

Knight, J. (2017). The International University: Models and Muddles in Barnett, R., and M. Peters (eds) *The Idea of the University-Volume 2. Contemporary Perspectives*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing p99-119

Internationalization of Higher Education – Models and Muddles

Jane Knight
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto

Introduction

It is impossible to reflect on the ‘idea of a university’ without looking at the international imperatives and dimensions of higher education. Universities have been active internationally for centuries through academic collaboration and the mobility of scholars and knowledge around the world. The fact, that ‘universe’ is the root concept for university is clear evidence of its internationality. But the role, priorities and strategies of universities have twisted and turned over the years in response to the environment in which they operate.

There remains little doubt that globalization, interpreted to mean the worldwide movement of ideas, people, economies, trade, values, services, technology, has had a profound impact on higher education. More importantly, the internationalization of universities has itself substantially changed over the last three decades in response to, or as an agent of, the forces and opportunities of globalization. For example, the bifurcation of internationalization into two interdependent pillars: ‘at home’ and ‘abroad’ is evidence of this change. Academic mobility has moved from student and scholar mobility to program and policy mobility. Crossborder education has gradually shifted from a development cooperation approach to a commercial competitive orientation. The international dimension of the curriculum has progressed from an area studies and foreign language approach to the integration of international, global, intercultural, and comparative perspectives into the teaching/learning process and program content. New information and communication technologies have introduced innovations in distance and online learning including the recent introduction of worldwide massive open online courses (MOOCs). Universities are establishing branch campuses in other countries, academic cities and hubs are being established and new independent universities are being co-founded by international partners. As the 21st century progresses, the internationalization of higher education is becoming increasingly important and at the same time, more complex (Altbach & Knight, 2007) .

Recent developments such as increased privatization and commercialization of higher education, the knowledge economy, for-profit education providers, new quality assurance and accreditation regulations, global higher education ranking systems, international research networks, and increased emphasis on learning outcomes and skill development have all influenced how the tertiary sector has interpreted and promoted the international dimension of higher education. There have been multiple benefits of internationalization, some risks, and, as internationalization matures, many unintended consequences as well. The purpose of this chapter is to explore the contemporary phenomenon of higher education internationalization in an applied sense, examine different models of the so-called ‘international university’, and identify critical trends and consequences.

The chapter is divided into three parts. The first part analyses the meaning of higher education internationalization, changing rationales, and new developments related to internationalization on campus and abroad. The second part focuses on the current interpretation- some say confusion- of what constitutes an international university by looking at three models or generations of international higher education institutions. The final part returns to the broader issues of higher education internationalization and examines the benefits, risk, and unintended consequences. Important to note is that any examination of higher education internationalization needs to take into account the differences among countries and regions of the world recognizing that priorities, rationales, approaches, risks and benefits differ between east and west, north and south, sending and receiving, developed and developing countries and their higher education institutions.

Internationalization- A complex and changing process

Internationalization is a term that is being used more and more to discuss the international dimension of higher education and, more widely, tertiary education. Because it means different things to different people, it is used in a myriad of ways. Most often it is described in terms of international activities such as academic mobility for students, researchers, and teachers; international linkages, partnerships, and projects; new international academic programs and research initiatives. For others it means delivering education to other countries using a variety of face-to-face and distance techniques and such new types of arrangements such branch campuses or twinning and franchise programs. To many, it means including an international, intercultural, and/or global dimension in the curriculum and teaching learning process. Still others see international development projects or, conversely, commercial crossborder education as internationalization. And others focus on the international makeup of the student, teacher and scholar population and the development of a multi-ethnic or international culture on campus. Finally, it is also being used to describe regional education hubs, zones, hotspots, education cities, knowledge villages.

Clearly the internationalization of higher education is interpreted and used to describe a vast array of issues, strategies, and new developments around the world. Yet, there is concern that internationalization is becoming a catch-all concept for anything that is related to international dimension of higher education. Perhaps the elasticity of the concept may have stretched too far when internationalization is described as a university's ranking in international league tables. The current obsession by higher education institutions around the world about their global standing and brand is a sign of the times. Definitely, there is an appetite for international and regional rankings of institutions, but one needs to seriously question whether this is part of the internationalization process or part of a university's international marketing and public relations campaign.

It is revealing to see how the terminology used to describe international dimension of higher education has evolved over the past fifty or more years. Table 1 illustrates how vocabulary reflects the priorities and trends over the years. Who would have guessed that in the 1960's when the emphasis was on scholarships for foreign students, international development projects and area studies that we would be discussing branding, crossborder education, global citizenship, international rankings, franchising, and education visa factories today. International education has been a much used term throughout the years and still is a preferred term in many countries, but the processes of internationalization, globalization, regionalization, and now planetization, are actively debated concepts and central to promoting and sustaining the international dimension of higher education (Knight 2012).

Table 1: Evolution of International Education Terminology

<i>Recent terms Last 15 years</i>	<i>New Terms Last 25 years</i>	<i>Existing Terms Last 35 years</i>	<i>Traditional Terms Last 50 years</i>
<i>Generic Terms</i>			
-regionalization -planetization -glocalization - global citizenship -education hubs --edu-glomerates -global rankings -academic cities -int co-founded university	-globalization -borderless education -crossborder education -transnational education -virtual education -internationalization 'abroad' -internationalization 'at home'	-internationalization -multi-cultural education -inter-cultural education -global education -distance education -offshore or overseas education	-international education -international development cooperation -comparative education -correspondence education
<i>Specific Elements</i>			
- MOOCs	-education providers -corporate universities	-international students -study abroad	-foreign students -student exchange

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - international competencies - degree mills - visa factories - joint, double, multiple degrees - branding, status-building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - liberalization of educational Services - networks - virtual universities - branch campus - twinning and franchise programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - institution agreements - partnership projects - area studies - bi-national cooperation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - development projects - cultural agreements - language study
--	--	---	---

Author updated 2015

Internationalization- A working definition

The purpose in trying to develop a clear and comprehensive definition of internationalization is to help clarify the current confusion and misunderstanding of what it means or involves. It is appropriate that there will never be one universal definition but the challenging part of developing a definition is the need for it to be generic enough to apply to many different countries, cultures, and education systems.

In the past three decades various definitions of internationalization have been proposed (Arum and van de Water 1992, Van der Wende 1997, de Wit 2002, Hudzik 2011) but their universal application has been severely curtailed by the inclusion of specific rationales, actors, strategies, and outcomes embedded in the description. It is contrary to the spirit of internationalism to have a definition biased toward a particular country or cultural perspective or activity. Recent debates about whether internationalization is a ‘western’ or ‘eastern’ or ‘northern’ construct reflects the ongoing concern that internationalization is interpreted as westernization, Americanization, Europeanization, or modernization. (Dzulkifli 2010, Odin and Mancias 2004) These debates often focus on the driving rationales and the implementation strategies which reflect national/cultural norms. That is precisely why a definition of internationalization of higher education needs to be neutral and void of motivations, benefits, activities, results as these vary enormously across nations, and from institution to institution. The working definition proposed for this chapter is the following. Internationalization at the national/sector/ institutional levels is defined as:

‘the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions, or delivery of post-secondary education.’ (Knight 2004, p11)

This is intentionally a neutral definition of internationalization. Many would argue that the process of internationalization should be described in terms of rationales, strategies, or outcomes such as promoting cooperation and solidarity among nations, improving quality and relevance of higher education, developing international understanding and

intercultural competences in students, or contributing to the advancement of research. While these are noble intentions and internationalization can contribute to these goals, a definition needs to be objective enough that it can be used to describe a phenomenon which is in fact, universal, but which has different purposes and outcomes, depending on the actor, stakeholder and context. Central to understanding internationalization is to see it as an ‘ization’ or a process and not an ‘ism’ or an ‘ideology’. Internationalism is different than internationalization even though both stress the concept of ‘between and among nations’ (Knight, 2012).

Rationales Driving Internationalization

Traditionally, the rationales driving internationalization have been presented in four groups: social/cultural, political, academic, and economic. (Knight and de Wit, 1999) This provides a useful macro view but as internationalization becomes increasingly complex and widespread a more up- to- date set of motives is needed to reflect current realities. Furthermore, it is important to distinguish between rationales at different levels of actors/stakeholders, especially individual, institutional, national, and regional levels. Table 2 juxtaposes the four categories of rationales first defined in the late 1990’s, but still relevant, with the rationales at the institutional, national and regional levels reflecting current trends and realities. Of particular interest is the relationship of higher education institutional rationales as compared to the national and regional actors and environments. Whether the rationales of universities converge or diverge from national priorities depends on the country and region of the world and merits serious examination.

Table 2: Changes in Rationales Driving Internationalization

Four Categories of rationales (Knight and de Wit 1999)	Levels of Rationales (Knight 2015)
Academic International Dimension to Research and Teaching Institution Building Profile and Status Enhancement of Quality International Academic Standards	Individual Level Develop worldview Enhance career Intercultural understanding and skills Knowledge of national/international issues Develop international network Institutional Level International branding and profile Student and staff development Strategic alliances Knowledge production Income generation
Economic Revenue Generation Competitiveness Labour Market Financial Incentives	
Political Foreign Policy	

National Security Peace and Mutual Understanding National Identity Regional Identity	National level: Human resources/ skill development Increased access to higher education Commercial trade Nation building Social cultural development Diplomacy and soft power Regional level: Alignment of national systems Regional identity Geo-political alliances Regional competitiveness
Social National cultural identity Intercultural understanding Citizenship development Social and community development	

Author updated 2015

Internationalization: ‘at-home’ and ‘crossborder’

A significant and interesting development in the conceptualization of internationalization at the institutional level has been the division of internationalization into ‘internationalization at home’ and ‘crossborder education’. A fundamental assumption is that these two pillars are separate but closely linked and interdependent. Crossborder education has significant implications for campus based internationalization and vice versa.

At home - campus based internationalization

The ‘at home’ concept has been developed to give greater prominence to campus based strategies given the recent heightened emphasis on international academic mobility. These ‘at home’ strategies can include the intercultural and international dimension in the teaching learning process, research, extra-curricular activities, relationships with local cultural and ethnic community groups, as well as the integration of foreign students and scholars into campus life and activities. There is also a realization that the number of domestic students who have some kind of study abroad or international research or field experience is frustratingly low in most countries around the world, with Europe being the exception. This requires that more attention be paid to campus and curriculum based efforts to help students live in a more inter-connected and culturally diverse world. Students and faculty need increased understanding of international and global issues and greater intercultural understanding and skills even if they never leave their community or country (Deardorff 2006). Such is the world we live in now and even more so in the future. Universities thus have the responsibility and challenge to integrate international, intercultural, and comparative perspectives into the student experience through campus based

and virtual activities in addition to international academic mobility experiences. Table 3 provides a framework of the major categories of activities involved in international ‘at home’.

Table 3: Framework for Internationalization ‘at home’

Internationalization ‘at home’- campus based
<p>Curriculum and programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -new programs with international theme -infused international, cultural, global, or comparative dimension into existing courses -foreign language study -area or regional studies -joint or double degrees
<p>Teaching/learning process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -active involvement of international students, returned study abroad students and cultural diversity of classroom in teaching/learning process -virtual student mobility for joint courses and research projects -use of international scholars and teachers and local international/intercultural experts -integration of international, intercultural case studies, role plays, problem solving scenarios, project-based learning, teams, learning communities, resource materials -integration of global learning outcomes and assessment
<p>Research and Scholarly Activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -area and theme centres -joint research projects -international conferences and seminars -published articles and papers -international research agreements -research exchange programs -international research partners in academic and other sectors - integration of visiting researchers and scholars into academic activities on campus
<p>Co-curricular activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -international/global leadership development programs -interdisciplinary seminars and think tanks -international in-service learning -distinguished speaker seminars
<p>Extra-curricular activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -student clubs and associations -international and intercultural campus events -language partners, friendship programs, student speaker programs -liaison with community based cultural and ethnic groups -peer support groups and programs

Liaison with local community based cultural/ethnic groups

- involvement of students in local cultural and ethnic organizations through internships, volunteering, placements, and applied research
- involvement of representatives from local cultural and ethnic groups in teaching/learning activities, research initiatives and extra-curricular events and projects

Author updated 2015

Crossborder education

Crossborder education refers to the movement of people, programs, providers, policies, knowledge, ideas, projects, and services across national boundaries. Delivery modes range from face to face to virtual. Crossborder education can be part of development cooperation projects, academic partnerships, or commercial trade. It includes a wide variety of arrangements ranging from study abroad to twinning to franchising to branch campuses. It is term that is often used interchangeably with transnational, offshore and borderless education which causes some confusion and misunderstandings (Knight 2008).

The demand for international education is forecasted to increase from 1.8 million international students in 2000 to 7.2 million international students in 2025 (Boehm et al 2002). By all accounts these are staggering figures and present enormous challenges and opportunities. It is not known what proportion of the demand will be met by student mobility but, it is clear that there will be exponential growth in the movement of programs and institutions/ providers across national borders.

Table 4 provides a schema to understand the nature of crossborder education and illustrates two significant trends. The first trend is the vertical shift downwards from student mobility to program to provider mobility to policy mobility. It is important to note that numbers of students seeking education in foreign countries is still increasing; however, there is growing interest in delivering foreign academic courses and programs to students in their home country. The second shift is from left to right signifying substantial change in orientation from development cooperation to competitive commerce, or in other words –from aid to trade.

Table 4: Framework for Crossborder Education

<i>Category</i>	<i>Forms and Conditions of Mobility</i>
	<p style="text-align: center;"> Development Educational Commercial </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Cooperation Linkages Trade </p>

People Students Professors/scholars Researchers/ Experts/consultants	Semester/year abroad Full degrees Field/research work Internships Sabbaticals Consulting
Programs Course, program sub-degree, degree, post graduate	Twinning Franchised Articulated/ Validated Joint/Double Award Online/Distance
Providers Institutions Organizations Companies	Branch Campus Virtual University Merger/Acquisition Independent Institutions
Projects Academic projects Services	Research Curriculum Capacity Building Educational services
Policies Academic Management Institutional and National	Quality Assurance Degree Levels Credit Accumulation and Transfer Degree recognition Academic Mobility

Author updated 2015

Crossborder mobility of providers can be described as the physical or virtual movement of an education provider (institution, organization, company) across a national border to establish a presence in order to offer education/training programs and/or services to students and other clients. The difference between program and provider mobility is one of scope and scale in terms of programs/services offered and the local presence (and investment) by the foreign provider.

This section has discussed internationalization of higher education as a process of integrating international, intercultural, or global dimensions into the goals, functions (i.e. teaching/learning, research, and service to society) and delivery of higher education. Changes in the rationales driving internationalization during the past fifteen years were examined and the key strategies for at-home internationalization and crossborder education have been identified. The next section focuses on the often used term – international university. Three different types or models of international higher education institutions are proposed, and the key characteristics identified.

International University – Three Models or Approaches

In the first part of the 21st century it is commonplace for a higher education institution, which is nationally founded, registered, and often funded, to call itself an international university. But what does the term “international university” actually mean? The definition of an international university is both comprehensive and evasive. The expression ‘international’ or ‘internationalized university’ is now so commonplace that it has become a catchall phrase for any hint of international activity at an institution of higher education and thus has also become almost meaningless. It does illustrate, though, how attractive, and important it is for a university to describe itself as international. To complicate the understanding of the concept of an international university, different labels such as multinational, cosmopolitan, transnational, global, and international university are being used interchangeably and without consistency with the term international university (Knight, 2015b).

The purpose of this section is to introduce three generic models of international universities – Classic, Satellite, Co-founded - in an attempt to clarify the confusion around the use of the term international university. The intent is to examine the defining characteristics of each model. The discussion focuses on the distinguishing characteristics of the three generic types and does not attempt to dissect the differences between the terms international, multinational, binational, or global. Such an exercise is important to undertake but is complex due to nuance of meaning according to different disciplines, the biases of the English language, and the difficulty of translating subtle differences into other languages. Thus, ‘international university’ is the operative term and for the purposes of this chapter a proxy for the others.

Important to note is that terms describing higher education institutions as ‘world class’ or ‘internationally recognized’ universities are not addressed because they deal more with perception and branding issues than the substantive nature of an international university. The term ‘world class’ is closely linked to global ranking and league tables. For instance, the Times Higher Education (THE) has prepared its own ranking of the top 100 most international universities in the world (Crooke 2015). The ranking is based on three specific measures of what THE calls an “international outlook”. The indicators are 1) the proportion of international students at each university, 2) the proportion of international faculty, and 3) the proportion of an institution’s research papers that are published with at least one author from another country. While these are relevant indicators, they represent an extremely narrow approach to defining an international university and do not represent the richness and diversity of activities undertaken by higher education institutions to become more international and intercultural. This categorization of an international university has very limited use.

Three Models of International Universities

Classic Model

Today, a common characteristic of universities is collaboration with international partner universities and research centres. These partnerships span a diversity of academic and management initiatives including: academic student/scholar mobility, joint program development and delivery, collaborative research projects, benchmarking, professional development, etc. The number of these bilateral or network-based arrangements has soared in the last few years. A 2013 world-wide survey of higher education institutions indicates that the international imperative and activities continue to grow in importance and number (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014).

Most of the partnerships are motivated by academic benefits, yet there are some which are driven by status building or commercial rationales. Nevertheless, for whatever reason, it is common practice for universities to have both international students and staff and be engaged with multiple foreign partners for a diversity of activities both on campus and abroad. These are labelled the Classic Model of an International University and are by far the most common interpretation and use of the term international university. This Classic model aligns closely with the examination on the meaning and strategies of internationalization of higher education as discussed in the previous section.

Satellite Model

An important new development in crossborder education is the number of universities that are establishing a presence in other countries of the world through 1) satellite research centres, 2) branch campuses, and 3) contact offices for alumni support, recruitment of students and professors, development of projects, fund/friend raising, and other related activities.

The international branch campuses are primarily devoted to providing undergraduate or graduate degree programs in a different country, but the courses are designed, and quality assured by the parent institution in the home country. The teaching can be done by local, expatriate faculty locally based or by fly-in faculty from the parent institution. International branch campuses are stand-alone independent brick and mortar campuses or can be located in rental premises in an 'education city' type of arrangement. On the other hand, the contact/representative offices are often embedded in a local partner institution or co-located in the offices of an international education office or embassy from the home/sending country.

The main feature of this model is that the university has strategically planned and developed a series of research, teaching, or management offices in targeted countries around the world. The growth of international branch campuses (IBCs) over the last decade has been steady and impressive. The most recent report from the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education (OBHE 2012) indicates that in 2004 there were only 24 reported IBCs, but by 2009 the number jumped to 162, and by 2011 there were 200 operating around the world with another 37 planned.

Furthermore, it is a common assumption that not all IBCs have been included in the OBHE report and the actual number of IBCs is much higher. The landscape of satellite operations is changing rapidly, and the scenario may look quite different in the next five years.

There is significant variation in how universities establish and operate their satellite academic, research or management offices (Wilkens & Huisman, 2012). A university with three or more campuses or offices is often referred to as an international networked university. For example, New York University calls itself a ‘Global Networked University’ with branch campuses in Shanghai, Abu Dhabi, and New York and 11 research centres around the world.

Thus, the second model, known as the Satellite model, focuses on crossborder education and setting up a presence in other countries. Worth noting is that the Classic model and Satellite models are not mutually exclusive. Many of the Satellite models would have a full range of international activities and could also be seen as a Classic model, but the converse is not true. Not all Classic model international universities have established satellite operations in other countries even though they may have multiple international partnerships.

Internationally Co-founded/co-developed Model

A more recent and bold development is the founding of new stand-alone universities involving one or more foreign partner institutions. This type of international higher education institution differs significantly from the international branch campus model because they are not operating as satellite operations of a parent institution. These are independent, internationally co-founded or co-developed institutions licenced by the host country but developed through international collaboration among partner institutions (Knight, 2015b).

There are many examples: Singapore University of Design and Technology is co-founded by MIT, Zhejiang and Singapore authorities; Nazarbayev University in Kazakhstan has developed its academic programs universities in the US, UK and Singapore; German University of Technology in Oman; the Sino-British University; and the Xi’an Jiaotong Liverpool University in China. While each example is slightly different, a common element is that existing universities from different countries have been deeply involved in the establishment of a new institution and its academic programs.

Apart from the common challenges facing most universities related such as funding, improving quality, responding to the needs of community and labour market, student and staff recruitment, research funding, there are other issues which are more specific to the Co-founded model of international universities (Zhuang 2009). These include governance models, intercultural partnerships, accreditation, awarding of qualifications, staffing, language, host country regulations and sustainability.

As discussed, and illustrated, much confusion exists as to what an international, university actually means. In fact, the term is less important than the model used to meet the needs and objectives of the participating higher education institutions. There is no standardized model of an international university, nor should there be. A ‘cookie cutter’ approach to international universities neglects the critical importance of the cultural, social, economic, political, and academic context of the host country and the nature of the international academic partnerships.

The next section of the chapter looks at the benefits, risks and unintended consequences linked to the complex and changing phenomenon of higher education internationalization.

Benefits, Risks and Unintended Consequences

As internationalization changes to meet new challenges it is important to examine some of the unexpected developments and results. While the benefits of internationalization are many and varied, there are clearly risks and also unintended consequences which need to be addressed and monitored (Knight 2009).

Student Mobility: The Brain Drain –Gain- Train

Little did we know twenty five years ago that the highly valued and beneficial international academic mobility for students, scholars and professors would have the potential to grow into a very competitive international recruitment business? Several countries are investing in major marketing campaigns to attract the best and brightest talent to study and work in their institutions in order to supply the ‘brain power’ for innovation and research agendas. The difficulties and challenges related to academic and profession mobility should not be underestimated. Nor should the potential benefits. But it is impossible to ignore the latest race for attracting international students and academics for ‘brain power’ and for ‘income generation’. The original goal of helping students from developing countries study in another country to complete a degree and return home is fading fast as nations compete for retaining needed human resources.

While ‘brain drain and brain gain’ are well known concepts, research is showing that international students and researchers are increasingly interested in taking a degree in country A, followed by a second degree or perhaps internship in country B, leading to employment in country C and probably D, finally returning to their home country after 8 to 12 years of international study and work experience. Hence, the emergence of the term ‘brain train’. In the final analysis, whether one is dealing with - brain gain, brain drain, or brain train this phenomenon is presenting benefits, risks, and new challenges for both sending and receiving countries. (Knight 2012). From a policy perspective, higher education is becoming a more important actor and is now working in closer collaboration with immigration, industry and the

science and technology sectors to build an integrated strategy for attracting and retaining knowledge workers. The convergence of an aging society, lower birth rates, the knowledge economy and professional labour mobility is introducing new issues and opportunities for the higher education sector and producing some unanticipated results and challenges in terms of international academic mobility.

Quality, Accreditation and Credential recognition

The increase in student, program and provider mobility is intended to increase access to higher education and meet the appetite for foreign credentials, but there are serious issues related to the quality of the academic offer, the integrity of the new types of providers, and the recognition of credentials. The increase in the number of foreign degree mills (selling ‘parchment’ only degrees) and accreditation mills (selling bogus accreditations for programs or institutions), and rogue for-profit providers (not recognized by national authorities) are realities that students, parents, employers, and the academic community now need to be aware of. Who would have guessed two decades ago that international education would be struggling to deal with issues such i) fake degrees and accreditations; ii) academic credentials that are earned but not recognized, and iii) non-regulated ‘fly by night’ institutions? Of course, it is equally important to acknowledge innovative developments by bona fide new providers and traditional universities who are delivering high quality programs and legitimate degrees through new types of international arrangements and partnerships (franchise, twinning, branch campus). The perpetual challenge of balancing cost, quality and access significantly impacts the benefits and risks of crossborder education.

Double and Joint Degrees- Twice the benefit or double counting?

Improvement in the quality of research, the teaching/learning process, and curriculum has long been heralded as positive outcome of international collaboration. Through exchange of good practice, shared curricular reform, close research cooperation, and mobility of professors/students there is much to be gained through internationalization. A recent trend has been the establishment of collaborative programs between institutions in different countries that lead to double (or multiple degrees) and in some cases joint degrees -although the latter face steep legal constraints (Kuder et al, 2013).

Collaborative programs are intended to provide a rich international and comparative academic experience for students and to improve their opportunities for employment. But, with all new ideas, come questionable adaptations and unintended consequences. For instance, in some cases, double degrees can be nothing more than double counting one set of course credits. Situations exist where two/three credentials (one from each participating institution) are conferred for little more than the work load required for one degree. While it may be very attractive for students

(and potential employees) to have two degrees from institutions in two different countries, the situation can be described as the thin edge of academic fraud if course requirements for two full degrees are not completed or differentiated learning outcomes not achieved. It is important to point out that there are many excellent and innovative joint and double degree programs being offered, but one of the unanticipated consequences is the potential misuse or abuse of degree granting and recognition protocols .

Intercultural competence for academic staff and students

One of the key factors involved in the success and sustainability of international education and research partnerships is effective and respectful communication and shared decision making. While this may be obvious, it is not always evident in the relationship. Many reasons account for this. The motivations driving the education partnership are not always academic in nature and secondly, the intercultural competence of academics is often limited. This is a particular challenge with senior professors and scholars who believe that knowledge of the discipline and research area is the number one priority and that ‘science’ is an international language thereby diminishing the importance of what is perceived to be the soft skill of intercultural competence. This is an ongoing risk and challenge in international education partnerships.

In terms of the design and delivery of collaborative education programs, the situation of intercultural competence is more critical and complex. There are multiple challenges involved in designing appropriate curriculum, but a more fundamental factor is the intercultural dimension of teaching/learning in multicultural situations. Not only do you have faculty coming from different cultural, linguistic, and disciplinary backgrounds, the same is true for the students. To complicate matters further, the language of instruction is often not the native tongue of the instructors or learners. Thus, the role of intercultural awareness and competence is as important in the teaching/learning process as the recognition of cultural norms and practices in the design of curriculum. While there is increasing awareness of the intercultural realities and challenges in education partnerships the importance attached to this issue and the professional development opportunities available for staff to improve their intercultural competence are unfortunately limited.

Commodification and Commercialization- For-profit Internationalization

For many educators, the heart of the debate about increased commercial crossborder education is the impact on the purpose, role, and values of higher education. The growth in new commercial and private providers, the commodification and market orientation of education, and the prospect of new trade policy frameworks are catalysts for stimulating serious reflection on the role, social commitment, and funding of public higher education institutions in society. The trinity of teaching/learning, research, service has traditionally guided the evolution of universities and

their contribution to the social, cultural, human, scientific, and economic development of a nation and its people. Is the combination of these roles still valid, or can they be disaggregated and rendered by different providers?

Cultural Diversity or Homogenization?

The impact of new forms of international academic mobility on the recognition and promotion of indigenous and diverse cultures is a subject that evokes strong positions and sentiments. Many believe that modern information and communication technologies and the movement of people, ideas, and cultures across national boundaries presents new opportunities to promote one's culture to other countries and to enhance the fusion and hybridization of cultures. Supporting their position is the assumption that this flow of culture across borders is not new at all; only the speed has been accelerated and the modes broadened.

Others see both the movement and the speed as alarming. They contend that these same forces are eroding national cultural identities and that, instead of creating new hybrid cultures, indigenous cultures are being homogenized, which in most cases means Westernized. Because education has traditionally been seen as a vehicle of acculturation, these arguments focus on the specifics of curriculum content, language of instruction (particularly the increase in English) and the teaching/learning process in international education.

Branding and Competition –World Rankings

International and regional rankings of universities have become more popular and problematic in the last five years. The heated debate about their validity, reliability and value continues (Hazelkorn 2011). But at the same time university presidents declare in their strategic plan that a measurable outcome of internationalization will be the achievement of a specific position in one or more of the global ranking instruments. Internationalization is perceived by some institutions as a means to gaining worldwide profile and prestige. Is this really internationalization or is it international marketing and branding? The intense competition for world rankings would have been impossible to imagine a mere twenty years ago when international collaboration among universities through academic exchanges and development cooperation projects were the norm. Of course, these types of activities still occur, but the factors driving internationalization are becoming increasingly varied, multifaceted, and competitive. Is international cooperation becoming overshadowed and trumped by competition for status, bright students, talented faculty, research grants, membership in elite global networks and rankings?

Last Words- Focus on Values

These new developments and unintended consequences illustrate that nothing unfolds entirely as planned and it is necessary to stay alert to unexpected bumps and diversions along the road of

internationalization. With innovation and a more globalized world come new opportunities, successes and also threats. It is imperative that the international, intercultural, and global dimensions of higher education continue to be proactive, responsive, and innovative while keeping a close watch on unanticipated spin-offs, misconceptions, and implications.

Serious reflection and debate are needed about the direction that internationalization is taking. Academics and organizations are calling for a new conceptualization, definition, or term for internationalization. But are new words enough? How can we avoid a scenario where words might change but actions and understandings do not? Practice and policy need to be closely examined in terms of what values and purposes are driving internationalization. No one could have predicted that the era of globalization would have changed internationalization, from what has been traditionally considered a process based on values of cooperation, partnership, exchange, mutual benefits, and capacity building, to one that is increasingly characterized by competition, commercialization, self-interest, and status building (Knight 2013). In other words, have the values related to economic, political and status related rationales trumped the importance and values related to academic and social-cultural purposes and benefits of higher education internationalization?

Internationalization and even the term ‘international university’ have always meant different things to different people, institutions, and countries. They always will. Internationalization has been guided by the principles that it must be linked to local context and purpose, that there is not ‘one way or a right way’ to internationalize, and that it is a means to an end not an end unto itself. The challenge of strengthening and reinforcing the values of cooperation, exchange, partnership over the current emphasis on competitiveness and commercialization is front and centre.

*This chapter is adapted from Knight’s articles from 2012, 2013, 2015a and b listed below.

Bibliography

Altbach, P. G. and Knight, J. (2007). The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities. *Journal of Studies In International Education*. 11(3-4) 290-305.

Arum, S., and Van de Water, J. (1992). The need for a definition of international education in U.S. universities. In C. Klasek (Ed.), *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education*. Carbondale, IL: Association of International Education Administrators. pp198-206

Boehm A., Davis, D., Meares, D., and Pearce, D. (2002). *The Global Student Mobility 2025 Report: Forecasts of the Global Demand for International Education*. Canberra, Australia: IDP

- Crook, R. (2015) The 100 most international universities in the world 2014.
<http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/news/the-25-most-international-universities-in-the-world/2010783.article>
- Deardorff, D. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization in *Journal of Studies in International Education, Vol 10* No. 3, pp 241-266.
- Dzulkifli, A.R. (2010) *Is Internationalization a Western Construct*. Presentation at British Council Going Global 4 Conference, London, UK.
- de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Egron-Polak, E. & R. Hudson (2014), *Internationalization of Higher Education: Growing expectations, fundamental values* IAU 4th Global Survey, International Association of Universities. <http://www.iau-aiu.net/sites/all/files/IAU-4th-GLOBAL-SURVEY-EXECUTIVE-SUMMARY.pdf>
- Hazelkorn, E (2011) *Rankings and the Reshaping of Higher Education: The Battle for World Class Excellence*. Palgrave Macmillan Basingstoke: UK.
- Hudzik, J. (2011) *Comprehensive Internationalization: From concept to action*. NAFSA, Association of International Educators, Washington, DC. USA.
- Klasek, (1992) (Ed.), *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education* (pp. 198-206). Carbondale, IL: Association of International Education Administrators.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definitions, rationales, and approaches. *Journal for Studies in International Education, 8*(1), 5-31.
- Knight, J. (2008) *Higher Education in Turmoil: The Changing World of Internationalization*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Knight, J. (2009) *New Developments and Unintended Consequences: Whither Thou Goest, Internationalization?* in R. Bhandari and S Laughlin (Eds) *Higher Education on the Move: New Developments in Global Mobility*. Global Education Research Reports. Institute for International Education. New York, New York pp113 -125.
- Knight, J. (2012) *Concepts, Rationales, and Interpretive Frameworks in the Internationalization of Higher Education* in D. Deardorff, H. De Wit and J. Heyl (Eds) *Handbook of International Higher Education*. California: Sage Publishers.
- Knight, J. (2013) *The Changing Landscape of Higher Education Internationalization- for better*

- or worse? In *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*. Journal of the Association of University Administrators, UK. (17) 2.
- Knight, J. (2015a) "Meaning, Rationales and Tensions in the Internationalization of Higher Education" in S. McGrath, S and Q. Gu, (eds) *2015 Routledge Handbook on International Education and Development*, Routledge, London. (in press)
- Knight, J. (2015b) "International Universities: Misunderstandings and Emerging Models" in *Journal for Studies in International Education* (in press)
- Knight, J and de Wit, H. (Eds) (1999). *Quality and Internationalization in Higher Education*. Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Paris, France.
- Kuder, M., Lemmens, N and Obst D. (2013). *Global Perspectives on International Joint and Double Degree Programs*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- OBHE (2012) *International branch campuses: Data and developments*. Authored by W. Lawton and A. Katsomitrou, London, UK: Observatory of Borderless Higher Education.
- Odin, J. and Mancias, P. (Eds.) (2004) *Globalization and higher education*. Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press
- OECD (2004). *Quality and Recognition in Higher Education. The Cross-border Challenge*. Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, OECD. Paris. France
- Van der Wende, M. (1997). Missing links: The relationship between national policies for internationalisation and those for higher education in general.' in T. Kalvermark & M. Van der Wende (Eds.), *National Policies for the Internationalisation of Higher Education in Europe* (pp. 10-31). Stockholm, Sweden: National Agency for Higher Education.
- Wilkins, S. and Huisman, J. (2012), "The international branch campus as transnational strategy in higher education", in *Higher Education*. Vol 64, no 5), pp 627-645.
- Zhuang L. (2009) "The challenges facing Sino-UK transnational education: an institutional experience", *Journal of Knowledge-based Innovation in China*, Vol. 1 Issue: 3, pp.243 - 255