

Other Examples

Other countries offer alternatives to American thinking. In Western Europe, tuition remains low, or in some cases entirely free. There is still a commitment to the public good argument. The European experience shows that modern postindustrial societies can support public higher education systems and provide access to growing numbers of students. In Australia, where there has been a U.S.-style shift to the private good idea, the funding system is based on a concept of a tax on the earnings of university graduates—degree holders pay back the cost of their higher education, over time, based on their

incomes. There is less of an immediate burden on individuals and a greater degree of equity. These examples show that there are other ways to think about financing large higher education systems.

The Logic of the System

The unaffordability of public higher education that the Lumina Foundation highlights is no surprise. Indeed, it is a logical and inevitable result of the changes in public policy of the recent past. To make higher education more affordable will require another philosophical and ideological change—one that is unlikely to occur in today's political and economic climate. ■

Perspectives on Internationalizing Higher Education

Philip G. Altbach

Philip G. Altbach is J. Donald Monan, S.J. professor of higher education and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College.

Internationalization is a major trend in higher education. It is also a worldwide phenomenon. And it is widely misunderstood. The aim of this article is to identify current themes in internationalization and to point to some of the new sources that will provide useful, albeit provocative, perspectives and analyses. It discusses the books and documents listed at the end.

The elements of globalization in higher education are widespread and multifaceted. They include flows of students across borders: it is estimated that more than 1.6 million students now study outside of their home countries, with more than 547,000 studying in the United States. International branch and off-shore campuses now dot the landscape, especially in developing and middle-income countries. In American colleges and universities, programs aimed at providing an international perspective and cross-cultural skills to American students are increasingly popular. These represent just a few dimensions of this growing trend. At the same time, in the United States at least, there is much more rhetoric than action concerning the internationalization of higher education.

A conceptual understanding of globalization and internationalization is needed to make sense of the varied and complex ways they are affecting higher education in the United States and worldwide. In broad terms, *globalization* refers to trends in higher education that have cross-national implications. These include mass higher education; a global marketplace for students, faculty, and highly educated personnel; and the global reach of the

new Internet-based technologies, among others. *Internationalization* refers to the specific policies and initiatives of countries and individual academic institutions or systems to deal with global trends. Examples of internationalization include policies relating to recruitment of foreign students, collaboration with academic institutions or systems in other countries, and the establishment of branch campuses abroad.

Deep inequalities undergird many of the current trends in globalization and internationalization in higher education, and they too need to be understood as part of the picture. A few countries dominate global scientific systems, the new technologies are owned primarily by multinational corporations or academic institutions in the major Western industrialized nations, and the domination of English creates advantages for the countries that use English as the medium of instruction and research. All this means that the developing countries find themselves dependent on the major academic superpowers.

Two works provide comparative global perspectives in international education that are insightful, sensitive and thought-provoking: Hans de Wit's *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe* (2002) and Peter Scott's edited volume, *The Globalization of Higher Education* (1998). De Wit, who until recently was vice president for international relations at the University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands, provides a broad historical and contemporary analysis of internationalization trends in the United States and Europe. While he argues that there have always been international elements in higher education, dating back to the medieval roots of the university, internationalization has not been the primary goal of academe. Internationalization, he argues, has had varied motivations over time: Cold War politics stimulated many of the American international initiatives in the post-World War II era—from the rise of area studies to the National Defense Education Act. In Europe, the

major emphasis on internationalization came with the advent of the European Union and the recognized need to provide a higher education system that would not only promote mobility from country to country, but also build a sense of European consciousness among students.

De Wit and Scott argue that the imperatives of the market are now driving internationalization trends worldwide. Universities and academic systems seek to make themselves attractive to overseas students and to build links with universities in other countries to enhance their global reach. This often means teaching in English in addition to the national language, developing the means to market higher education programs effectively, treating intellectual property as a commodity, and adopting strategies of profit-driven corporations.

The scope of internationalization discussed in these books is broad-ranging. One area that has grown significantly is transnational higher education. Examples include offshore and branch campuses in other countries and collaborative degree programs with universities and business enterprises abroad. Distance learning technologies are often used to deliver part or all of the educational program.

Australia and Britain have been especially active in establishing transnational programs. More than 140,000 international students were involved in academic programs under the auspices of British universities elsewhere in the world. The United States has come relatively late to transnational education, although initiatives by, for example, the University of Chicago, the University of Pennsylvania, and Temple University to partner with business schools overseas or to develop their own offshore programs are indications of a growing trend. Other American for-profit institutions and organizations are also developing overseas partnerships and programs, including the purchase of overseas campuses by Sylvan Learning Systems.

Scott's edited volume provides discussion of international trends primarily in Europe, but also in South Africa and in a comparative context. Several chapters discuss Britain's current efforts to internationalize by increasing the number of overseas students in U.K. universities, developing relationships with foreign institutions, and offering British degrees offshore.

The voices discussing internationalization are largely Western. One exception that offers a perspective on how developing countries think about these issues is *Internationalization of Indian Higher Education (2001)*, edited by K. B. Powar. This book focuses on India but is also relevant to other developing countries and to the larger conversation about internationalization. India has a large academic system, enrolling more than 5.6 million students. It ranks third among countries sending students to the United States, with more than 42,000 students studying

abroad. India also receives more than 10,000 students from abroad, mainly from other developing countries.

A long-standing concern for India has been its "brain drain." The majority of Indian students who study in the United States, for example, do not return home. India is eager to make its own universities more attractive for foreign students. As M. Anandkrishnan notes, India is concerned about the more than 200 foreign academic programs, enrolling 30,000 students, now operating in India. With many of its own academic institutions using English as the main language of instruction and with a large distance education university (the Indira Gandhi National Open University), India is in a unique position among developing countries to be a significant participant in international higher education. Powar's book offers us an in-depth case study of the challenges and opportunities developing countries face as they pursue internationalization.

The voices discussing internationalization are largely Western.

Two important volumes trace the flows of students, patterns of foreign study, and new initiatives in two key countries, the United States and Britain. *Open Doors: Report on International Educational Exchange*, is published annually by the Institute of International Education (IIE). The IIE has been collecting data on international exchanges for 30 years, and its analyses provide important insights into trends and patterns. *Student Mobility on the Map: Tertiary Education Interchange in the Commonwealth on the Threshold of the 21st Century*, is not an annual publication but rather a single survey of patterns of global student mobility, with an emphasis on the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth.

International students are now a significant factor in U.S. higher education. *Open Doors* reports that more than a half million foreign students spend more than \$11 billion on tuition and living expenses and more than two-thirds of foreign students receive most of the funding for their education from personal and family resources. Relatively few receive scholarships or other support from American institutions or agencies. This pattern of self-funding is also the case in Britain, where, as *Student Mobility* points out, about 60 percent pay for the bulk of their studies. The impact of international students on American higher education is varied. While they constitute 2.7 percent of undergraduates, foreign students account for 12 percent of graduate enrollments. Foreign students are concentrated in a relatively small number of U.S. colleges and universities.

The flows of students overseas move largely from the developing countries to the industrialized nations. Just 15 percent of foreign students in the United States come from Europe. The large majority come from developing countries—55 percent from Asia (although Japan ranks number three). China has more than 10 percent of the total number of international students in the United States. There has been considerable stability in these patterns over time for the United States. In Europe, the situation has changed. As the *Student Mobility* study points out, there has been considerable growth in intra-European mobility in such European Union programs as ERASMUS and SOCRATES. De Wit discusses these programs and points out that they are central to the EU's efforts to build a sense of European unity and encourage integration in education and in the labor market. Recently, the EU has pledged to harmonize degree structures and programs so that it will be easier for European students to transfer from one university to another, as is common in the United States.

The three elements of this tectonic shift can be summarized as public good vs. private good, high tuition and high aid, and send the masses to the community colleges.

Both *Open Doors* and *Student Mobility* provide important information about the patterns of international study. While the United States retains its position as the major host country for international students, it is losing its dominance. As both *Student Mobility* and Scott's book show, European and Commonwealth countries have clear policy goals to enhance internationalization and improve their competitive position as destinations for students and as sponsors of international degree programs. The United States has no such policy and no national commitment to internationalization.

Despite America's lack of a coherent internationalization policy, there is substantial support, on campus and off, for international programs in higher education and for study abroad. Two useful studies, funded by the Ford Foundation and undertaken by the American Council on Education (ACE), examine patterns of internationalization in U.S. higher education, and attitudes about international issues and campus-based international programs among high school students and the general public. These studies are reported by Fred Hayward and Laura Siaya in *Public Experience, Attitudes, and Knowledge: A Report of Two National Surveys About International Education* (2000). These studies paint a picture that is surprisingly positive concerning

internationalization strategies for academe, and reflect a considerable degree of international experience among Americans. Fifty-five percent of Americans reported that they had traveled abroad (35 percent of these to Europe with the largest number to Canada or Mexico). Three-quarters of college graduates reported foreign travel. Seventeen percent reported fluency in another language, and 98 percent of the high school students polled reported that they had studied a foreign language in primary or secondary school. The public, as reflected in the ACE survey, is very supportive of foreign language instruction in higher education, and even more strongly favors courses that focus on international issues.

Globalization and internationalization are now central issues for higher education worldwide. The resources discussed here provide us with a map to navigate the trends in international higher education and the complex relations between academe and society, nationally and globally. These books deal with key areas such as foreign student policies, enrollment patterns in the United States and elsewhere, how the American public thinks about internationalization, how American higher education is responding, and finally, approaches to campus internationalization. American higher education has a long way to go to come to grips with the internationalization imperatives of the new millennium. These resources will help us begin to think about the challenges.

Publications discussed in this article:

Todd M. Davis. (2002). *Open Doors: Report on International Educational Exchange, 2001*. New York: Institute of International Education. 95 pp. \$42. (www.opendoorsweb.org)

Hans de Wit. (2002). *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe: A Historical, Comparative, and Conceptual Analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishers. 270 pp. \$74.95.

Fred M. Hayward. (2000). *Preliminary Status Report 2000: Internationalization of U.S. Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education. 38 pp. \$15.00.

Fred M. Hayward and Laura M. Siaya. (2001). *Public Experience, Attitudes, and Knowledge: A Report on Two National Surveys about International Education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education. 63 pp. \$ 20.00.

K. B. Powar, ed., *Internationalization of Indian Higher Education*. (2001). New Delhi: Association of Indian Universities. 200 pp. \$30, Rs. 350.

Peter Scott, ed. (1998). *The Globalization of Higher Education*. Buckingham, U.K.: Open University Press and the Society for Research Into Higher Education. 134 pp. £19.95.

Student Mobility on the Map: Tertiary Education Interchange in the Commonwealth on the Threshold of the 21st Century. (2000). London: UKCOSA: The Council for International Education, 2000. 86 pp. £20. (<www.ukcosa.org.uk>)

A longer version of this article appears in *Change Magazine*. ■