

Higher education globally: towards new frameworks for research and policy

1. Introduction

The frameworks within which higher education operates have become more international over the last decades. We speak now not only about the internationalisation of higher education but also about its globalisation. The key question is what this means: there is clearly a geographical expansion in focus and an increased level of inter-dependence of national systems, but does the globalisation also mean that higher education frameworks are becoming more global in the sense of less nationally specific? Can we still speak meaningfully of national higher education systems and policy? What influence do these changes have on the role of different stakeholders, what does this mean for policy and steering processes in higher education, and for research into higher education? These are some of the central questions that this paper seeks to address.

2. The internationalisation of higher education

The recognition that higher education has an international dimension is not new. We were all intellectually raised on the argument that research has an intrinsically international character. We all acknowledge our roots in the Middle Ages when Erasmus of Rotterdam and other “wandering students” transversed this continent to study at different centres of learning. Despite the authenticity of this example, it does not substantiate the often advanced position that higher education has always had, and has inherently, an international character.

- In the first place, nation states have played a crucial role since the nineteenth century in the development of the modern university. In part this role related to the initiation and regulation of training programmes for important legal, educational, medical and military functionaries. In this context Neave (2001) refers to two centuries of nationalism in higher education.
- Secondly, very few higher education institutions can lay claim to a centuries-old international tradition for the simple reason that two-thirds were established after 1900 and half after the Second World War. The modern university, therefore, is a national institution (Scott, 1998, p. 123).
- Thirdly, the extent of international activity and orientation in education and research varies enormously depending on the discipline and professional area concerned.
- Finally, very limited numbers of students and staff have actually participated in international activities¹.

Nevertheless, in the second half of the twentieth century a gradual change in the extent to which higher education policy was nationally determined and orientated can be observed. Increasingly national governments began to interact with each other on (higher) education policy with the OECD, UNESCO and the EU Council of Education Ministers serving as important forums. In these discussions the comparison of educational policies, and in particular their effects, assumed an increasing importance. A natural development was that these organisations began to establish

institutes focussed on international comparative data collection and analysis². In the Netherlands, CHEPS³ became a pioneer in demonstrating the contribution that international comparative research could make to policy debates on higher education. In addition, more policy attention came to be paid to the internationalisation of higher education itself⁴. In some cases OECD reports indicating a narrow national orientation in the fields of higher education and research served as a catalyst for individual countries to develop internationalisation policies⁵, but in general the major spur to action was the process of European integration and more specifically EU programmes in the field of higher education (Van der Wende, 1997).

It is clear that since the Second World War we have seen more actual international co-operation between nations in the field of higher education. For a long time this co-operation was limited to the creation of enhanced possibilities for co-operation and exchange at the level of individual students, scholars and institutions. More recently this international co-operation has extended to the level of higher education systems, notably in the context of the Bologna Declaration that was signed in 1999.

In the Bologna Declaration, 29 European countries agreed to harmonise their higher education systems. This has led primarily to the reform of degree structures in these countries to an undergraduate-graduate system (Haug & Tauch, 2001). Alongside these reforms, and of no less significance, the Bologna process has also strengthened the international dimension to higher education policy (Van der Wende, 2001b). Nevertheless, these international policies are still decided and implemented at the national level. In the context of the EU it is important to remember that no legal or political powers or responsibilities in the field of higher education have (yet?) been transferred to a supra-national level (notwithstanding the Treaties of Maastricht and Amsterdam). European policy is confined to agreements on co-operation between (and more recently the harmonisation of) national systems. These agreements are seldom legally binding⁶. All of this suggests that higher education systems in Europe are indeed coming to resemble each other, and are increasingly mutually interconnected. The key question remains, however, whether this will also lead to the integration of the different systems and the extent to which this is a desirable or necessary outcome. A related question is then whether EU policy is sufficiently strong and far-reaching. I will return to this point later in the paper.

First I will give a brief account of the different factors and initiatives that have played an important role in the internationalisation of higher education, their underlying rationales and their key consequences. If we look at post-world war two developments in Europe it is evident that geo-political factors have played a major role (Blumenthal et al, 1996, De Wit, 2002).

- One of the ways in which the post-war reconstruction of Europe was supported was through the stimulation of scientific co-operation between the USA and Europe. The Fulbright programme is a prime example of this. These policies led to a multiplicity of bilateral, individual, research orientated contacts and enhanced North-North mobility and co-operation.
- The process of de-colonisation in the 1950s and 1960s resulted in new forms of mobility and co-operation aimed at the development of a new intellectual stratum in the former colonial nations. In the first instance students from these countries were enrolled in European universities (South–North mobility), sometimes in

regular programmes (for example, in Germany and France) but also in specially designed institutions such as the Institutions for International Education in the Netherlands⁷. Subsequently countries such as the Netherlands placed greater emphasis on developing training capacity in the former colonial nations themselves by way of North-South co-operation.

- The first forms of multilateral exchange and co-operation developed in the eighties in the context of the process of European integration. This process saw the creation of the world's largest programme of this nature – the ERASMUS programme, now part of the SOCRATES Programme for Education and Youth.
- After the fall of the Berlin wall both individual European nations and the EU developed extensive co-operation programmes with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. In the framework of the EU programmes (including TEMPUS) this took the form of multilateral exchange and co-operation, but this time on a West-East axis.

The strengthened international dimension of higher education is not only a consequence of these geo-political developments. It is an explicit response to support the processes of reconstruction, nation-building and economic and democratic reform through co-operation, capacity building, knowledge transfer and the education of a local intellectual cohort to modern and international standards. In this context we can speak of a *political* rationale behind the process of internationalisation that has now an almost independent existence in the policies of higher education institutions and (supra) national authorities. From the middle of the 1990s this process was conceptualised increasingly as: “The process of integrating an international dimension into the education, research and service functions of a higher education institution” (Knight & de Wit, 1995).

Other rationales also played a role. Within European policy there was a particular concern for the promotion of mutual understanding and knowledge of different languages and cultures: the *cultural* rationale. In the 1980s a specific *academic* rationale became more explicit which focused on internationalisation as a means to enhance the quality of education and research⁸. Finally, a fourth rationale can be identified which came to assume an increasingly prominent role in relation to the three mentioned previously: the *economic* motive for internationalisation. In its various forms this relates, directly or indirectly, to the international competitive power and position of a region, country, education system or individual university. A distinction can be made between the short and the long-term objectives that such policies contain. Short-term objectives include the generation of additional institutional or national income from international activities. In a longer term perspective different objectives may come to the fore such as education for an international labour market and the strengthening of international trade relations by foreign students playing an ambassadorial role for the country in which they studied (Van der Wende, 1997, 2001a). Recent research suggests that the economic rationale has become dominant in Europe and that the competition paradigm is now more significant than the co-operation paradigm (Van der Wende, 2001b). This appears to be linked to the process of globalisation and its impact on higher education. An alternative definition of internationalisation is then: “Any systematic attempt to align higher education (more closely) with the demands associated with the globalisation of society, economy and the labour market” (Kälvermark & Van der Wende, 1997, p. 19). I will return to this point later.

The most important consequences of internationalisation can be summarised as follows:

- A significant increase in the mobility of students and scholars, although the degree of mobility varies markedly by discipline, and serious imbalances exist in the flows between different countries and regions.
- A broadening of the range of activities associated with internationalisation: from an almost exclusive focus on individual mobility to more sophisticated strategies encompassing curriculum development, research co-operation, staff development and quality enhancement (Teichler, 1999, Van der Wende, 2001a). Examples include the development of international educational programmes, joint or double degrees, international accreditation, etc.
- Internationalisation has come of age: from a marginal to a more central institutional concern that is increasingly recognised to be of strategic importance (Barblan et al, 2000). Examples here are the international consortia initiated by groups of institutions to enhance their international profile and market position.
- Internationalisation has broadened to become a characteristic not only of universities but also of other higher education sectors. In the Netherlands the higher vocational education sector made major progress in this regard in the 1990s⁹.
- The use of English as the language of scientific research and international communication about higher education has become even more prevalent. English is also increasingly used as the second language of instruction, particularly in countries with relatively “small” national languages such as the Netherlands and Denmark.
- Finally, the rapid development of the internet has strengthened and extended the possibilities for international co-operation (Collis, 1998).

3. Globalisation: a new phenomenon?

In recent years there has been more and more discussion of the globalisation of higher education. The interesting question is why this is the case, and if this is something different from the attention paid to internationalisation. Are we really talking about a different phenomenon, is this really something new, is it only a question of a new “in vogue” concept, or does the use of the term signal a stronger form of internationalisation than in the past? In the first instance I will situate these questions within the broader debate around globalisation. The question of whether globalisation is indeed a new phenomenon has played an important role here as well.

Giddens (2001) identifies two phases in the globalisation debate. The first phase (1985-1995) took place primarily in academic circles and focused on whether globalisation did represent a fundamentally new development. Some scholars (including Ohmae and Castells) argued that this was the case citing the increasing internationalisation of economic activities and financial markets and the associated growth in the mobility of capital, goods, services and people in the last three decades¹⁰. Sceptics (including Hirst & Thompson, 1996) countered this argument noting that globalisation does not represent a new reality as from as early as the late middle ages there have been increasing levels of international activity and interrelatedness, and that particularly from the end of the 19th century a major growth

in international trade and mobility can be observed¹¹. They argue further that these processes are concentrated in the triangle of Western Europe – North America – Japan, so while the world economy is clearly becoming more international, it is not global¹². This debate has been more or less resolved with a fair degree of consensus now existing that there is a fundamental difference between current developments and those of one hundred or more years ago (Giddens). The essential difference is that the changes of the past two to three decades are qualitatively faster, more far-reaching and comprehensive than those around the turn of the previous century or before, primarily due to developments in information and communication technologies¹³. There is also agreement that we are witnessing an increase in mutual interdependence in economic terms, higher levels of global and inter-regional competition, an increase in problems that cross national borders, and a greater influence of international policy (Held & McGrew, 2000, p. 38). Finally, it has been demonstrated that the sceptics have concentrated too much on the financial-economic aspects of the process of globalisation and have overlooked the political, social and cultural elements of this process (Guillen, 2001).

The second phase of the globalisation debate is notable for the fact that it has become a public debate. At least since Seattle in 1999, it has been a debate taken to the streets¹⁴. The concern is not whether globalisation exists or whether it is a new phenomenon but about its consequences. High levels of polarisation and a strong anti-globalisation movement are added features. Yet it is striking that both proponents and critics focus again on the economic aspects of globalisation: trade liberalisation, international monetary policy, the integration of financial markets and the role of multi-national corporations. As indicated earlier, in the literature in general different aspects of globalisation have been distinguished. While this has enriched the interpretation and analysis it has certainly not simplified it. The explosive growth in the number of scientific articles published on globalisation is a clear indication of the extent to which the topic has occupied the minds of social scientists over the last 10 years.

4. Globalisation: Concept and Complexity

The complexity of the concept of globalisation relates not only to its different elements but also to the enormous scope of the process to which it refers. The process is far from unequivocal: it is fragmented, incomplete, and in many respects contradictory and confusing. The analysis of this process proceeds from different starting points, disciplinary perspectives and ideological positions – whether these are explicitly adopted or implicit in the analysis. It is hardly surprising that globalisation is currently one of the most contested subjects in the social sciences and that there is disagreement and a multiplicity of views on its conceptualisation. I endeavour to find a way through this labyrinth by limiting myself to those aspects most relevant to higher education.

Globalisation: defining the process in terms of time and space

In general globalisation is summarised as a process both driven by, and resulting in, increased cross-border flows of goods, services, money, people, information and culture (Held et al, 1999). In the further conceptualisation of this process, concepts of space and time, and their uncoupling, transcendence or compression, play a central

role (Ohmae, 1990, Giddens, 1990). The significance this has for social relations and interaction is a second important dimension.

Giddens (1990) defines globalisation as: “The intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa”. Two elements of this definition are particularly important: we are talking about an intensification of social relations, and this entails a process wherein the global and the local exert mutual influence upon each other. Held (et al, 1999) also gives a central place to the changing spatial organisation of social relations. Their definition reads: “Globalisation can be thought of as a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organisation of social relations and transactions – assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact – generating transcontinental or interregional flows, and networks of activity, interactions, and the exercise of power”. Once again this stresses that it is not a question of everything becoming global, but of flows and activities between (particular) continents and within regions. Held goes on to demonstrate how these change social relations in an analysis in which we can recognise Giddens’ notion of intensification. These changes can be determined in terms of scale (geographical reach), intensity (number and volume of flows), speed (of the movement of flows through space), and impact (total effect on society and the economy). Space and time also play a role in Castells’ (2000) analysis. He argues that new social forms of space (“space of flows”: simultaneous activity without geographic proximity) and time (“timeless time”: compressed and without sequence) coexist with their traditional forms. This is integral to his analysis of the “new economy” where *global*, *information* and *networks* are central concepts. The economy now has the capacity to operate as a single entity in real time on a planetary scale. He refers to the informational society, a specific form of social organisation where the generation, modification and transmission of knowledge is the most fundamental source of productivity as a result of the new technological possibilities opened up in this historic period (2000, p. 21). One of the most important characteristics of the new social structure, and the logic of its basic structure, is that it is composed of networks. Castells also speaks more generally about the network society but this does not exhaust all of the characteristics of the informational society. The key technological enabler for the development and functioning of these networks is the Internet: a technological application that makes possible new ways of transcending space and time.

Globalisation and the role of the nation state

New forms of information and communication technology and the dynamics of multinational corporations are clearly important driving forces behind the process of globalisation. But in reality, Castells argues, national governments, particularly those of the wealthy western countries (G7) and their – in his view – subordinate international institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank and the WTO, have played a not to be underestimated and deciding role. They have done so through three mutually inter-related policy lines: [1] the deregulation of domestic economic activities; [2] the liberalisation of international trade and investment; [3] the privatisation of public controlled enterprises (2000, p. 137).

In this assessment the role of national governments seems unaffected; they retain responsibility and they control policies in critical areas. However, a rigorous debate has developed about the impact of globalisation on the role and position of the nation state. On the one side it is argued that globalisation is eroding the role of the nation state. Globalisation erodes the nation state and in the process its sovereignty, autonomy and legitimacy are weakened (see amongst others Beck, 2000, Ohmae, 1995). The alternative view suggests that the nation state is not disappearing but that it is adjusting and changing (Castells, Giddens), or that it will disappear only if it doesn't (Carnoy, 2001). This debate has also highlighted the fact that it is not globalisation itself, but the neo-liberal trends associated with it – such as the promotion of free trade – that are threatening the role of the nation state (Guillen, 2001). Some argue that this is a result of government policies at a national and international level (Castells, 1996). Others believe that there is a vacuum in the governance of national economies that has not been fully filled by international and inter-governmental agencies (Strange, 1996).

It is also acknowledged that economic globalisation is an uneven process that furthers global inequality, not only between but also within countries. A horizontal segmentation between winners and losers in the process of globalisation results in a weakening of social solidarity and presents real challenges for the unity of nations (Castells). The theoretical contestation in this debate can be traced back to divergent perspectives originating respectively in world system and international relations theories. In the first the concept of worldwide social relations (and not society confined within the borders of the nation state) is central. In the second theory the development and strengthening of linkages between nation states is emphasised, but the prospect of a world state is not seen as a viable proposition (Giddens, 2000)¹⁵. From the second perspective globalisation can be seen as a reflection of changes that have occurred in the way nation states are governed (Clark, 1999).

Convergence, divergence and inequality

An important question concerning the process of globalisation is whether it leads to convergence or divergence in social, political, economic and cultural terms. Here again there is contestation in the debate (see Guillen for an overview). For along time it was anticipated that the opening of markets and the distribution of technology would lead to greater convergence amongst post-industrial societies. Once again the world-system (or world-society) perspective suggests that nation states will increasingly display structural similarities. But also that this may imply a de-coupling of aims and structures and of intentions and outcomes. In this regard it is apparent that despite growing similarities in form there is a growing inequality in outcomes (Meyer & Hannan, 1979). This inequality implicit in the process of globalisation, and indeed its contradictions, is recognised from many perspectives (Giddens, 2000, Held & McGrew, 1999, Castells, 1996, Strange, 1996). Emphasis has been placed in particular on the rising levels of inequality between and within countries¹⁶, which Castells has described as a parallel process of development and underdevelopment, and of inclusion and exclusion.

Anti-globalisation arguments

Representatives of the anti-globalisation movement¹⁷ base their criticism of globalisation primarily on the phenomenon of increased inequality and argue that international organisations and specifically multi-national corporations have become too powerful. These drive the globalisation process, which leads to social exclusion and oppression while at the same time the corporations largely escape democratic control. In both political and academic discussions about globalisation the need to recognise and analyse these anti-globalisation arguments is increasing. While this may be attributed to political pragmatism, from a theoretical perspective the importance of agency, interest and opposition in the formulation and outcomes of policy processes has been stressed (Guillen, 2001). From both political and scientific perspectives the importance of recognising and analysing the positions and roles of different stakeholders is acknowledged increasingly.

5. Globalisation and higher education

The foregoing short analysis of globalisation has identified a number of concepts and notions that I will now develop for application to the field of higher education. The key issues are: [1] the flows of people and services across borders, and the role of information and communication technology in this process; [2] the changing role of the nation state in relation to trends towards deregulation, liberalisation and privatisation; [3] the question of convergence or divergence; and [4] the role of stakeholders (including anti-globalisation arguments) in the process of globalisation.

Trans-national flows of people and services: the role of networks and ICT

As was indicated early on in this paper, cross-border mobility of people within higher education is not a new phenomenon. In recent decades the internationalisation policies of governments and institutions have focussed primarily on stimulating organised mobility and exchange. This entails the movement of people (mainly students) in more or less predetermined numbers between clearly defined and highly varied national higher education systems. The consequences of the differences between systems are bridged through mechanisms such as the recognition of study credits and diplomas, tuition fee calculations etc. based on agreements between countries that do not bring either the boundaries or the competencies of the national systems into question.

Free mobility has developed into a market wherein higher education institutions eagerly recruit foreign students. And in recent years yet another trend has emerged that has been termed “Moving education, not learners”. This trend is a result of the rapidly increasing demand for higher education¹⁸. On the one hand this demand concerns increased access to the initial phase of higher education particularly in specific developing and transitional countries where strong economic development is occurring. In western countries the desire to increase the participation of 18 –24 year olds in higher education is also still apparent. Knowledge economies after all need large numbers of highly educated people. In addition it is clear that the rapid expansion of our knowledge base means that a single higher education experience is not adequate anymore: life-long learning is required. For countries with an ageing population and relatively few young labour market entrants this need for life-long learning is particularly pronounced. Many national higher education systems are not in a position to respond to these demands for more and different forms of higher

education. In financial and logistical respects regions such as Asia are not able to rapidly develop new institutions of significant scope. In countries where the demand is primarily for life-long learning, traditional institutions often find it difficult to enter the realm of more student-orientated, competency-based learning that is flexible in terms of the time and place of study. This mismatch between demand and supply at the national level has given rise to the development and substantial growth of education as an export commodity and in particular to what has been termed transnational education¹⁹. In principle this means that it is not the learner but the institution that is mobile. Sometimes this occurs physically through branch or overseas campuses, more often through co-operation agreements with local providers (who offer the programme through a licensing or franchise arrangement, or act in a supporting role in distance learning programmes) and increasingly through the provision of education via the Internet²⁰ (Van der Wende, 2002a en 2002b).

Although the rapid growth in transnational education is frequently cited, there is limited systematic data available. The economic importance of higher education as an export sector can be demonstrated as follows. In the USA education is one of the five top sectors in the export of services (generating \$10 billion in 1999), education generates 4% of the UK's service export income and in Australia education is one of the top five export items (NCITE, 2000), generating \$3,7 billion excluding tuition fees (DETYA, 2001). The three countries are the world's largest education exporters.

Transnational education offerings constitute a cheaper alternative to study in a foreign country but are often more expensive than local offerings. The preparedness to pay this premium appears to be related to the perceived added value of a Western diploma on the local and international labour markets. In addition, employers are sometimes prepared to pay more for transnational programmes. It appears that purchasing power is a key component of this market: international providers compete not only with traditional educational institutions but also with new types of providers such as for-profit, virtual and corporate organisations. It is important to recognise that this market does not only operate in developing and transitional countries and regions but also within Western Europe. Importing countries are primarily Greece, Spain and Italy with the USA and the UK the major exporters (Dos Santos, 2000). North Western Europe is itself seen as an interesting potential market by institutions such as the University of Phoenix (USA) and Monash University (Australia).

The extent of the market, the level of investment needed and the expertise required to offer virtual education in particular, make it impossible for many institutions to enter the market on their own. Co-operation is sought with other higher education institutions an/or with private companies. In recent years a number of internationally operating consortia have been established of which the best known example is Universitas 21 that works in co-operation with Thompson Learning Systems Ltd.²¹

In terms of Held's definition of globalisation there is a clear transformation in the spatial organisation of social relations in these new forms of educational provision (in this case between educational institution, content and student) that results in transnational flows and networks of activity and interaction. The transformation consists of the rapidly broadening geographical scale of educational provision, and the increasing intensity (volume) and speed of transnational flows. However, transnational education is not simply about the flow and mobility of students, but about

flows of services. Education is now seen as a service provided on an international market. In contrast to transnational flows of students, national boundaries become blurred and the competencies and responsibilities of national governments are challenged in this situation, particularly when ICT plays a significant role. What powers of control or regulation do national governments have over foreign providers or over offerings distributed across the Internet, and what responsibilities do they have to domestic consumers of these products?

The home governments of transnational providers also face questions over their activities beyond national borders. Such providers often fall outside the reach of national quality assurance mechanisms²², which has highlighted the need for a supra-national approach in this area (Van Damme, 2001; Van Vught, Van der Wende & Westerheijden, 2002). Institutions also take on different forms and capacities in these activities: a publicly financed institution may operate internationally as a private organisation or company. International networks and consortia further extend the range of geographical, financial and legal possibilities and even allow institutions wishing to do so to escape national laws and regulations²³.

The changing role of the nation state: liberalisation, deregulation and privatisation

The trends described above do not imply that national boundaries and governments are no longer obstacles to transnational provision. On the contrary, providers orientated to the international market encounter all manner of problems with regard to establishment requirements, tax legislation, the recognition of awarded diplomas etc. (NCITE, 2000). This situation lies behind recent proposals made by the USA, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan concerning the further liberalisation of the international trade in educational services. Education has fallen within the ambit of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) since the Uruguay round of negotiations (1987-1994)²⁴, but remains the area where countries have made the least commitments to date²⁵. The countries mentioned are now proposing new negotiations with the goal of increasing the accessibility of national education markets to foreign providers. The most important submission, from the USA, proposes to limit this access to the higher and adult education and training sectors and to situations where there is already domestic competition – in other words where private providers already operate²⁶. Under the provisions of GATS, services "provided in the exercise of governmental authority" are excluded from international competition.

There is thus a clear plea for the further liberalisation of international trade in educational services. In the context of the existence of a global economy, as outlined by Castells, this call cannot be separated from processes of deregulation and privatisation. A process of deregulation has occurred in higher education in many western countries in the past decades whereby the influence of government has declined relative to the autonomy of institutions and the role of the market (Clark, 1983, 1998; Dill & Sporn, 1995, Goedegebuure et al, 1994). In other countries a more centrally regulated system still exists. The situation with regard to privatisation also varies considerably across different countries. In some countries such as the USA and Japan public and private sectors have co-existed for a long time, while in others the public sector dominates²⁷. Overall a growth in the market share of private providers

can be observed, linked to the growing demand for higher education that the public sector in many countries is unable to respond to, as outlined earlier²⁸. This trend is most apparent in regions such as Central and Eastern Europe, Latin America and Southeast Asia and has been supported in part by the World Bank that stimulates an increasing private contribution to the costs of education (Cohen, 2001). The relationship between the public and the private sectors and the way that this is dealt with by governments also varies enormously by country. In many countries private providers avoid government regulation partly or fully and are classified as part of the non-official higher education sector (Kokosalakis, 1999). Whether this term is always relevant depends in part on the delimitation and definition of public and private higher education. In OECD terminology this refers to whether a public authority or private entity has final control of the activities of the institution. In policy debates this is often complicated by how an institution is financed. In the Netherlands we know well that the locus of control and the source of finance need not be the same²⁹.

Given these differences in respect to deregulation and privatisation it is not unexpected that countries will react differently to proposals concerning the further liberalisation of international trade in educational services. The reasons for this go deeper than different visions on competition in the public sector and the government's role in this. They also explicitly relate to ideological conceptions about higher education as a public good (achievement and rights), or as a trading good on an international market. Different national responses are also related to how a country assesses its competitive position in terms of threats and opportunities on this market. The Dutch government that has steered higher education "at a distance", has stimulated competition in the public sector since the first "purple coalition" (1994 – 1998)³⁰ and already accepted private providers in the higher education market³¹, has responded with an open mind. In the latest policy statement on internationalisation of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science³², globalisation, higher education as a trading commodity, competition and commercialisation (including e-learning and corporate universities) are described frankly. It is suggested that this new environment will require a serious engagement with the issues raised: "Sooner or later new providers will make their way to Brussels or the Netherlands Competition Authority to complain that it is unfair competition for publicly funded institutions to operate in the commercial market" (p. 10). It is argued further that the national government will play a different role under these circumstances. It will increasingly concentrate on creating a sound framework within which autonomous institutions should operate. Related to this a shift from supply-driven to demand-driven steering and funding is being considered. Government will also need to play an increasing role on the international stage, in particular in terms of inter-governmental agreements within Europe (p. 10 and following). It is clear in this assessment that the Dutch government does not see liberalisation policies to be in conflict with deregulation and privatisation, sees opportunities for the country in this market and is therefore not defensive in its response. This is not the case in all countries, and not all actors within the Netherlands agree with this position. In general there is serious concern over loss of sovereignty over one's own system, the implications for the public sector (including funding) and the influence of foreign providers. It is also not clear what the concrete implications could be for particular countries³³, particularly when these are dependent on the commitments made by each country and the conditions they attach to these.

The Dutch example makes it clear that the role of the nation state does not so much disappear as a result of globalisation, but changes and shifts. Increasing competition leads to greater attention being paid to informing and protecting the consumer, and in doing so concern about the quality of programmes certainly does not diminish. In the Netherlands, partly as a result of international pressures, there will be a move towards accreditation that will also be able to incorporate foreign offerings. In Australia, international competition has also led to a strengthening of the quality assurance system (McBurnie, 2001).

The changing role of government is evident: it is no longer a role limited to national concerns but one where inter-governmental co-operation is of increasing significance. Globalisation is mainly having an impact on the role of governments through trade liberalisation. The extent to which governments or inter-governmental agencies are able to exert serious steering influence in this process is, in the case of higher education, also the subject of divergent opinions. Carnoy (1999) points to the increasing tension caused by globalisation, particularly in developing countries. He argues that on the one hand in the framework of trade liberalisation nation states are expected to create conditions for economic and social development, including the production of more highly educated citizens and the stimulation of knowledge production. On the other hand, globalisation increases pressure on governments to reduce their steering role and financial contribution to education. The double challenge is therefore to produce more higher education graduates with a lower governmental contribution per graduate. There is thus concern about the effects of globalisation on the position of higher education in developing countries in relation to that in western countries: "The fear is also that transnational education will be detrimental to smaller nations and languages. It will exacerbate dramatic inequalities among the world's universities, with a dominant role of the world-class universities in Western industrialised countries. Smaller and poorer countries will have little autonomy or competitive potential in the globalized world" (Altbach, 2001, p. 4.). This echoes Castells' observations on the parallel processes of development and underdevelopment associated with globalisation.

The question of the extent to which governments can act to steer international developments in the area of educational trade has a particular meaning in the European context. As indicated earlier, the European Commission has little to no internal competence in the field of education. Yet it is the body that negotiates with the WTO on behalf of EU member states on the question of trade liberalisation. In the case of education this situation is therefore an extremely delicate affair, exacerbated by the fact that national education ministries do not appear in general to exercise significant control over the agenda. This role is played by ministries of economic affairs, which in strong exporting countries therefore also exert substantial influence in the field of higher education³⁴. In this area we see once again the changing role of government.

Convergence or divergence?

It is clear from the discussion thus far that the question of whether globalisation leads to convergence or divergence is also relevant to higher education. On the one hand

there are efforts to achieve more formal resemblance between systems but on the other hand the differences in outcomes across systems appear to be increasing. Convergence as a result of globalisation can be assumed when it comes to system characteristics such as programme duration and qualification and criteria, standards and methods of quality assessment. In the framework of the Bologna process we see much activity on these fronts aimed at making European higher education more transparent and therefore more competitive on the international market. In addition the globalisation of a number of professions³⁵ is leading to the internationalisation of professional requirements which in turn leads to curriculum convergence (and in some cases uniformity). Convergence can also result from bottom-up co-operation in the field of curriculum development. Finally, particular methods of institutional management, educational organisation and teaching practice spread widely across the higher education world.

At the same time divergence as a consequence of globalisation can be expected when it comes to the outcomes of systems. The negative effects of heightened international competition can weaken the position of particular countries and institutions in relation to others through such mechanisms as brain drain. In a positive sense, institutions wishing to be successful on the international market need to distinguish themselves from others and to find their own distinctive niches.

The role of stakeholders

I indicated earlier that not all countries and stakeholders have adopted the same position as the Dutch government when it comes to globalisation in general and the liberalisation of educational markets in particular. Higher education has its own anti-globalisation movement in which the stakes (power, interests) of the different stakeholders can be clearly distinguished. The established higher education institutions see a clear threat to their protected status of little to no competition and (an often exclusive) right to governmental funding. In an international declaration they have urged governments and other actors involved in the WTO negotiations not to make any further commitments concerning (higher) education³⁶. Various trades unions of education personnel have also taken a position against further liberalisation of the higher education market out of concern of the effects this would have on their legal position and on academic freedom³⁷. Amongst higher education researchers it is sometimes argued that the worsening employment conditions (e.g. more temporary staff and less academic freedom) that have accompanied greater managerialism, accountability and privatisation can be more or less directly attributed to globalisation (Currie & Newson, 1998). Students have mobilised, amongst others at a European level, over their concerns about the subsidisation of higher education and their fear that tuition fees will be introduced or increased and that student finance will be put at risk. They argue that as higher education is a public good (and right) they reject the concept of students as consumers, seeing themselves rather as part of the academic community with a democratic right of participation in decision-making therein³⁸. These opponents of the globalisation of higher education are confronted on the one side by governments and other interest groups that strive to increase the profitability of (their) trade in education. On the side of the opponents appear to be governments and interest groups that believe higher education as a public good to be of paramount importance. An important question is, however, the extent to which these latter governments are currently able to offer adequate higher education, or put more

strongly, are able to finance on their own an expansion of higher education offerings without losing quality. The latter constitutes one of the most important pro-globalisation arguments: the export countries argue that countries that maintain a protectionist stance when not in a position to offer adequate education are denying students higher education of good quality.

Leaving aside the issue of whether and to what extent higher education can be described as a public good³⁹, behind this discussion lies the question of whether the concept of public good should be inextricably linked to the nation state as provider and financier of it and thereby exclude higher education from trade and competition⁴⁰. In a globalising world this appears to be an outdated idea. The notion of a global public good is developing (Marginson, 2001a). These are public goods that are (increasingly) important for everybody across the world and that cannot be defined, regulated and controlled purely within the boundaries of nation states. A clean environment is the most obvious example, but (higher) education might also be considered this way. On the basis of national experiences we know that competition can contribute to the accessibility and quality of public goods. But across the world we are confronted with huge inequalities in the accessibility and distribution of higher education as a result of which countries have grossly unequal competitive positions. The question is how we can better distribute higher education as a global public good through honest competition. "It is important to remember that higher education is a public good with benefits that go beyond individual beneficiaries and institutions. Indeed there is a growing recognition of the global nature of this public good, given the interconnectedness of the global community" (Ramphela, 2001).

6. Globalisation and internationalisation in higher education

I now return to the question posed earlier of whether the fact that globalisation is increasingly discussed in the context of higher education means that we are witnessing something new, and if so how this differs from internationalisation. In theoretical terms we can approach this question with the help of the concepts "interconnected" and "integrated" discussed earlier (Beerkens, 2001). In these terms internationalisation refers to the increasing interconnectedness of national education systems without the boundaries between them or the authority of national governments over these systems being brought into question. In contrast, globalisation refers to the increasing integration of flows and processes over and through boundaries that leads to a transformation in the spatial organisation of social relations⁴¹. This paper has shown that the development of transnational education, the use of ICT and international trade liberalisation have indeed changed the relations between government, institution and student. It has also demonstrated that the role of national governments has been affected, although this has not been a case of their influence disappearing but rather changing. We can then conclude that globalisation does point to a new phenomenon in higher education and that the difference with internationalisation focuses on the change in the spatial organisation of social relations in higher education and in particular on the changed role of the nation state therein. Scott (1998, 1999) also refers to this distinction when he concludes that globalisation cannot be seen simply as a higher form of internationalisation. The relationship between the two concepts is therefore not linear or cumulative but of a different order. Internationalisation is predicated on a world order dominated by nation states while globalisation is more agnostic on this point. Scott argues that the

relationship is in fact a dialectical one in the sense that "not all universities are (particularly) international, but all universities are subject to the same process of globalisation - partly as objects, victims even, of these processes, but partly as subjects, or key agents of globalisation" (1998, p. 122). Globalisation, which is characterised by increasing competition and a global division of labour, can even be seen as a rival of the old internationalisation.

From an empirical perspective, we can see that in the field of higher education a lot of thinking and quibbling has been devoted to this distinction⁴². Globalisation is first of all perceived as an external process upon which individual actors and institutions can exercise little influence (Van der Wende, 1999). Internationalisation is seen more as a steerable policy process. Globalisation is associated with international competition and internationalisation with co-operation between countries, systems, institutions and individuals. Internationalisation is therefore also seen as a response to globalisation in terms of co-operation for enhanced competitiveness, but also in the sense that internationalisation developed its own specific, internal institutionalised meaning in higher education as a reaction of institutions to the globalisation of their external environment⁴³. This institutionalisation had much to do with the fact that internationalisation is highly compatible with the goals and values of the academic world (Van der Wende, Beerkens & Teichler, 1999). Globalisation seems much less compatible, not least because of its association with competition, higher education as a tradable commodity and reduced academic freedom. At both system and institutional levels globalisation has led to tension in policy agendas between financial-economic interests and the concern for higher education as a public good (Scott, 1999, Marginson, 2001b). It is no wonder then that many higher education institutions see globalisation and particularly trade liberalisation as a threat and have issued the Joint Declaration mentioned earlier. They would prefer to stay within the realm of internationalisation that maintains the (sometimes difficult but so much) safer order of government regulation and funding of higher education. The alternative, the global market, is attractive only to extremely entrepreneurial institutions with enormous self-confidence, or institutions short of national sources of income. And perhaps most of all to those with a combination of these two factors.

To return to the question of the desirability of integration and the role and power of EU policy, one final remark about current European developments. The EU programmes for higher education and the broader Bologna process can of course be summed up as European co-operation for better global competition. Wholly consistent with the tradition of internationalisation, the boundaries between national systems and governments' competencies are not brought into question. Nevertheless, at the same time there is talk about a European higher education and research space and about joint frameworks, for example for the quality assessment of education and research. The concept of a single space does suggest the disappearance of boundaries and the ceding of competencies (integration) as has occurred in other areas of EU policy. But as indicated earlier, in the field of (higher) education there is (as yet) no suggestion that this is actually happening. Furthermore, there is the question of whether or not the concepts "space" and "market" are interchangeable. The policy rhetoric denies the existence or even the possibility of an education market in Europe and appears to have an incomplete vision of the wider international market for higher education and the position of European higher education within it. The European policy response to the globalisation of higher education has therefore not yet fully crystallised (Van Vught,

Van der Wende & Westerheijden, 2002). This is likely to be a problem in the forthcoming negotiations over GATS and may increase the room for manoeuvre for individual European countries. This places European co-operation and the concept of European co-operation for better global competition under further pressure. Whether this will result in the prospects of an eventual integration process receding further into the future, or in a greater recognition of the need for this integration, will be evident only in the years to come.

7. The implications for higher education research

In the preceding sections it was apparent that internationalisation and particularly globalisation have implications for higher education policy and the role that governments, institutions and other stakeholders play in the policy process. Changing frameworks lead to shifts in responsibilities and competencies and to a new dynamic between actors (the transformation of the spatial organisation of social relations). I will now turn finally to what this implies for research on higher education policy.

The CHEPS research programme for 2001 – 2005 and the "Institutional Change" research programme of the newly established Institute for Governance Studies (in which CHEPS staff are active) provide important lines of investigation that have generated the following clusters of questions:

1. How does the “new architecture” of higher education systems take form? Which new institutional arrangements exist between different stakeholders at the sub-national, national, and supra-national levels, and how do these develop?
2. How do these forms of multi-level governance (Sharpf, 1999) influence the modes of co-ordination of higher education systems? To what extent can we still talk of national systems (the question of de-nationalisation)?
3. Through which forms of organisational adaptation do higher education institutions respond to these institutional changes?
4. What role do networks, information and communication technology and new providers of higher education play in this process?

With respect to the first cluster of questions it is important to analyse the ways in which regional treaties and free trade agreements (as exist in the European Union and other regions) ⁴⁴ influence higher education. For example, this influence can be indirect through agreements concerning the free mobility of people and services, the recognition of professional qualifications, competition agreements and employment guidelines. But the influence can also be direct through policy, goals and actions in the field of higher education itself. It is then important to analyse what the new agreements concerning the further liberalisation of trade in educational services in the framework of WTO/GATS will mean for higher education, and how these are related to the regional agreements and treaties noted earlier⁴⁵. To gain real insight into the new institutional arrangements that result from these agreements and behaviours, and to understand the way in which these develop, it is important to clarify the role played by different stakeholders at different levels. Here we need to distinguish the roles of intergovernmental organisations, national and regional governments, organisations that represent higher education institutions or act as promoters of their interests, professional bodies, employer organisations, trade unions and student organisations and their representatives at the sub-national, national and supranational levels.

In connection with the second cluster we need to explore the following questions. How do new institutional arrangements and forms of multi-level governance influence national governments in the steering of higher education? Which competencies and responsibilities of national governments are changed, how and why? In this new context how do national governments create an equilibrium between international policy agendas and national economic, social and cultural interests linked to higher education? How do different countries react to supra-national agreements, treaties and proposals, and how do we explain the differences between them? What are the consequences of these supra-national agreements and treaties for forms of divergence and convergence at the level of systems, institutions and programmes?

Current developments surrounding quality assurance in higher education constitute an important case study for the questions flowing from the first two clusters of issues. Here we can see the (indirect) influence of multi-lateral agreements and treaties, the involvement of a range of different stakeholders at a supra-national level, and strong pressures for an international convergence of methods and standards. Yet at the same time, all of the competencies and responsibilities with respect to the quality (assurance) of higher education are (still) located with national or sub-national governments, as well as being linked to their role in the funding of higher education. Furthermore, governments see this as a sensitive subject as it goes to the heart of national sovereignty over education policy, which they do not wish to see transferred to the supra-national level. Preliminary indications from a number of countries suggest that a bottom-up middle way is being developed in the form of multi-lateral mutual recognition of national quality assurance systems. Once again the question of the role that Europe might play in a broader international context is an important one⁴⁶.

In the third and fourth clusters of questions that are concerned with the response and adaptation of higher education institutions, an interesting point of departure is to look at the role played by networks. The initiation of international inter-university consortia appears to be related to organisational strategic behaviour focussed on financial resources, markets, provisions, expertise and technology. Little is known about the internal dynamics of these consortia, their successes and the factors that have played a determining role in these.

A second set of questions concerns the role and usage of information and communication technology. What role does ICT play in the processes of internationalisation and globalisation (and vice-versa), in forms of networking, and what types of innovation does the use of ICT lead to within the higher education institution as an organisation? What does the management of such innovation entail: what combination of rules, incentives and policy has the greatest impact on existing norms and behaviour? What do these innovations imply for the interaction between academic and support staff, and how do they influence the status and the practice of the academic profession? And finally: to what extent does the increasing use of ICT in higher education lead to the de-coupling of the functions of knowledge generation and knowledge dissemination, and what consequences does this have for the university?

The theoretical approach to these questions can be built largely upon the foundations of previous work at CHEPS (and the Faculty of Public Administration and Public

Policy) and its research tradition. A line of research into the relation between the state/government and higher education has been developed from within institutional theory (Powel & DiMaggio, 1991) drawing a distinction between the regulative, normative and cognitive structures and activities that constitute institutions and give stability and meaning to social behaviour (Scott, 1995). With respect to the regulative structure and initially based on a dichotomy (Van Vught, 1989), subsequently more elaborated models of steering concepts have been developed (Olsen 1988, Gornitzka & Maassen, 2000). Amongst other enhancements, these models give greater attention to the role of the market. The influence of the supra-national level (in this case the EU) on these relationships has also been explored (Huisman, Maassen & Neave, 2001). These research lines enable further investigation of the influence of new institutional structures, themselves changed by internationalisation and globalisation, on the role and capacity of national governments in the steering of higher education systems. Normative structures, in this case dominant perceptions about higher education, also appear to be relevant to understanding and explaining the varying reactions of different countries and stakeholders to international developments and global trends.

Research has also been undertaken into the processes of differentiation and de-differentiation that lead to growing or reducing levels of diversity at the system and programme levels (Meek et al, 1996). This has drawn on a combination of theoretical perspectives including population ecology and an integration of neo-institutional and resource dependency perspectives (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). This line will be of great importance in addressing the questions concerned with the convergent and divergent tendencies of the processes of internationalisation and globalisation. It is clear from these different theoretical vantage points, as well as from empirical research, that it is essential to remain open to the possibility that these contradictory processes may operate simultaneously at different levels. For example, when analysing developments in Europe surrounding the Bologna-process this implies making a clear distinction between the system and the programme levels.

Organisational theory focuses more specifically on the strategies by which organisations adjust to changing institutional structures (Oliver, 1991) and on how innovations within higher education are implemented (Cerych & Sabatier, 1986) and institutionalised (Levine, 1980). This provides a good basis for the analysis of those questions relating to how higher education institutions respond to internationalisation and globalisation. In this area too we can draw and build upon earlier work within CHEPS.

An adequate investigation of all of the questions identified, however, will also require insights drawn from other theoretical directions. Business administration and management theories appear to offer useful contributions (Barney, 1991, Parkhe, 1993, Porter, 1985) to the understanding of networks and consortia and to the factors that determine their success or failure. Similarly, insights drawn from international (commercial and public) law will be indispensable to the analysis of the potential legal and regulatory consequences of further trade liberalisation for higher education systems.

In conclusion I would like to touch briefly on the question of what the complexity of the phenomenon of globalisation implies for research into globalisation itself. At

minimum this implies that there must be a strong inter-disciplinary orientation and a broad comparative perspective (Guillen, 2001 p. 256). CHEPS with its inter-disciplinary and international team, and its wealth of experience in international comparative research, is well placed in this respect. The challenge, however, is not simply more of the same – it lies not only in the comparison of national systems but also in the analysis of the dynamics between, above, below, and even in spite of these systems.

References

- Altbach, Ph. (2001) Higher Education and the WTO: Globalization Run Amok. In: *International Higher Education*, number 23, pp. 2-4.
- Barblan, A, S. Reichert, M. Schotte-Kmoch, U Teichler (2000). *Implementing European Policies in Higher Education Institutions*. Werkstattberichte 57, Kassel: Centre for Higher Education and Work, University of Kassel.
- Barney, J.B. (1991) Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage, in: *Journal of Management*, Vol 17, pp. 99-120
- Beck, U. (2000). The cosmopolitan perspective: sociology of the second age of modernity. In: *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. No. 51 Issue 1, pp.79-105.
- Beck, U. (2000). The cosmopolitan perspective: sociology of the second age of modernity. *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol 51 No. 1, pp. 79-105
- Beerens, H.J.J.G. (2001). *Globalization and Higher Education Research: Outset for a Conceptual Framework*. Paper presented at the CHEPS Summer School on Higher Education Research. July, 2001
- Blight, D. (1995). *International Education: Australia's Potential Demand and Supply*. IDP Education Australia, Canberra.
- Blight, D. (1997). *Partnership in International Education: Tatology or Oxymoron?* Paper presented at the International Conference on Off-shore partnerships. Penang, November 1997.
- Blumenthal, P. C. Coodwin, A. Smith & U. Teichler (Eds.) (1996). *Academic Mobility in a Changing World*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Campbell, C., & van der Wende, M. (2000). *International Initiatives and Trends in Quality Assurance for European Higher Education: Exploratory Trend Report*. Helsinki: European Network of Quality Assurance Agencies.
- Carnoy, M. (1999). *Globalisation and Educational Reform: What Planners need to know*. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Education Planning
- Carnoy, M. (2001). The role of the state in the new global economy. In: J. Muller, N. Cloete, & S. Badat (eds.). *Challenges of Globalisation. South African debates with Manuel Castells*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.
- Castells, M. (1996). *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Castells, M. (2000). Materials for an exploratory theory of the network society. In: *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol 51 No. 1, pp. 5-24.
- Cerych, L. & P. Sabatier (1986). *Great Expectations and Mixed Performances*. Stoke: Trendham Books.
- Clark, B. R.(1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities. Organizational Pathways of*
- Clark, B.R. (1983). *The higher education system. Academic organisation in cross-national perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Clark, I. (1999). *Globalization and International Relations Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, D. (2001). *The Worldwide rise of private colleges. In nation after nation, the public monopoly on higher education is over*. OECD Education Database 2000.
- Collis, B.A. (1998). Expanding Boundaries in the university: the WWW as a tool. In: M.C. van der Wende (ed.) *Virtual Mobility. New technologies and the internationalisation of higher education*. The Hague: Nuffic Papers 10.
- Currie, J. & J. Newson (Eds.) (1998). *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- De Wit, J.W.M. (2002). *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe. A Historical, Comparative, and Conceptual Analysis*. Greenwood Press.
- Department for Education, Training and Youth Australia (2001). *Overseas student statistics 2000*. Canberra.
- Dill, D. & B. Sporn (eds.) (1995). *Emerging Patterns of Social Demand and University Reform: Through a Glass Darkly*. Oxford Pergamon Press.
- Dos Santos, M. (2000). *Introduction to the Theme of Transnational Education*. Conference of the Directors General of Higher Education and the Heads of the Rectors' Conference of the European Union.
- Forrester, V. (2000). *De terreur van globalisering*. Anthème Fayard, 2000
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.
- Giddens, A. (2001). *The Great Globalization Debate*. Zellerbach Distinguished Lecture. University of California, Berkeley. 25 October 2001.
- Goedegebuure, L.C.J., F. Kaiser, P.A.M. Maassen, V.L. Meek, F.A. van Vught and E. de Weert (Eds.) (1994). *Higher education policy: an international comparative perspective* Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Gornitzka, A. & P.A.M. Maassen (2000). Hybrid Steering Approaches with Respect to Higher Education. In: *Higher Education Policy*. 12(1), pp. 267-285.
- Guillen, M.F. (2001). Is Globalization Civilizing, Destructive or Feeble? A Critique of Five Key Debates in the Social Science Literature. In: *Annual Review of Sociology*, No. 27, pp. 235-260.
- Haug, G. & Ch. Tauch (2001). *Trends in learning structures in higher education II*. Follow-up report prepared for the Salamanca and Prague Conferences of March/May 2001. National Board of Education, Finland.
- Held, D. & A. McGrew (2000). *The Global Transformations Reader. An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Held, D., A. McGrew, D. Goldblatt, J. Perraton (1999). *Global Transformations*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hertz, N. (2002). *De stille overname. De globalisering en het einde van de democratie*. Contact.
- Hirst, P. & G. Thompson (1996). *Globalisation in Question*. London: Polity Press
- Huisman, J. P. Maassen & G. Neave (Eds.) (2001). *Higher Education and the Nation State. The International Dimension of Higher Education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Klein, N. (2000). *No Logo*. Flamingo.
- Knight, J. (2002). *Trade in Higher Education Services, The Implications of GATS*. The Observatory of Borderless Higher Education Report. [www.obhe.ac.uk].

- Knight J, & H. de Wit (1995). Strategies for internationalisation of higher education: historical and conceptual perspectives. In: H. de Wit (Ed.) *Strategies for internationalisation of higher education. A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europa and the United States of America*. Amsterdam: EAIE.
- Kokosalakis, N. (Ed.) (1999). *Non-Official Higher Education in the European Union*. Library of Social Science & Social Policy Guthenberg.
- Kol, J. (2001). Wat is globalisering en tot hoe ver is het wenselijk? In: *Economisch Statistische Berichten*, 26-10-2001, pp. 816-819.
- Levine, A. (1980). *Why Innovations Fail. The Institutionalisation and Termination of Innovation in Higher Education*. Albany, State University of New York Press.
- Marginson, S. (2000). Rethinking academic work in the global era. In: *Journal of higher education policy and management*. Vol. 22, No. 1.
- Marginson, S. (2001a). Presentation at the Research Conference on *Herding Cats, Moving Cemeteries, and Hauling Academic Trunks: Managing Change in Higher Education*. University of California, Los Angeles, Department of Political Science. 18 October 2001.
- Marginson, S. (2001b). *The Global Market in Foreign Higher Education: The Case of Australia*. Paper presented at the 26th Annual Conference of the Association for Studies in Higher Education. November 2001, Richmond, Virginia.
- Mazarr, M.J. (1999). *Global Trends 2005*. Palgrave, 1999.
- McBurnie, G. (2001). Globalization: A New Paradigm for Higher Education Policy. In: *Higher Education in Europe*, Vol. XXVI, No. 1, pp. 11-26
- Meek, L., L.Goedegebuure, O. Kivinen & Risto Rinne (eds) (1996). *The Mockers and Mocked: Comparative Perspectives on Differentiation, Convergence and Diversity in Higher Education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Meyer, J.W. & M.T. Hannan (eds.) (1979). *National Development and the World System: Educational, Economic and Political Change, 1950-1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- National Committee for International Trade in Education (2000). *Barriers to trade in education*. <http://www.cqaie.org/ncite.htm>
- National Committee for International Trade in Education (2000). *Mission statement of the National Committee for International Trade in Education*. [www.tradeineducation.org]
- Neave, G. (2001). The European Dimension in Higher Education: An Excursion into the Modern Use of Historical Analogues. In: J. Huisman, P. Maassen & G. Neave (Eds.) (2001). *Higher Education and the Nation State. The International Dimension of Higher Education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Ohmae, K. (1990). *The Borderless World*. New York: Harper Business
- Ohmae, K. (1995). *The End of the Nation State*. New York: Free Press.
- Oliver, R. (1991). Strategic Responses to Institutional Processes. In: *Academy of Management Review*. 16(1), pp. 145-179.
- Olson, J.P. (1988). Administrative reform and theories of organisations. In: C. Campbell & B.G. Peters (Eds.) *Organizing Governance, Governing Organizations*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, pp. 233-254
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (2001b). *Trade in Educational Services: Trends and Emerging Issues*. Working Paper. Paris: OECD/CERI.
- Parkhe, A. (1993) Partner nationality and structure-performance in strategic alliances, in: *Organization Science*, Vol 4, No.2, pp. 301-324.

- Peace Lenn, M & J. Reason Moll (2000). *The Globalization of the Professions in the United States and Canada: A Survey and Analysis*. The Center for Quality Assurance in International Education.
- Pfeffer, J. & G.R. Salancik (1978). *The External Control of Organizations, A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Porter, M. (1985) *Competitive Advantage*. New York: Free Press.
- Powell, W.W. and P.J. DiMaggio (eds. 1991), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ramphele, M. (2001). Opening Plenary of the conference: *Privileges Lost, Responsibilities Regained: Reconstructing Higher Education*. Columbia University Teachers College, New York, 14 June 2001.
- Scott, P. (1999). Globalisation and the University. In: *European Universities, World Partners*. CRE Action No 115. Geneva: CRE.
- Scott, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The globalization of higher education*. Buckingham / Philadelphia, PA: Society for Research into Higher Education / Open University Press.
- Scott, W.R., (1995), *Institutions and Organisations*, Thousand, Oaks: Sage
- Sharpf, F.W. (1999). *Governing in Europe: effective and democratic?* Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Strange, S. (1996). *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Teichler, U. (1999) Internationalisation as a Challenge for Higher Education in Europe. In: *Tertiary Education and Management*. Vol. 5, No. 1. *Transformation*. IAU Press. Issue in Higher Education. IAU Press / Pergamon.
- Trow, M. (1972). The expansion and transformation of higher education. In: *The International Review of Education*. Vol 18, No. 1. Pp. 61-84.
- Van Damme, D. (2001). *Higher Education in the Age of Globalisation: The need for a new regulatory framework for recognition, quality assurance and accreditation*. Introductory paper for the UNESCO Expert Meeting, Paris, 10-11 September 2001.
- Van Vught, F., (ed. 1989), *Governmental Strategies and Innovation in Higher Education*, Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London.
- Vught, van F. A, M.C. van der Wende & D.F. Westerheijden (forthcoming). Globalisation and Internationalisation. Policy Agendas Compared. In: *Higher Education in a Globalizing World. International Trends and Mutual Observations*. University of Kassel / Consortium of Higher Education Researchers.
- Wende, M.C. van der (1997). Missing Links. The Relationship between National Policies for Internationalisation and those for Higher Education in General . In: T. Kalvermark, & M.C. van der Wende (Eds.) (1997). *National Policies for Internationalisation of Higher Education in Europe*. Stockholm: National Agency for Higher Education.
- Wende, M.C. van der (1999). The Central Role of Universities in a Global World, Final Report of the 52nd CRE Bi-annual Conference. In: *European Universities, World Partners*. CRE Action No 115. Geneva: CRE.
- Wende, M.C. van der (2001a). Internationalisation Policies: About New Trends and Contrasting Paradigms. *Higher Education Policy*, Vol. 14, Issue 3, pp. 249-259.

- Wende, M.C. van der (2001b). The International Dimension in National Higher Education Policies: What Has Changed in Europe over the Last Five Years? In: *European Journal of Education*, Vol 36, No. 4, pp. 431- 441.
- Wende, M.C. van der (2002a). *The Role of US Higher Education in the Global E-learning Market*. University of Berkeley: Centre for Studies in Higher Education. Policy Papers Series (CSHE.1.02)
- Wende, M.C. van der (2002b). The possibilities and Limits of Virtual Mobility in International Cooperation. In: Proceedings of the SIU/ACA Conference "*The Virtual Challenge to International Cooperation in Higher Education*". Brussels: ACA.
- Wende, M.C. van der, & D.F. Westerheijden, D. F. (2001). International aspects of quality assurance with a special focus on European higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(3), 233-245.
- Wende, M.C. van der, H.J.J.G. Beerkens & U. Teichler (1999). Internationalisation as a cause for innovation in higher education: a comparison of European and regional cooperation programmes . In: *In the Eye of the Storm. Institutional Change in Higher Education* (pp. 65-92). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- West, R. (1997). *Review of Higher Education Financing an Policy*. (Report of the West Review). Canberra: Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.
- World Bank (2000). *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise*. Washington D.C.

¹ Higher education was an opportunity available only to the elite until far into the previous century. Participation rates of up to 15% of the relevant age group are characterised as *elite higher education*, up to 50% as *mass higher education* and above 50% as *universal higher education*. The transition from *elite* to *mass higher education* in most western countries took place since the 1950s (Trow, 1972).

² Such as the International Institute for Education Planning (UNESCO), the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (OECD), and EURYDICE (European Commission).

³ The Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies was established in 1984 under its Dutch name *Centrum voor Studies naar het Hoger Onderwijs Beleid (CSHOB)*.

⁴ In most countries this occurred in the second half of the 1980s. An exception was Sweden, where this happened in the 1970s.

⁵ An OECD education review of the Netherlands formed the basis for the first policy paper on internationalisation of higher education and research, issued in 1988 by Minister Deetman.

⁶ Exceptions are agreements relating to the recognition of particular professional qualifications.

⁷ This category includes the Institute for Social Studies (ISS) in The Hague and the International Institute for Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation (ITC) in Enschede. Recently a policy has been accepted that aims to increase co-operation between these institutes and Dutch universities.

⁸ These objectives are central themes in the Dutch policy document "Widening Horizons: Internationalisation of Education". Ministry of Education and Science, 1991. They were also an important aim of the SOCRATES programme.

⁹ This process also occurred at the levels of primary, secondary and general vocational education but these developments are beyond the scope of this paper.

¹⁰ The most frequently cited economic indicators for this are (1) the relationship between world trade and world production (global GDP): the former has grown faster than the latter since 1974 which indicates a further integration of the world's economy, (2) direct foreign investment that has shown strong if irregular growth over the past twenty years, and (3) trade in foreign currency that has grown 10 times as fast as global GDP between 1979 and 1997 (Castells, 2000, Kol, 2001, Guillen, 2001, Mazarr, 1999). For the indicator labour (migration) such a trend is not perceptible for that matter. Labour markets in wealthy countries were more integrated a century ago than they are today. There is however a clear increase in the international division of labour. Labour intensive sectors are transferred to low-wage economies, capital intensive sectors are found in middle-income countries and knowledge intensive sectors are located in wealthy countries (Kol, 2001). Beck (2000, p. 93) points to this tendency as "*not the people but the workplaces move*" and as "*transnational job sharing between rich and poor countries*".

¹¹ The period between 1870 and 1914 was described as (particularly for Europe), and shown to be, the "golden age of globalisation". In Europe international trade grew faster than national production and there was a rapid increase in labour migration and the flow of international capital (Mazarr, 1999, Held & Mc Grew, 2000, Guillen, 2001).

¹² In terms of the economic indicators mentioned earlier (see note 10) it is often noted that when these are analysed in more detail it can be seen that we are dealing more (or simultaneously) with the phenomenon of regional integration than actual worldwide economic integration (Mazarr, 1999). Castells (2000) refers in this respect to a regionalised global economy.

¹³ Guillen (2001, 240-244) argues in a review article that the balance of scientific opinion is shifting towards the position that globalisation is a real phenomenon, although he is less clear than Giddens on whether it is a new phenomenon.

¹⁴ The WTO meeting in Seattle in 1999 was seriously disrupted by heavy protest action from anti-globalisation activists.

¹⁵ Beck points in this regard to a dangerous confusion where the world is on the one hand seen as a patchwork (or sum) of (sovereign) nation states yet on the other hand as a world society that is simultaneously individualised and globalised. In both cases there is reference to conscious aspects of globality and a form of world power. However, globalisation currently influences not just the interconnectedness of states but also their internal quality of political and economic life as the congruence between state and society is severed. Economic and social activities, work and life no longer take place within the confines of the nation state (2000, 85-88).

¹⁶ The difference in *per capita* income between wealthy and poor countries increased five-fold between 1870 and 1990 and in the last two decades income inequality within countries has increased (Guillen, p. 247). Giddens (2001) adds the qualification that indicators other than just income must be considered. He argues that women's rights, diet and health are important and that in these respects the position of a number of the world's regions has improved over the last 30 years.

¹⁷ The anti-globalisation movement is difficult to characterise as it is composed of various sub-movements. Important authors such as Klein (2000), Forrester (2000) and Hertz (2002) criticise particularly the role and power of multinationals, branding and mass-marketing; the role of international organisations such as the WTO, World Bank and IMF; and the threat these developments pose to democracy.

¹⁸ The number of higher education students doubled from 40 million in 1975 to 80 million in 1995 (World Bank, 2000) and is expected to reach 150 million in 2025 (West, 1997). This growth will occur primarily in Asia where a growth of 50 million students is anticipated between 1995 and 2020 (Blight, 1997). A further consequence is that the number of international students is predicted to increase from ± 1,8 million in 2000, to 2,8 million in 2010 and 4,8 million in 2025 (Blight, 1995).

¹⁹ Transnational education: educational activities where the student is in another (host) country to that where the degree awarding educational institution is established.

²⁰ This is also referred to as e-learning, on-line education or virtual higher education.

²¹ For an extended discussion of this see: CVPC (2000). *The Business of Borderless Education*. London: CVCP, HEFCE.

²² UNESCO, in co-operation with the Council of Europe, has developed a Code of Good Practice concerning transnational education, but much remains unclear in this field. Quality and quality assurance in transnational education is one of the major concerns of governments and is frequently raised in OECD discussions. In the literature in general regulation, quality assurance and diploma recognition are the most cited problems (for more information see Campbell & Van der Wende 2000 and Van der Wende & Westerheijden 2001).

²³ A good example of this is the so-called "U-turn construction" whereby Dutch HBO institutions offered Masters degrees on the Dutch market in co-operation with UK universities. (This is now less significant in the context of the introduction of the bachelor-master degree structure in the Netherlands).

²⁴ GATS distinguishes between primary, secondary, higher, adult and "other" education. The following four forms of trade in services apply: mode 1: *cross border supply* (e.g. e-learning), mode 2: *consumption abroad* (study abroad), mode 3: *commercial presence* (e.g. branch campuses) and mode 4: *presence of natural persons* (e.g. guest lecturers). (OECD, 2001). Available data on international trade in education is almost exclusively based on mode 2 (flows of international students) and is furthermore limited to higher education. At the same time it is acknowledged that growth is also taking place with regard to mode 1 (and 3). (See also Knight, 2002.)

²⁵ To date only 38 countries have committed themselves to trade in a minimum of one education sector (see <http://www.wto.org>).

-
- ²⁶ See WTO (2000). *Communication from the United States* (S/CSS/W/23).
- ²⁷ Student participation in public and private higher education (1998): USA 68,9% - 31,1%, Japan 26,1% - 73,9%, France 91% - 9% and Germany 100% - 0% (OECD Education Database, 2000).
- ²⁸ See also *The Universal Impact of Competition and Globalization in Higher Education*. The Futures Project. Policy for Higher Education in a Changing World, 2000.
- ²⁹ In terms of the "freedom of education" (art. 23 of the Dutch constitution) educational institutions with religious foundations are eligible for government subsidies. On the basis of their independent governing structures they can in legal terms be regarded as private institutions.
- ³⁰ As part of the restructuring process "Marketization, Deregulation and Quality of Regulation".
- ³¹ The so-called designated and recognised individual educational institutions. (see www.paepon.nl)
- ³² "Education for World Citizens". Policy letter Internationalisation. December 2001.
- ³³ Further analysis of trade in services from the perspective of international trade law is needed with a specific application to (higher) education. A CHEPS PhD research project is underway in this area.
- ³⁴ In the USA this role is played by the *US Department for Commerce*, the *US International Trade Committee* and the *National Committee for International Trade in Education*, in Australia by the *Industry Commission* and in the UK by the *Department of Trade and Industry*.
- ³⁵ Such as for example accountants, engineers, etc. The globalisation of these professions is also taking place within the framework of GATS (and various regional trade agreements), which includes the free practice of professions – in other words, the provision of professional services in other countries (Peace Lenn & Moll, 2000).
- ³⁶ *Joint declaration on higher education and the WTO's General Agreement on Trade in Services*. EUA (European University Association), AUCC (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada), ACE (American Council on Education) and CHEA (Council for Higher Education Accreditation - USA), September 2001 (see: www.unige.ch/eua).
- ³⁷ See for example the document "*The WTO and the Millennium Round: What is at Stake for Public Education*" from PSI (International Federation of Public Sector Trade Unions) and EI (International Federation of Workers in Education).
- ³⁸ See *Joint Declaration* EUA-ESIB (6-3-2002) at www.esib.org.
- ³⁹ From an economic perspective this is hard to defend as higher education does not meet the conditions that (a) nobody can be excluded and (b) that consumption of the service does not lead to reduced chances of others consuming it. It is also becoming increasingly clear that the private benefit of (particularly) post-graduate programmes is often greater than their public benefit. This is not to suggest that higher education should not be a public responsibility and/or should be thrown open to international trade and competition without further thought.
- ⁴⁰ See F. Newman & L. Couturier (2002). *Trading Public Good in the Higher Education Market*. The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education.
- ⁴¹ This goes further than *interconnectedness*, as not only the relations between nation states are influenced. Globalisation influences the internal quality of social and political life as territoriality, collectivity and borders are affected. (Beck, 2000).
- ⁴² Although it cannot be denied that terms are used differently in different parts of the world. See for example Marginson (2000) who talks about "*the university as a global institution*".

⁴³ The definition of Kälvermark & Van der Wende mentioned earlier refers to this (see section 2).

⁴⁴ For example: the Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation Forum (APEC), the Common Market of the Southern Cone (MERCOSUR) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC).

⁴⁵ See also: Mallea, J. *et al* (2001). *Globalization, Trade Liberalization and Higher Education: Research Areas and Questions*. Report of a seminar organised by the University of Manitoba, Canada, and sponsored by the Ford Foundation.

⁴⁶ Some countries including the Netherlands are not waiting for this to happen and have made a start on the so-called "*Joint Quality Initiative*" [see: <http://www.jointquality.org/>].