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Internationalisation at a crossroads?

Is internationalisation having an identity crisis?
Knight (IMHE Aug 2011)

The End of Internationalisation?
Brandenburg & de Wit (EAIE Forum 2011)

Has International Education Lost Its Way?
Brandenburg & de Wit (The Chronicle of HE 15/11/11)

Yet we are still very far from implementing internationalisation other than in narrow terms

Affirming Academic Values in Internationalization of Higher Education: A Call for Action
IAU (April 2012)

Naming internationalisation will not revive it
De Wit (UWN 23/10/11)
Maybe the new thinking about internationalization in higher education has to come from the emerging higher-education sector in Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and Africa, not polluted by traditional ways of thinking about international education.


Globalisation of Internationalisation

- Internationalisation has become a mainstream notion in higher education around the world and has evolved thematically and regionally from the concept as it was developed in the 1990s.

- As the international dimensions of higher education have developed their own momentum and become a global topic of interest, the ‘globalisation of internationalisation’ requires a more nuanced approach to its interpretation and delivery.
Learning from other contexts

• We continue to talk as though we share the same understanding, but in fact there are many different interpretations of ‘internationalisation’.

• It is timely to consider whether this variety of interpretation is a barrier or a benefit and to question whether we are learning sufficiently from other global contexts.

• Looking ahead, we are more likely to learn from the potential offered by the globalisation of internationalisation if we can agree on concepts and terminology, in order to share and implement good practice more effectively.

The ‘globalisation of internationalisation’ requires us to take account of:

- A vast increase in the scale of operations, eg an increase in the number and types of offshore campuses and other cross-border activity
- Global competition for students and talents
- A wider range of regional practices
- Geographical variation in social and economic needs resulting in differentiated local and regional responses
- Ethical issues in global engagement and sustainability of practice
- The importance of careful consideration of the local context and culture when engaging in cross-border activity
Australia

• professional, quality assured market-driven approach to international recruitment and the support of international students, including pathways to study, international student experience etc
• Trans-National Education and branch campuses
• Led the world in introducing Graduate Attributes
• Internationalisation of the curriculum

USA

• Notions of intercultural competence

• ‘Study abroad’

• Campus internationalisation
Continental Europe

• Student mobility – Erasmus programme

• ‘Internationalisation at Home’

• Bologna Process

• Delivery through English to attract students

UK

• ‘Global citizenship’ / Global perspectives for domestic students - link with school curriculum

• Link between internationalisation and multiculturalism “responding to the diversity of international students and responding to the diversity of home students are in fact not two agendas but one” (Jones & Killick, 2007)
Recruiting countries?

- East and South East Asia
- Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand declare themselves international education ‘hubs’
- China, Japan, Korea, India, Brazil, South Africa and the Middle East,
- International branch campuses of western universities. Changing notions of importing and exporting countries as students choose study destinations once seen as merely sending students to the west to study.
- Global mobility flows are increasingly complex
- New opportunities for those able and willing to access them.

Increasing awareness of risks as well as benefits of internationalisation

- Global responsibilities of western universities as internationalisation takes different directions and is influenced by alternative perspectives.
- Ethical and sustainability issues take on a new importance if we are not to see internationalization as exploitative or as a “slave trade in education”. (Jegede, 2012).

\[\text{brain-drain, cultural homogenization, competition among higher education institutions as well as increased commercialization continues to be attributed as possible consequences of higher education internationalization. They are seen by some as the risks of internationalization, by others as collateral damage of the process.}\]

(Egron-Polak, 2012)
Impact of western-dominated discourse and practice?

Critical reflection needed as countries in parts of the developing world open up to internationalisation.

**Of special concern is that by trying to be global and world class, African universities may neglect their important function of community engagement – so vital for their societies.**

Mohamedbhai 2012

Africa encounters internationalization with peculiar social, historical, economic and political realities.... Historically these relations have left Africa with the shorter end of the stick.

Jowi 2012

How can established players learn from the ‘newcomers’?

In the same way that those countries with longer histories of internationalization need to learn from the varied contributions to debates and practice of other developed nations, so voices from countries which have come on the scene more recently should be heard as offering new perspectives and dimensions to the existing landscape of international education.
Thematic views on the broad concept of internationalisation

• Attempts are made at structuring the increasingly broad concept of internationalisation by thematic differentiation, in much the same way as, in the past, international education was divided into disciplinary curriculum and student mobility.

• In particular, some authors attempt to distinguish between the ‘globalisation of higher education’ and ‘internationalisation of higher education’. This is described by Cantwell and Maldonado-Maldonado (2009) as a common distinction, but is challenged by researchers and perceived as ‘theoretically unsatisfying’.

Secondly, there is Jane Knight’s (2008) attempt to clarify the old divide between curriculum and mobility

• Internationalisation at home: activities that help students develop international understanding and intercultural skills (curriculum-oriented) and that prepare students to be active in a much more globalized world

• Internationalisation abroad: all forms of education across borders, including circulation of students, faculty, scholars, and programs.

While conceptually this may offer a helpful starting point, the reality of internationalisation means that a clear distinction is often difficult to draw from either an institutional or an individual perspective, ‘at home’ and ‘abroad’ are not neat divisions in today’s complex context.
Other researchers distinguish between:

- **Cooperation** and **Competition** (Van der Wende, 2001)

- **Institutional and student focused internationalisation** (Jones and Brown 2007, Jones 2010b)

- **Internationalisation ideologies**: ‘instrumentalism’, ‘idealism’, and ‘educationalism’ (Stier, 2010)

- ‘Internationalisation of the curriculum’ and ‘internationalisation at home’ (Beelen, 2007).

- Further distinction is made between **intercultural, international and global competences** (Deardorff, 2006).

A theme emerging more recently is the attempt to put broad new labels on the term ‘internationalisation’ itself:

- Mainstreaming, comprehensive, holistic, integrated and deep internationalisation are some of those more widely used in recent writings and presentations

- This underlying urge to broaden and deepen the notion of internationalisation, is understandable but does not help in furthering internationalisation, and it may even be a hindrance.

- i.e.: The inclination to embrace these new labels but to continue as before, making little real progress, with practice failing to follow the rhetoric.
A different approach

- Take internationalisation a step further and look at its accomplishments
- Challenge misconceptions about internationalisation
- Consider the changing global landscape and the related debate about internationalisation as a ‘western concept’
- Avoid the danger that new players will simply replicate the activities of the old
- Consider whether internationalisation should be for a small elite or for all
- Question the similarities and differences between intercultural, international and global
- Debate other fundamental developments and values.

‘If internationalisation is to revive, that will not be the result of new labels, but of the debate and action on these key questions.’ (De Wit, 2011b)

In essence, the current debate on the notion of internationalisation in higher education needs to be focused on:

- How to move away from an input and output approach to more of an outcome and process approach to internationalisation

- How can we make sure that students and faculty are prepared and competent for a society that is more than ever interconnected.

- At the same time, there is a need for more reflection on the ‘why’ question, the rationales for internationalisation, on the external and internal context, faculty and student perspectives, as well as external stakeholders perspectives, especially as we take into account the emerging global context for internationalisation
We suggest the following priorities in the current context as internationalisation itself becomes globalised.

**Priority 1:** The need to learn from other non-western national and cultural contexts – to understand the full extent of internationalisation as a phenomenon and what we can learn from each other in order to benefit students, employers and nations.

**Priority 2:** To ensure that no single approach or paradigm dominates the discourse but to take account of the nature of internationalisation as a comprehensive process.

**Priority 3:** Not to see internationalisation as a goal in itself but as a contribution to the quality of education and research for the benefit of students.

**Priority 4:** To offer greater clarity on the ‘why’ of internationalisation, being more explicit about institutional and individual rationales for a strategy or approach so that objectives and outcomes are clear and measurable.

**Priorities Continued**

**Priority 5:** To pay more attention to faculty and student perspectives on internationalization. There is still too great a focus on political and economic rationales from an (inter)national and institutional perspective, in which the perspectives of those for whom it is all intended are underrepresented.

**Priority 6:** To understand better the impact of international and intercultural learning outcomes on student employability, taking into account the perspectives of employers.

**Priority 7:** To continue research on the benefits of internationalisation and the impact on students, faculty and administrators.

**Priority 8:** To better understand the link between internationalization and multiculturalism and undertake further research on whether similar benefits can be gained through internationalization of the curriculum at home as are evident in the literature on study/work/volunteering overseas.
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