despite the regulatory challenges, however, foreign universities are seeking inroads into Indian higher education. For example, Leeds Metropolitan University and Lancaster University in the United Kingdom have taken the initiative to start full-fledged branch campuses in India, despite challenges they encountered.

While these positive and strategic developments are shaping the policy and practice of internationalization of Indian higher education, there are several challenges in translating intentions to actions. This discussion outlines opportunities and challenges with the internationalization of Indian higher education and concludes with a discussion of future directions.

Opportunities

With only 12% of the relevant age cohort enrolled in higher education, India offers huge potential for growth. The Indian middle class sees foreign education as valuable both for social recognition and for career advancement, resulting in an increasing demand for international programs.

Internationalization is glamorous and attracts students: Traditional outbound mobility of Indian students has been consistently increasing, however, many who aspire to study abroad do not have the resources. In addition, institutions with an international component in their programs also command a higher tuition. This has resulted in an increase in joint academic offerings and student exchange programs.

Potential of Impact and Diversity of Institutions

Although India is the third-largest postsecondary education system, internationalization is concentrated in a handful of institutions and types of programs such as business or engineering. There is enormous potential for foreign institutions to create mutually beneficial relationships with programs in social sciences and education, at one level, and vocational colleges at another level. For example, Montgomery College is leading an initiative to advance the community college model in India with the help of a grant funded by the US-India Education Foundation. Thus, internationalization opportunities exist beyond traditional models, level of programs, types of institutions, and fields of study.

Challenges

Among many challenges faced by Indian higher education, the lack of a coherent policy framework and institutional capacity to manage internationalization are two major hindrances.

1. Incoherent policy framework and lack of a national strategy:

The policy and governance framework of Indian higher education is allegedly corrupt, incoherent, and inefficient. There have been cases of corruption with leading regulatory bodies, including All India Council for Technical Education. The nexus of business, politics, and regulation also became evident with the quality issues with several universities. This policy incoherence has resulted in a paradoxical situation, where many high-quality institutions lack approval at the same time that many poor-quality institutions have approval. In addition, India also lacks a national strategy for internationalizing higher education.

(Continued)

(Continued)

2. Lack of institutional capacity and preparedness for internationalization

Only a handful of Indian institutions such as Manipal University have taken a big leap in internationalization, and some have even started foreign campuses. However, there are hardly any exemplars for comprehensive internationalization. While several institutions have the intent and interest in internationalizing, very few have a capacity, mind-set, understanding, and the resources to develop a comprehensive internationalization strategy. Many Indian institutions also misrepresent and overpromise the international component in their programs. This has resulted in misplaced priorities and ineffective collaborations with foreign institutions.

The Way Forward

To address the need and challenges of internationalization, there is a need to develop a comprehensive internationalization strategy both at the national and institutional levels. The Indian higher education system also needs to recognize that top talent, which has the potential to achieve global excellence, is the core for achieving success with international ambitions. This includes building an ecosystem of students, faculty members, and administrators and advancing the profession of higher education.

Many foreign institutions interested in India already know that it is not an easy market, and Indian higher education is even more complex. However, opportunities and potential to make an impact are very high. This means that institutions need to take a consultative and capacity-building approach. While it is important to be cautious and vigilant in finding a partner, it is also critical to take an entrepreneurial approach in starting with low-risk engagement and using it as a learning opportunity.

Charles Klasek (1992) rightfully noted, "It is not difficult to sign an agreement with universities of all types throughout the world; it is difficult to implement the agreements so that there are mutual academic benefits to the institutions involved" (p. 108). Likewise, opportunities and intentions for internationalization of Indian higher education are ample, however, the successful execution of these intentions requires an enabling environment, institutional capacity, and a coherent policy framework.

BOX 25.4 Internationalization of Universities in Japan

Hiroshi Ota

Professor and Director of the Center for Global Education

Hitotsubashi University (Japan)

The need for the internationalization of universities is a long-standing issue in Japan. It seems that universities and internationalization have been closely intertwined ever since the beginning of modernization of the country (Meiji period: 1868–1912). The internationalization of universities was essentially a national strategy for Japan, considered a less developed country in the area of higher education during the Meiji period, and, in that sense, internationalization could be considered a

government-led endeavor. The Japanese government and universities typified the approach of importing knowledge and technology from overseas and modifying them to Japanese usage for the sole purpose of the country's modernization (internationalization for modernization) under the imported models of universities from the West. However, after the early stage of Japanese higher education development, universities started to localize their institutional organizations and structures to fit in traditional Japanese culture, featuring rigid hierarchy and the low mobility of students and faculty, although those universities continued to import Western knowledge and technology and translated them for Japanese application. This is a typical case of "Japanese spirits and Western knowledge" and prevented Japanese universities from internationalizing their curricula for a long time since the vast majority of course contents originally came from the West.

With the subsequent development of the country and its universities, the Japanese government has made substantial efforts to promote international exchange programs, such as the Japanese Government Scholarship (launched in 1954), the 100,000 International Students Plan (from 1983 to 2003), the JET (Japan Exchange and Teaching) Program (started in 1987), and Japanese Fulbright Programs (organized by Japan-U.S. Educational Commission). As a result of these intentional efforts to internationalize, Japan has become one of the most popular destinations for study abroad students in Asia. Nevertheless, it seems that the internationalization of universities ended up becoming dependent primarily on the personal activities of faculty members. For instance, individual researchers collaborated with researchers abroad, participating in international conferences and international research projects; those individual researchers introduce advanced studies in foreign countries to academic circles in Japan; or they teach foreign studies courses. Thus, international activities at Japanese universities have relied heavily on the initiative of individual faculty members, and there have been few concerted organizational efforts, apart from international student exchange programs, to garner true support for internationalization within universities. Representative and common problems with hosting international researchers in Japan include visa application procedures, language, a lack of adequate housing, and schools for family members of those international researchers. In most cases, individual host researchers provide solutions to those problems without the systematic support of their university. At the same time, institutional support for Japanese researchers to conduct research abroad has been limited and so, as mentioned above, the individual-level activities have inadvertently come to play a major part in the ad hoc internationalization of Japanese universities, despite a number of funding programs for Japanese and international researchers provided by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and the Japan International Cooperation Agency. It is likely that this happened as a result of each faculty or department, or even each professor, having a high degree of academic autonomy, especially within national universities. This autonomy meant that the institutionally organized activities of the university were relatively weak, particularly with regard to internationalization, and there was little leadership for exploring comprehensive internationalization strategies for the university as a whole. However, under recent and rapidly changing circumstances, such as university privatization, the deteriorating demographic climate within many industrialized countries, and the increasing competition to recruit international students and researchers, it seems that this ad hoc approach is no longer viable in the global landscape of higher education.

The Japanese higher education system is currently undergoing a comprehensive process of reform, in which internationalization is a major component. This includes the corporatization of public universities (the changing role of government from direct control to supervision at the macro

(Continued)

(Continued)

level and the delegation of more autonomous powers to individual institutions). Under the reform agenda and given the low percentages of international faculty (5.0%) and students (3.8%), the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT, 2011) has supported Japanese researchers and students' engagement in increased international activities abroad as well as supporting Japanese universities' capacity to host increased numbers of international students (under the 300,000 International Students Plan started in 2008) and researchers. The ministry also has encouraged universities to increase the number of courses and programs taught in English to enhance the diversity of the student and faculty population and to meet the increasing demand for global-minded graduates (workforce) at globalizing Japanese companies.

At the same time that internationalization grows in importance in education and research evolves into a more mainstream role in Japanese higher education, Japan's public debt is reaching 200% of its GDP under the prolonged economic stagnation. Society and taxpayers increasingly expect universities to be able to clarify the added value of the international dimensions and the impact of internationalization on the institution. Under the circumstances, a growing number of successful international liberal arts institutions and schools—Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University, Akita International University, and Waseda University's School of International Liberal Studies—offer a truly international learning experience with a high percentage of English-taught courses, highly diversified student population and faculty, and a variety of study abroad programs. They have made internationalization the first priority within their institutions' missions and efforts.

Currently, one of the crucial challenges among Japanese universities is to develop the effective evaluation process of their internationalization efforts. This challenge lies in balancing trusted quality control (which creates a bottom line in terms of accountability), transparency, resource management, and quantitative expansion. In addition, such an approach requires a creative assessment structure and related methods, such as peer review and benchmarking, which encourages overall internationalization initiatives and adds a strategic dimension to further university internationalization.

All in all, the MEXT's initiatives (e.g., Strategic Fund for Establishing International Headquarters in Universities from 2005 to 2010 and Global 30 launched in 2009) have promoted the organizational restructuring of universities to better attune them to these institution-wide internationalization tasks, and university leaders have equally made efforts to introduce an institutionally organized, proactive, and strategic approach to university internationalization. The Japanese government is expected to continue to develop strategic policies of university internationalization in order to provide a catalyst for the functional transformation of Japanese universities toward meeting the demands of the 21st century's global knowledge-based society.

Latin America

Latin America is the third region that is emerging as a key player in the global economy and society. Its higher education sector is rapidly expanding and demonstrates particularities such as a strong private sector and an emerging

regional approach. The continent as a whole and specific countries such as Mexico, Argentina, Chile, Colombia, and Brazil emerge as key actors in international higher education. Here are two discussions, one on Latin America as a whole and one specifically on Brazil as a rapidly emerging country in international higher education.

BOX 25.5 Latin America: Challenges and Trends in the Internationalization of Higher Education

Jocelyne Gacel-Ávila

Professor, University of Guadalajara (Mexico)

Latin American higher education faces the challenge to respond to globalization and the emergence of a knowledge-based society, at the same time that higher education systems of the region are still dealing with unsolved problems in terms of access, equity, quality, and relevance. The potential of internationalization as a key strategy to update and improve the quality and relevance of higher education systems, as well as the student's graduate attributes, is still not fully explored.

The knowledge-based society is challenging the limited levels of research and innovation typical of Latin American institutions. Most postgraduate studies were established relatively late, mostly in the 1980s and 1990s. Enrollment in graduate studies in the region amounts to only 4.2% of the total student population (Gazzola, 2008). Despite great efforts made in the last few decades, the region has not yet achieved a sufficient number of high-quality postgraduate programs, and most of these are at the master's level (Rama, 2006, p. 53). In several areas of study, especially in scientific fields, doctoral programs are lacking, and enrollment in doctorate studies is minimal; it represents only 1% of the enrollment in countries such as Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico. Research is mainly carried out for academic purposes and therefore has little impact on the production process and national competitiveness. Knowledge transfer to society and enterprises is scarce, largely because the productive sector itself does not actively support research and development, which is a traditional characteristic of the region. Scientific and technological knowledge production in Latin America in 2008 represents only 4.9% of the world's total (UNESCO, 2010, p. 10). All these factors result in a weak national innovation system, which is just the opposite of what is needed in a knowledge-based society.

A World Bank publication declared that "the internationalization of education appears not yet to have reached a sufficient level of importance on the political agenda," concluding that the region needs a more proactive approach to education and research by establishing strategies for the medium and long term in order to shape the agenda for the future rather than reacting to changes introduced by other international stakeholders; and to strengthen capacity to generate and analyze data on the performance of the sector. This will provide a strong basis for long-term policy decisions, which in turn would improve the prospects of reaping the full benefits of internationalization (Holm-Nielsen, Thorn, Brunner, & Balán, 2005, p. 65).

Latin America is a region where governmental support is one of the lowest in the world. The main external barriers identified are limited funding (27%, a slightly higher percentage than the world average of 25%); difficulties of recognition of qualifications or study programs (16%); and language barriers (13%) (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2010, p. 82). As a consequence, international activities are not linked to key national programs, and the lack of national leadership leaves the internationalization process to initiatives essentially stemming from institutions. The internationalization process is still marginal to national and institutional policies.

The lack of foreign language proficiency in students and faculty hinders opportunities for mobility abroad, as well as participation in cooperative projects. The lack of curricular flexibility, a

(Continued)

(Continued)

trait of the Latin American educational model, is definitely an obstacle for the internationalization of the curriculum (Gacel-Ávila, 2007, pp. 407–408), a situation that explains, in part, little curricular change and very few international joint and double degree programs.

International offices generally occupy a low position in institutional organization charts, being on the fourth or fifth tier of the hierarchy, generally reporting to academic or planning provosts who might not have the required international training and vision (Gacel-Ávila, 2005, p. 352). This means that the international office lacks the required autonomy and capacity to implement the complex strategies required by the internationalization process. Furthermore, turnover is high among the staff managing international activities and programs because of recurring changes in institutional authorities. As a consequence, staff members generally have a low level of professionalization with insufficient international expertise, leading to a lack of institutional capacity for the successful promotion and management of the internationalization process.

Latin America has one of the lowest rates of outbound student mobility in the world with 6% (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2010). Nevertheless, it should be underscored that outbound mobility is on the rise. However, the region hosts only 1.9% of foreign students, with the majority coming from within the region (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2010, pp. 174–181). Intraregional mobility has increased since 2000 as a result of the establishment of university networks, like Red de Macrouiversidades, UNIVERSIA, Grupo Montevideo, CONAHEC, among others.

The World Bank and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development conclude that “very little curricular change has occurred in Latin America” in the last decade (de Wit, Jaramillo, Gacel-Ávila, & Knight, 2005, p. 346). One of the major obstacles for integrating the international dimension into the curriculum is the traditional curricular model and structure of the first-cycle prevalent in most Latin American institutions of higher education; it is characterized by a lack of flexibility, disciplinary overspecialization, and professional orientation. A survey led by the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education (Gacel-Ávila, 2009) reports that since 2002, an increasingly important strategy of curricular internationalization has been the establishment of joint and double degrees with foreign universities. Nevertheless, very few of these are in Latin America, compared with other regions, such as Europe or Asia.

Regarding international cooperation, research data show high levels of participation of the major public universities of Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Chile, and Cuba. The most important partners are European countries, among them France, Germany, Spain and the United Kingdom, and, to a lesser degree, the United States, Canada, and Japan. These projects are generally fostered and partially funded by national organizations dedicated to the advancement of science and technology, thanks to the establishment of bi- or multilateral agreements with sister organizations abroad. This type of cooperation is more inter- than intraregional, but there has been a noticeable move away from development cooperation toward collaborative research cooperation since the 1980s, thanks to the advancement of science and knowledge in countries such as Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, and Chile. Nevertheless, countries like Peru and Bolivia are still primarily recipients of development in research (Gacel-Ávila, 2005). Worth mentioning is the case of ENLACES, (*Espacio de Encuentro Latinoamericano y Caribeño de Educación Superior*), which is a regional initiative whose main objective is the creation of a system of networks for intraregional cooperation to develop a comprehensive framework for research at the regional level (Carvalho, 2009).

The level of awareness of the need for inter- and intraregional integration of higher education, following the influence of the Bologna Process in Europe, is definitely rising in the region, evidenced

by the region's participation in such projects as the Latin American and Caribbean-European Union Common Area of Higher Education, which intends to create a common higher education area between Europe and Latin America, and the Ibero-American Space for Knowledge promoted by UNIVERSIA. The feasibility of such a common space and the influence of the Bologna Process in Latin America have been subject to debate and criticism (Brunner, 2009; Gacel-Ávila, 2010). A criticism of such an integration process is its limited viability for Latin America; nonetheless, it becomes a promising avenue for further research on convergence and educational models for the region.

In conclusion, one can say that in spite of modest, but undeniable progress, the region still lags behind others. The international dimension is not yet sufficiently institutionalized in Latin American tertiary education, either at the national or institutional level. Internationalization activities are not in the mainstream but rather marginal to institutional development. Therefore, the potential of internationalization is underexplored. Latin America is not able to fully reap the benefits of the world process and to trigger the much-needed transformations required by the system. Latin American governments and decision makers must put education and higher education at the top of the agenda for development, and second, they must perceive internationalization as a key strategy for the advancement of higher education.

BOX 25.6 Internationalization of Higher Education in Brazil: Now and In The Future

Sonia Pereira Laus

Researcher on the internationalization of higher
education process and international academic cooperation (Brazil)

Brazil has over 190 million inhabitants and the biggest higher education system in Latin America, composed of almost 2,400 higher education institutions (74% of them private) where about 6.4 million students are enrolled. Although its postgraduate system was created only during the 1970s, it graduated nearly 11,000 PhDs in 2008, an increase of 278% since 1996. The most significant research in the country is produced at public universities. Brazilian scientists published more than 26,000 scientific papers in international journals indexed by Thomson Reuter's Science Citation index in 2008 (UNESCO, 2010), which ranks the country as the 13th-largest producer of science in the world. More than 90% of this work is produced at public universities.

On the other side, these numbers are out step with other government data indicating that 48% of Brazilian young people in the age group 18 to 24 years enroll at higher education institutions (Brazilian Institute of Statistics and Geography, 2010, p. 49), which means that social exclusion persists in spite of the significant advancement of science and technology as the result of a state policy developed over the last 40 years leading to higher level skills training in the country and abroad.

Government policy initiatives during the 1970s led to the creation of nationally supported fellowship programs intended to support graduates with master's and doctoral degrees. During the

(Continued)

(Continued)

late 1990s, the discussions about internationalization evolved in Brazil when the government agency for the evaluation of postgraduate education (CAPES) decided to establish international patterns. The decision led to a gradual adjustment to these new standards, mainly at the public and the private-not-for-profit pontifical Catholic universities, in order to qualify its students and teachers abroad and to improve international participation in research groups (Laus & Morosini, 2005). The gap is noticeable between those institutions that rapidly adapted their structures to these new challenges, promoting internal changes and engaging in a wide range of international cooperation, and those that did not.

We can observe over the past decade a significant growth in the numbers of academic mobility abroad and an increasing number of joint projects, joint publications, and participation of Brazilian academics in international events and networks. From 2001 to 2008, many fellowships were financed by national government agencies, including CAPES (26,789) and the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (4,398), especially for postgraduates but also including undergraduates studying abroad.

The main Brazilian partners are France, the United States, Germany, Portugal, Spain, the United Kingdom, and Canada, but we can also observe an increasing movement toward South–South cooperation, led by a national foreign policy that, in addition to traditional partners, is increasingly focused on academic and scientific dialogue to new areas such as India, China, and its traditional and new partners in Africa. Following this same movement, there is an increase in the number of intraregional mobility programs, provided mainly by the action of the *Mercado Comum do Sul* (MERCOSUL) agreement (Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay) created in the early 1990s. In this regional context, some new educational policies have been implemented, such as those concerning the accreditation of university degrees, titles and graduate courses in the region. Those actions increase regional international cooperation within the framework of postgraduate teacher training and scientific research and are contributing to the implementation of the Higher Education Space ALCUE (Latin America, Caribbean and European Union) (Laus, 2009).

The impact of these activities is manifest in the number of scientific networks, like those in the frame of the Montevideo Group University Association and the MERCOSUL Higher Education Mobility Support Program, as well as multilateral academic programs like those supported by the European Commission, the Ibero-American Summit, and UNESCO, among others. These networks, programs, and projects are agents and objects of the internationalization process, acting as strong tools for internationalization nationally, regionally, and subregionally and at the same time promoting South/South integration and enlargement of academic relations in the region.

As a result of these academic activities, we can observe in many higher education institutions an evolution in the role of the international relations offices, shifting from an unimportant staff activity to an integrated part of the academic decision process, some of them having their own budgets and an institutional status of vice rectors, which was not the reality some years ago.

In recent years, international rankings are provoking a race between Brazilian universities best evaluated under CAPES patterns to strive for so-called international standards or an “equivalent performance to that of international centers of excellence in the area,” even knowing that those ranking patterns are not exactly based on the model and purposes of the universities in the region.

Brazil's political and economic stability, the increase in revenues of a growing middle class, and the needs of national science, technology, and innovation to support the competitiveness of national economy are leading the country to an aggressive policy of internationalization of its higher education.

To support national growth with qualified human resources, the Brazilian government created in 2011 the Science Without borders initiative (<http://www.capes.gov.br/ciencia-sem-fronteiras/sciencewithoutborders>), which is a large-scale nationwide scholarship program. Supported by R\$3.1 billion (about US\$1.76 billion) mainly from the federal government and with some private financing expected, the program seeks to strengthen and expand the initiatives of science, technology, innovation, and competitiveness through international mobility. Its aims are to send abroad 100,000 undergraduate and postgraduate students and researchers between 2011 and 2014 to the top-ranked universities worldwide and also to stimulate the visit of highly qualified young researchers and senior visiting professors to Brazil. Science Without Borders is focused on those areas considered strategic for national development, mainly engineering; new technology construction engineering; physical sciences (mathematics and physics); clinical, pre-clinical, and health sciences; chemistry; biology; geosciences; computing and information technology; aerospace technology; pharmaceuticals; sustainable agricultural production; oil, gas, and coal renewable energies; minerals technology, bioprospecting, and biodiversity; biotechnology, nanotechnology, and new materials; natural disasters prevention and mitigation; creative industry; marine science; and practical technologies. The first group of students went to the United States in 2011, to be followed by those who go to Germany, France, and the United Kingdom (among others) in succeeding years.

Middle East

The Middle East is another important new regional player in international higher education. In the past, several countries like Egypt, Lebanon, and Jordan were already important international players, but they lost their position at the end of the past century. Recently, countries like Dubai, Qatar, the United Arab

Emirates, and Saudi Arabia are positioning themselves as regional hubs and strive for world-class status. It is still too early in the aftermath of the Arab Spring to ascertain its impact on the future of the region in general and on its higher education sector internationally. The Middle East section below provides one perspective on the current trends, issues, and challenges in the region.

BOX 25.7 A New "Spring" for Higher Education in the Middle East: Internationalization as a Positive Challenge

Georges H. Nahas

Vice President, University of Balamand (Lebanon)

Higher education in the Middle East was driven for the last decades by ideologically oriented centralized regimes. In this geographical space, Lebanon stands out as a country with a liberal education sector having different approaches to higher education and a very strong private sector open to international cooperation. All other countries in the Middle East region, because of the centralized and politicized decision-making policies, have a homogeneity characterized by the following:

1. A democratization of the educational system leads to crowded universities, even in programs such as technology and applied sciences,¹³ while the recruitment policy, based on the final degree grades, does not encourage the best students joining the higher education system.

(Continued)

(Continued)

2. A lack of flexibility within the system hinders the possibility of establishing programs able to meet fast-changing market demands.
3. A lack of academic freedom within the universities due to the reigning political atmosphere has impacted the quality of teaching and of faculty.
4. A reliance on Arabic-translated resources due to political decisions leads to lower foreign language proficiency.
5. A paucity of financial resources, which primarily cover salaries and basic infrastructure, leave few resources remaining for research and professional development.

On the other hand, due to the efforts of the Arab Universities League,¹ efforts were made:

1. To reach consensus about the programs organization to enhance student mobility within the region.
2. To establish training programs in centers of excellence established within the region.
3. To establish an Arab Accreditation Agency to help search for quality and sustain the human development in all countries, mainly those who pass through wars and trouble.
4. To establish professional boards to maintain a recognized quality level within the professions, mainly the medical ones.
5. To enhance the relations between the universities (libraries, research centers, faculty exchange, etc.) to meet the requirements of a challenging new paradigm of higher education within this globalization era.

Regarding mobility, over 220,000 (7.3%) students left the Middle East and North Africa for study in 2008, compared to 134,400 international students who studied in that region. Two thirds of North African for study international students study in France, but that country is only the fifth-largest destination for students from the Middle East. One can find North African students also in Canada and Germany (80% each), while students from the Middle East are more dispersed, studying in the United States (16.5%), Jordan (14%), the United Kingdom (13%), Saudi Arabia (11%), and France (8%) (Jaramillo, 2011). About 25% of students from the Middle East study in other nations within the region. As Jaramillo (2011) states, "This creates a significant regional education market that seems to be growing in size and importance as the region's economies diversify and as countries in the region develop internationalization strategies" (p. 4).

The Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region is also a host region for international students: Egypt, Jordan, and Lebanon are among the top 30 host countries in the world. Most MENA international students' movement is intra-regional, that is, between MENA countries, attributable to cost, culture, and language competence (Jaramillo, p. 5).

As Jaramillo (2011) states, "One of the most distinctive features of higher education in the region is the large presence of foreign providers" (p. 6). In 2009, the Middle East hosted 34% of all international branch campuses (Observatory on Borderless Higher Education, 2011). The United Arab Emirates has the most branch campuses, followed by Qatar. There are also branch campuses in Kuwait, Bahrain, Yemen, Jordan, and Tunisia. Institutions operated in partnership with foreign

institutions exist in some other MENA countries. For example, there are German universities in Egypt (German University of Cairo, opened in 2003 and is operated by the universities of Ulm and Stuttgart), Jordan, and Oman. The French University of Cairo operates following a similar partnership model with the University of Paris-IX Dauphine, and there is a recent partnership of Paris-IX Dauphine in Tunis. A French business school is offering MBAs in Lebanon (ESA in Beirut), and Saint Joseph University of Beirut has a branch campus, the Law School in Abu Dhabi. In Saudi Arabia, the King Abdullah University of Science and Technology has adopted another model: It has engaged world-class universities to help design the curriculum of its programs and has created a Global Research Partnership allowing its faculty and students access to top researchers and research facilities from four world-class research universities. Given that some MENA countries have adopted these new policies regarding the presence of private institutions of higher education, some for-profit organizations are creating the challenge of maintaining quality in education due to lack of academic accountability.

Having this background in mind, it is worth mentioning that the policies toward internationalization are still very problematic. Even if a large number of faculty members are trained outside the region, the choice of universities where the future faculty members are sent is driven by political issues and not by excellence priorities. As stressed in a study of the International Association of Universities, this region is reluctant to adopt an aggressive internationalization policy mainly for cultural reasons. The identity issue seems to be crucial, along with the fear of having a brain drain. Other minor problems hinder internationalization actions in the MENA region, among them the language of instruction, degree recognition, and the accredited institutions. But the paradox in this regard is the following: As state institutions, the universities could organize excellent means for internationalization through diplomatic channels, but the prevailing atmosphere does not help due to the two major factors mentioned earlier.

For example, in Lebanon, three main Lebanese universities were established as part of foreign institutions, and these relations were maintained and strengthened through the years between the Lebanese universities and European and U.S. institutions. In Lebanon, the identity issue is not considered serious, and all other factors are not hindering the open and efficient relations universities are having with the nonprofit institutions that are operating in the country. However, academic society has experienced brain drain for many years, and this remains a serious challenge factor regarding the adoption of a national policy toward internationalization.

It is likely that the political changes the Arab countries are going through at the time of this writing will have an impact on the higher education systems in the region. A change in the political approach that supports a democratic spirit and an atmosphere of freedom might boost and enhance quality in the universities by adopting a critical approach to their status quo. At the same time, internationalization is being viewed as an opportunity to make faculty better knowledge producers rather than only knowledge consumers. Jaramillo (2011) states for the Middle Eastern and North African region:

Internationalization is one of the most important developments that globalization has brought to higher education worldwide. In the MENA region, it has turned into quite a complex undertaking. The Arab Spring has made it clear that young people in MENA are asking for more and better opportunities: to study and work; to move about the world; and to learn and to create new knowledge and enterprises. Higher education, migration, and

(Continued)

(Continued)

labor mobility are key policy areas as MENA nations address the need for a strong skills base to underpin the economic and social development of the region's disparate economies.

Foreign universities and governments are presented with the opportunity to consider institutions in MENA region as potential partners in rebuilding and restructuring the future following the Arab Spring. Internationalization has to be presented in that process as a means and not as an objective by itself.

Concluding Regional Observations

Through these brief overviews of internationalization developments in specific world regions and countries, several common themes emerge. First, the role of national governments has been a driving force in propelling international higher education forward in many of the cases. Second, underlying motivations for internationalization often involve capacity-building within the various countries, although in a decreasing scale. Third, private higher education is becoming an important factor in these regions. Fourth, internationalization itself has become a driving factor in propelling countries forward. And fifth, the traditional role of higher education and its international dimension is rapidly changing.

Within these and other themes, there are also some ongoing challenges endemic to particular regions of the world such as counteracting the persistent issue of brain drain, the risks related to increasing privatization, and a debate about ethics and values in internationalization of higher education. Indeed, these concerns are not exclusive to these regions and countries but are also highly relevant to the traditional players in North America, Europe, and the Pacific. Future trends include a growth in regional mobility through greater development of regional networks and increased intracontinental engagements, collaborations, and reforms, which are viewed as positive indicators in internationalization efforts (Jowi, 2012).

Why is it important for international education leaders to understand the emerging themes and challenges in this global landscape of higher education? To be effective in their own work, these leaders must be able to contextualize their work in understanding the rising prominence of

higher education institutions in other regions, which then impacts the different themes that have been addressed in this volume, all of which are played out at the institutional level.

This rising prominence of other regions is leading to the slow but steady growth in research and scholarship on internationalization issues from non-Western perspectives. This is a welcome development, given the dominance of Western concepts and scholarship to date in the field of international education. As Jones and de Wit (2012) observe,

those countries with longer histories of internationalization need to learn from the varied contributions to debates and practice of other developed nations, so the voices of countries who have come on the scene more recently should be heard as offering new perspectives and dimensions to the existing landscape of international education. (p. 25)

These fresher perspectives can help guide the future developments in international education; leaders would be wise to seek out such voices and research.

RETHINKING INTERNATIONALIZATION

In Chapter 2 of this Handbook, Jane Knight writes at length about the concept of internationalization. Her definition of internationalization as “the process of integrating international, intercultural, or global dimensions into the purpose, functions, or delivery of postsecondary education” has

undergirded internationalization for decades and is widely referred to in other Handbook chapters and publications. Given the rapidly changing world of the 21st century, the question becomes: Does the concept of internationalization require reconceptualization? For example, is it sufficient to focus on the internationalization of one's institution? How might global issues in sustainability, economic and social justice, and human rights lead international educators to initiate broader networks and resource-sharing among institutions? How would a "layered approach" to internationalization look that involved a mix of public, private, nonprofit, and commercial entities? Some senior international educators see the new technologies, entrepreneurship, and expanding student and faculty mobility as elements of a new matrix for both institutional internationalization and enhanced student learning (see Chapters 9, 21, and 23, this volume). Others question the increased focus on competitiveness and numbers with respect to internationalization (see Chapter 10, this volume), as well as the ethics and values related to this approach.

The emerging debate on the concept of internationalization was stimulated in early 2011 by an essay with the provocative title, "The End of Internationalization" (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011a):

Over the last two decades, the concept of the internationalization of higher education moved from the fringe of institutional interest to the very core. . . . In the late 1980s changes occurred: Internationalization was invented and carried on, ever increasing its importance. New components were added . . . in the past two decades, moving from simple exchange of students to the big business of recruitment, and from activities impacting on an incredibly small elite group to a mass phenomenon. (pp. 15)

The authors argued that it is time for critical reflection on the changing concept of internationalization. Others are also advocating for a review of the current conceptualizations and approaches to internationalization, including Mestenhauser (2011), who writes that "the present system of mainstreaming international dimensions, whatever they are, is neither adequate or feasible and . . . a different idea is long overdue" (p. 159). He advocates for a "systems-oriented approach" (p. 159) which not only is a "multiplier of learning, but . . . also provides a

new cognitive structure for dealing with the complexity" of the modern world (p. 161).

In the fall of 2011, the International Association of Universities (IAU) took the initiative to bring together a diverse group of international educators in a discussion on reconceptualizing internationalization of higher education with the objective to stimulate the revitalization of international education. The group addresses three questions: Is the concept and the definition of internationalization keeping up with developments in higher education? Is there a shared understanding of the concept? Has internationalization lost sight of its central purposes? (www.iau-aiu.net). The result of this initiative has been the publication of an IAU document, 'Affirming Academic Values in Internationalization of Higher Education: A Call for Action,' April 2012 (www.iau-aiu.net), in which the benefits of internationalization are acknowledged, potentially adverse unintended consequences addressed, and a call is made to higher education institutions to act to ensure that its outcomes are positive and of reciprocal benefit to institutions and countries involved. Knight (2011b) also wonders about an identity crisis in internationalization and calls for a "focus on values and not only on definitions." And Mestenhauser (2011) likewise questions the traditional definitions of internationalization involving "international dimensions" by wondering "what the 'international dimension' is, how much of it is needed, where to find it, and how to add it to the existing academic programs," concluding that "a new pattern is needed to ensure the conceptual integrity of international education" (p. 135).

What those calling for a debate have in common, according to Brandenburg and de Wit (2011a), is

the shared feeling that international education no longer can be seen as a fragmented list of activities executed by international offices and a small group of motivated internationalists among staff and students. Internationalization should on the contrary be integrated, broad and core. (p. 15)

Moreover, senior international educators could no longer be viewed as the spearhead of innovation; rather, they "are holding firm to traditional concepts and act on them while the world around [them] moves forward" (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011a, p. 16). Thus, it becomes crucial for leaders to explore and understand this changing

nature of internationalization within higher education. However, it is important to explore multiple perspectives on this debate, which can be viewed as more of a “Western” debate as noted by Murray (2012), who states that

In many countries, there is an excited, healthy sense of only just beginning on internationalization. There is no sense of a “mid-life crisis” and at the same time there is a global recognition that “education is changing quite fundamentally and that we are entering a new era.” (p. 21)

One phenomenon in the debate on the future of internationalization of higher education is the inclination to put new broad labels on the term: *mainstreaming*, *comprehensive*, *holistic*, *integrated*, and *deep internationalization* are some of the main ones used in recent writings and presentations (de Wit, 2011a; Hudzik, 2011). The underlying urge to broaden and deepen the notion of internationalization is understandable, but such endeavors may be counterproductive or, at a minimum, translate into continued use of familiar approaches, albeit with new labels. For example, an instrumental approach to internationalization has led to the *why* and *what* being overtaken by the *how* and *how much*. In many cases, what can be measured has become the end goal: more exchange, more degree mobility, and more recruitment (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011a, 2011b; Deardorff, 2005; de Wit, 2011a, 2011b), although this has gradually been shifting beyond the *how much* to the more substantive goals and outcomes as discussed by Deardorff and Van Gaalen in Chapter 10, this volume.

Nonetheless, the instrumental focus has led to myths and misconceptions about what internationalization actually has meant. These myths may be grouped in various ways (de Wit, 2011b; Knight, 2011a).

- International students are effective agents of internationalization.
- An institution’s international reputation is a good proxy for its quality.
- Internationalization is synonymous with: a specific programmatic or organizational strategy; teaching in the English language; study abroad; having many international students on campus; having just a few international students in the classroom; more and more international

subjects taught; or more international agreements and accreditations.

- Higher education is international by nature.
- Internationalization is an end in itself.

These various myths and misconceptions have been explored throughout this volume and are topics for critical reflection for international educators in the future. Those who advocate for internationalization must confront key issues in the future: What are internationalization’s real accomplishments in terms of improving learning and students’ readiness for the future? How does the changing global landscape force international educators and leaders to rethink internationalization as a “Western concept” or as the sole model for new (non-Western) players? How do leaders internationalize internationalization? (Sutton & Deardorff, 2012) What other viable approaches and models may be utilized? How are terms such as *intercultural*, *international*, and *global* related to core educational values? What are indeed the bridges to the future for students?

Moving Forward

Taking an even broader look at internationalization of higher education, it is helpful to examine some of the assumptions being made as to how what has been described in this volume and this chapter will all work in the future. There are larger issues at play that can greatly impact not just internationalization but higher education in general. For example, given the increasing innovations around technology, will the traditional “bricks and mortar” concept of universities remain a viable option for education, in a world of 24/7, “point, click, study,” just-in-time training and asynchronous learning? Where will international education be in a world where the rate of information is expanding exponentially and shared through gaming, virtual reality, text messaging, social reading, and social networking? What formats, beyond traditional semester systems, may work best in educating the next generation? What is the value-added in maintaining centuries-old educational traditions at “brick-and-mortar” universities in the global world of the 21st century? What impact will there be with the increasing number of nonformal providers of education?

For example, in the United States, the largest provider of professional development for science teachers is National Public Broadcasting, a public television network (Levine, 2010). And with the growing popularity of online educational venues, and other online ventures that are increasing the access to education, what are the implications for international education? How will international educators collaborate with nontraditional providers of education? How will higher education be re-imagined in a global context? Considering the future of higher education is crucial as leaders in international education envision how to achieve the preparation of global-ready students. Traditional ways of “doing international education” may no longer be viable. Innovation is needed in rethinking not only internationalization but also how it translates into a rapidly changing world. To that end, there is a danger that increased calls for homogenization of international education will stifle the innovation that is so greatly needed in the 21st century.

This Handbook has provided an overview of trends, issues, and opportunities and looked at the past, present, and future of internationalization in an effort to map the global landscape of international higher education. In the discussions found in these pages are many specific strategies for moving internationalization forward into the future. The words of Maurice Harari seem as appropriate now as when they were quoted in the predecessor to this volume (*Bridges to the Future*: Klasek, 1992), when he described an institution of the future as being one that has a

positive attitude toward understanding better other cultures and societies, learning more about the political and economic interconnectedness of humankind, a genuine desire in interacting with representatives of these other cultures and societies, a genuine desire to understand the major issues confronting the human and ecological survival of planet earth and to learn how to cooperate with others across national and cultural boundaries in seeking solutions to world problems. (Klasek, 1992, pp. 204–205)

May this handbook serve as a bridge to the future as higher education institutions seek to fulfill this vision.

REFERENCES

- Altbach, P. (2002) Centres and peripheries in the academic profession: The special challenges of developing countries. In P. Altbach (Eds.), *The decline of the guru: The academic profession in developing and middle-income countries*. Boston: CIHE.
- American Council on Education (ACE). (2011). *Report of the blue ribbon panel on global engagement: Strength through global leadership and engagement*. Washington DC: Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement, American Council on Education.
- Aughenbaugh, S., Falk, D., Moss, S., & Shapiro, M. (2010). *Educating globally competent citizens: A tool kit for teaching seven revolutions*. Washington, DC: ISIS.
- Bhandari, R. (2012, February/March). Re-envisioning internationalization: International education for what? *IAU Horizons*, pp. 18–19.
- Boschini, V. J. (2011). Learning to change the world: Making international education core to the institutional mission. *AIEA: Presidential Perspectives*. Retrieved January 6, 2012, at <http://www.aieaworld.org/publications/PresidentialPerspectives>.
- Brandenburg, U., & de Wit, H. (2011a). The end of internationalization. In *International Higher Education*, no. 62, pp. 15–16. Boston: Boston College Center for International Higher Education.
- Brandenburg, U., & de Wit, H. (2011b). Has international education lost its way? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 15 November 2011, blog. <http://chronicle.com/blogs/worldwise/has-international-education-lost-its-way/28891>
- Brazilian Institute of Statistics and Geography. (2010). *Síntese de Indicadores Sociais Uma Análise das Condições de Vida da População Brasileira*. Retrieved from http://www.ibge.gov.br/home/estatistica/populacao/condicaovida/indicadoresminimos/sinteseindicsois2010/SIS_2010.pdf
- Brunner, J. J. (2009). The Bologna Process from a Latin American perspective. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(4), 417–438.
- Carvalho, J. (2009). *ENLACES: Propuesta para la Creación del Espacio Latinoamericano y Caribeño de Educación Superior*. Retrieved April 30, 2010, from www.iesalc.unesco.org/ve/.../Jose_Renato_Carvalho_texto.pdf
- Deardorff, D.K. (2005, May/June). Matter of logic? *International Educator*, pp. 26–31.
- de Wit, H. (2011a, Summer). Internationalization misconceptions. *International Higher Education*,

- no. 64, 6–7. Boston: Boston College Center for International Higher Education.
- de Wit, H. (2011b, October 23). Naming internationalisation will not revive it. *University World News*, Issue 0194.
- de Wit, H., Jaramillo, I., Gacel-Ávila, J., & Knight, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Higher education in Latin America*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Egron-Polak, E., & Hudson, R. (Eds.). (2010). *Internationalisation of higher education: Global trends, regional perspectives: IAU 3rd global survey*. Paris: International Association of Universities.
- Frost, M. (2009). The new global student: Skip the SAT, save thousands on tuition and get a truly international education. New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Gacel-Ávila, J. (2005). Internationalization of higher education in Mexico. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Higher education in Latin America* (pp. 239–279). Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Gacel-Ávila, J. (2007). The process of internationalization of Latin American higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), pp. 400–409.
- Gacel-Ávila, J. (2009). Joint and double degree programmes in Latin America: Patterns and trends. *The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education*.
- 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.
- Gazzola, A. (2008). *Panorama de la Educación Superior en América Latina y el Caribe*. Presentación, IESALC-UNESCO, Cartagena de las Indias.
- Green, M. (2012, February/March). What is global citizenship and why does it matter? *IAU Horizons*, pp. 27–28.
- Heyl, J. (2011). Third-party program providers and education abroad: Partner or competitor? *AIEA Issue Brief*. Retrieved from www.aieaworld.org/publications/contemporary-issues
- Holm-Nielsen, L., Thorn, K., Brunner, J. J., & Balán, J. (2005). Regional and international challenges to higher education in Latin America. In H. de Wit, I. Jaramillo, J. Gacel-Ávila, & J. Knight (Eds.), *Higher education in Latin America* (pp. 39–70). Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- Hudzik, J. (2011). *Comprehensive internationalization*. Retrieved from www.nafsa.org/cizn
- Jaramillo, A. (2011). *Internationalization of higher education in MENA: Policy Issues associated with skills formation and mobility* (World Bank Report No: 63762-MNA). Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Jones, E., & de Wit, H. (2012). Globalization of Internationalization: Thematic and regional reflections on a traditional concept. *AUDEM: International Journal of Higher Education and Democracy*, 3.
- Jowi, J. O. (2009). Internationalization of higher education in Africa: Developments, emerging trends, issues, and policy implications. *Higher Education Policy*, 22(3), 263–281.
- Jowi, J. O. (2012, February/March). Re-thinking internationalization and what it portends for Africa. *IAH Horizons*, p. 29.
- Jowi, J.O., Kiamba, C., & Some, D. K. (2008). Kenya. In D. Teferra & J. Knight (Eds.), *Higher education in Africa: The international dimension* (pp. 238–261). Accra/Boston: AAU/CIHE.
- Kishun, R. (2006). *Internationalisation of higher education in South Africa*. Durban, South Africa: IEASA.
- Klasek, C. (Ed.). (1992). *Bridges to the future*. Carbondale, IL: Association of International Education Administrators.
- Knight, J. (2008). Higher education in turmoil: The changing world of internationalization. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Knight, J. (2011a). Five myths about internationalization. *International Higher Education* 14(63), 14–15. Boston: Boston College Center for International Higher Education.
- Knight, J. (2011b, August). Is internationalisation having an identity crisis? *IMHE Info* (p. 1). Paris: OECD/IMHE.
- Laus, S. P. (2009). Calidad y Acreditación en el MERCOSUR. In *SAFIRO II. Casos Prácticos para la Gestión de la Internacionalización en Universidades* (p. 163–179). Alicante, España: Universidad de Alicante. Retrieved from http://www.safironetwork.org/public_documents/SAFIRO%20II%20-%20libro.pdf
- Laus, S. P., & Morosini, M. (2005). L'internationalisation de l'enseignement supérieur au Brésil. In *L'Enseignement Supérieur en Amérique Latine. La dimension Internationale*. Washington, DC: OECD.
- Levine, A. (n.d.). *The future of colleges: Nine inevitable changes*. http://education.gsu.edu/ctl/Programs/Future_Colleges.htm
- Levine, A. (2010). *The future of higher education*. Unpublished talk given at 2010 Association of International Education Administrators conference, Washington DC.
- Mestenhauser, J. (2011). *Reflections on the past, present, and future of internationalizing higher education: Discovering opportunities to meet the challenges*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT). (2011). *University*

- internationalization and international student policy*. Tokyo: Author.
- Mohamedbhai, G. (2003). Globalization and its implications on universities in developing countries. In G. Breton & M. Lambert (Eds.), *Universities and globalization: Private linkages, public trust* (pp. 167–168). Paris: UNESCO.
- Mulumba, M., Obaje, A., Kagiso, K., & Kishun, R. (2008). International students mobility in and out of Africa: Challenges and opportunity. In D. Teferra & J. Knight (Eds.), *Higher education in Africa: The international dimension* (pp. 490–514). Accra/Boston: AAU/CIHE.
- Murray, D. (2012, February/March). Alexander's sword? *IAU Horizons*, p. 21.
- Observatory on Borderless Higher Education. (2011). *Perspectives on the future*. Retrieved from www.obhe.org
- Oyewole, O. (2009) Internationalization and its implications for the quality of higher education in Africa. *Higher Education Policy*, 22(3), 319–329.
- Pol, P. (2012, February/March). Re-thinking internationalization: Towards “coopetition” or new forms of cooperation?” *IAU Horizons*, p. 30.
- Rama, C. (2006). *La Tercera Reforma de la educación superior en América Latina*. Mexico City: FCE.
- Salmi, J. (2003). *Constructing knowledge societies: New challenges for tertiary education*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Sanchez, C., & Wertheimer, L. (2011). *School dropout rates add to fiscal burden*. National Public Radio, July 24, 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/2011/07/24/138653393/school-dropout-rates-adds-to-fiscal-burden>
- Sutton, S., & Deardorff, D. K. (2012, February/ March). Internationalizing internationalization: The global context. *IAU Horizons*, pp. 16–17.
- 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* (pp. 44–79). Accra/Boston: AAU/CIHE.
- Teferra, D., & Knight, J. (2008). *Higher education in Africa: The international dimension*. Accra/ Boston: AAU/CIHE.
- UNESCO (2010). *UNESCO science report 2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/natural-sciences/science-technology/prospective-studies/unesco-science-report/>
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2010). *Global education digest 2010*. Montreal: UNESCO.
- Wildavsky, B. (2010). *The great brain race: How global universities are reshaping the world*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.