Globalization and Internationalization as Frameworks for Higher Education Research

Malcolm Tight

Lancaster University, UK

m.tight@lancaster.ac.uk

Globalization and Internationalization as Frameworks for Higher Education Research

Abstract

In contemporary writing on higher education, globalization and internationalization are increasingly popular terms, and they are also increasingly being used as frameworks for higher education research. This article discusses the meaning and application of these terms, documents their usage in higher education research, and critically reviews this research and its usefulness for higher education policy. It concludes that, while many interpret the growing globalization and internationalization of higher education as another effect of neo-liberal agendas, the role of higher education institutions as instigators of further globalization and internationalization should not be ignored, while the compromises they make in doing so need to be acknowledged. It also suggests that higher education researchers themselves need to move out of their national comfort zones and think and research more globally.

Introduction

Higher education is an inter-disciplinary field for research (Brennan and Teichler 2008, Kehm and Musselin 2013, Tight 2012). With only a limited number of academic and other researchers devoting themselves full-time and long-term to researching higher education, most of those researching this field come from and remain based in other disciplines, departments or institutions, and their contributions are usually part-time and/or short-term.

While this means that higher education researchers are highly dispersed, which might be viewed as disadvantageous, it also has a more positive aspect, as a diverse range of methodologies, theoretical frameworks, research designs and, in the broadest sense, ideas are applied to researching higher education. While many of these are introduced from other disciplines – by researchers with a background or interest in those disciplines - other methodologies, theories and designs are also developed within higher education research itself (Tight 2012, 2013, 2014a).

This article forms part of a larger research project, which is tracing the origins, spread and development of particular theories, methodologies, research designs and ideas of influence within higher education research (see also Tight 2014b, 2014c, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c, 2016a, 2016b, 2018a, 2018b, 2019). In addition to charting where they come from, how popular they are and how they change over time, the project is considering why and how these theories, methodologies, research designs and ideas are being used, their relation to other frameworks, and the critiques of them that have been advanced.

The focus of this article is on the linked ideas of globalization and internationalization. These are amongst the most discussed and researched aspects of higher education in the last two decades (Kehm and Teichler 2007), as evidenced by being the subject of several edited books (e.g. Ennew and Greenaway 2012, King, Marginson and Naidoo 2011, Maringe and Foskett 2010, Scott 1998a, Stromquist and Monkman 2000) and special issues of journals (e.g. Magyar and Robinson-Pant 2011, Maringe and Woodfield 2013, Sellar and Gale 2011, de Wit 2011).

But what are globalization and internationalization, particularly as applied to higher education, and how do they differ? What impact are globalization and internationalization having on higher education policy, provision and practice, what issues are they raising and what critiques have been offered? This article focuses on research into globalization and internationalization in higher education, examining successively their origins and meaning, application and practice, and the issues and critiques arising, before reaching some conclusions (note that while I shall spell both terms with a 'z', original spellings will be maintained in quotations).

The aim of the article is to provide a comprehensive account of how the ideas of globalization and internationalization have developed and been applied in higher education research. It does this by carrying out a systematic review of the research literature on the topic that has been published in the English language (Jesson, Matheson and Lacey 2011, Torgerson 2003). Relevant articles, books and chapters were identified through Google Scholar and Scopus, with no date restrictions applied, using the key words 'globalization', 'internationalization', 'higher education' and 'universities'. The items identified were then checked for relevance; where relevant, copies were then obtained for scrutiny and analysis, with any additional items identified through their references followed up.

Origins and Meaning

Three key points may be stressed immediately regarding globalization and internationalization in higher education research. First, the discussion in the higher education literature draws and builds on the broader discussion of globalization, in particular in the social science literature (e.g. Albrow 1996, Beck 2000, Giddens 1999). Second, as we shall see, while distinctions may be drawn between the two terms, in practice they are often used interchangeably or in overlapping ways. Third, while they have attracted particular attention (in policy and research terms) in the last 20 years or so – following the massification of higher education spreading from North America to Europe, the Asia Pacific region and worldwide – these are not new phenomena. As Scott makes clear, internationalism at least has always been part of the university's mission:

> There are four topics relevant to the overall theme of internationalization and/or globalization. The first is the contrast between internationalism – a quality which the university has espoused from its earliest days – and globalization. The second topic is the very important changes that have taken place in HE [higher education], which are often summed up by the word massification. The third, linked to the first, is the radical shift from neo-colonial internationalization to post-colonial globalization. And the fourth and last topic is the even more radical configurations of time and space in which the university, as a key institution of the knowledge society of the future, is directly implicated. (1998b, pp. 122-123)

The linkages made between globalization and internationalization and colonialism, in its various changing forms, are telling, as is the link to the changes brought about by the internet and related developments.

How, then, might we distinguish between globalization and internationalization? Teichler seeks to explain the difference in the following way:

Internationalisation can best be defined as the totality of substantial changes in the context and inner life of higher education relative to an increasing frequency of border-crossing activities amidst a persistence of national systems, even though some signs of "denationalisation" might be observed. Phenomena often viewed as characteristic for internationalisation are increasing knowledge transfer, physical mobility, cooperation and international education and research. Globalisation initially seemed to be defined as the totality of substantial changes in the context and inner life of higher education related to growing interrelationships between different parts of the world whereby national borders are blurred or even seem to vanish. In recent years the term "globalisation" is substituted for "internationalisation" in the public debate on higher education, whereby a shift of meaning takes place… the term tends to be used for any supra-regional phenomenon related to higher education… and/or anything on a global scale related to higher education characterised by market and competition. (2004, pp. 22-23)

In his interpretation, then, while internationalization in higher education is about cross-border flows – of students, staff and knowledge – and international cooperation, globalization (which Teichler suggests has changed in meaning over time) represents a step change, with international trends and developments now impacting upon the national and local.

Gacel-Ávila adds more flesh to this distinction, arguing that, while internationalization refers to mutually satisfactory relationships between nations, globalization encompasses forces outside of the control of individual nations which are typically viewed as negative:

The concept of internationalisation differs dialectically from that of globalisation because it refers to the relationship between nation-states, which promotes recognition of and respect for their own differences and traditions. By contrast, the phenomenon of globalisation does not tend to respect differences and borders, thus undermining the bases of the very same nation-states, and leading to homogenisation. In this sense, internationalisation can be understood as complementary or compensatory to globalizing tendencies, given that it allows for a resistance to the latter's denationalising and homogenising effects. (2005, p. 124)

Unusually – as it seems much more typical for academics to disagree, even (or perhaps especially) on the meanings of widely used terms – a third author, Dodds, makes much the same point, presenting internationalization as a relatively benign force in comparison to globalization:

A final conceptual ambiguity concerns the relationship between 'globalisation' and 'internationalisation'. Some theorists have been

happy to use the two concepts almost interchangeably. Others have described globalisation as a particularly 'intense' form of internationalisation. However, 'internationalisation' is generally seen as a less critical concept within academia than is 'globalisation'. (2008, p. 509)

In other words, internationalization may be viewed as a contemporary expression of internationalism, whereas globalization is a much more challenging prospect.

Altbach and Knight, however, put it in another way, seeing internationalization as encompassing the responses that may be made to the forces of globalization:

Globalization and internationalization are related but not the same thing. Globalization is the context of economic and academic trends that are part of the reality of the 21st century. Internationalization includes the policies and practices undertaken by academic systems and institutions — and even individuals — to cope with the global academic environment. (2007, p. 290)

What seems clear from all of these definitions, however, is the portrayal of globalization as a set of forces, and of internationalization as the approach or response of policy-makers and, in this case, higher education institutions, to underlying trends and opportunities.

Turning to discussions of the meanings of the two terms individually, Beerkens distinguishes four main interpretations of globalization, arguing that: 'the main disagreement is between the notion of global as a geographical concept on one hand and as an authority-related, cultural, and institutional concept on the other' (2003, p. 133). Clearly, while also implying the former, the authors quoted earlier were emphasizing the latter interpretations.

Dodds (2008), based on a content analysis of the literature, also identifies a series of contested meanings of globalization: as flows of capital, people, information and culture (associated with King), as marketisation (associated with Altbach) and as ideology. The consequences of globalization are seen as a concentration of linguistic and economic power, increased competition between higher education institutions, higher education institutions being seen as having a crucial role in maintaining or developing national competitive advantage, and changes in the nature of information and access to it. Dodds argues that the role of higher education institutions themselves in promoting globalization has been overlooked (something which Scott (1998b) also implies):

Globalisation remains a contested concept, within studies of higher education as in many other fields. Rather than it being taken to refer unambiguously to global flows, pressures, or trends, its meaning continues to depend on the particular perspective adopted by contemporary researchers. The same conflict is apparent

concerning the impacts which are attributed to globalisation, and with regard to the appropriate response to globalisation amongst academics and HEIs [higher education institutions] more generally. Perhaps the only apparent point of consensus amongst contemporary researchers is the claim that globalisation affects HEIs, rather than HEIs themselves being implicated in its promotion… this position underplays the often important role of HEIs in encouraging cross-border flows and pressures, and global trends such as marketisation. (pp. 514-515)

This explanation also suggests why globalization has been the subject of so much critique from academics, as will be discussed later in this article.

As regards internationalization, a number of different distinctions or typologies have been presented. Haigh (2014, p. 6), for example, identified eight layers in the evolution of thinking about internationalization:

> (1) recruiting international students; (2) teaching international students; (3) growing the international enterprise university through the competitive recruitment of international staff and students; (4) compliance with standards set by international accreditation agencies; (5) 'internationalisation at home', which means internationalisation of the curriculum for local learners; (6) education for global citizenship; (7) connected e-learning; and (8) education for planetary, whole-Earth, consciousness.

These layers suggest a natural developmental process, moving from pragmatic concerns about increasing student recruitment, through changing curricula and practice, towards an overarching concern for the welfare of the whole planet.

Bedenlier, Kondakci and Zawacki-Richter (2018) approach the issue differently, by examining 20 years output of the *Journal of Studies in International Education*, a key journal in this field. They identify: 'Four major developmental waves in this research area… delineation of the field (1997-2001), institutionalization and management of internationalization (2002-2006), consequences of internationalization: student needs and support structures (2007-2011), and currently, moving from the institutional to the transnational context of internationalization (2012-2016)' (p. 108). In other words, the research foci have paralleled developments in the field, albeit with an inevitable time-lag built in.

Similarly, Mwangi et al (2018) carry out a critical discourse analysis of four higher education journals – *Higher Education*, the *Journal of Higher Education*, *Research in Higher Education* and *Studies in Higher Education* - noting their strong western focus, and arguing that:

> The concept of internationalization is complex and challenging to define within higher education given the need for researchers to apply it to diverse country contexts and university systems. While

we selected articles for their focus on internationalization within higher education, we found that the majority of articles did not explicitly define internationalization. When articles did describe the concept, it was often discussed as a change process within higher education that can positively improve universities. However, articles that had a more critical emphasis did tend to illustrate how internationalization could foster both positive and negative outcomes for higher education institutions, while less critical articles tended to emphasize solely the positive. (n.p.)

Perhaps unsurprisingly, it is those who stand to benefit most from internationalization in higher education who are doing most of the research, while also often ignoring or underplaying the power issues involved.

In another vein, Engwall (2016) identifies four modes of internationalization - (a) import of ideas, (b) outsourcing (i.e. sending students abroad to study), (c) insourcing (attracting students from abroad to study), and (d) foreign direct investments (delivering higher education abroad) - with the first of these seen as the most important for higher education. There are some parallels here with Haigh's categorization, though Engwall does not go as far. Both, though, while identifying the pragmatic elements of internationalization, such as the movements of students and academics, seek to emphasize underlying values: international consciousness and the sharing of ideas.

Clearly, both globalization and internationalization remain somewhat contested concepts, though the former is generally viewed as more problematic from the perspectives of higher education policy and higher education research.

Application and Practice

Bibliographic searches carried out using Scopus on 16/7/18 show a steady increase in the number of publications in the English language focusing on globalization and/or internationalization and higher education since the 1990s (paralleling the growth in the number of publications on higher education as a whole). Over 200 new publications are being produced each year with the words globalization or internationalization, or both (there is, unsurprisingly, a considerable overlap between the two listings), and higher education in their title, abstract or keywords; which is taken as indicating a close focus on the topic. Other articles also address the topic, of course, and are discussed in this article; what follows here is an indicative content analysis of those identified through this search.

Analysis of these search results shows that the majority of authors in both listings are based in social science departments. Interestingly, authors based in the UK form the largest group for articles focusing on internationalization. The UK accounted for 350 articles (e.g. Trahar and

Hyland 2011, Walker 2014), with the USA contributing 286 (e.g. Blanco-Ramirez 2015, Urban and Palmer 2014, Wamboye et al 2015), Australia 232 (e.g. Fischer and Green 2018, Harman 2004, Levatino 2017), China 149 (e.g. Huang 2006, Jokila 2015, Li and Bray 2007, Liu and Metcalfe 2016, Mok and Han 2016, Pan 2013, Wu 2018) and Germany 100 (e.g. Bedenlier and Zavenski-Richter 2015, Berchem 1991).

The more usual order, with USA-based authors well ahead, occurs for articles focusing on globalization: the USA accounted for 669, with the UK producing 329, Australia 251, China 136 and Canada 110 (e.g. Larsen 2016, Pashby and Oliveira Andreotti 2016). It may simply be, of course, that the two terms are more or less popular, and used in subtly different ways, in different countries.

However, despite producing the largest number of authors on internationalization in higher education, and the second largest for globalization, none of the leading authors identified – Teichler (19 articles), Knight (17) and Yemini (13) for internationalization, Marginson (22), Mok (15) and Teichler (12) again for globalisation – have been primarily UK-based.

Despite the dominance of the major Anglophone countries, plus China and Germany, in research and writing (in English) on globalization and internationalization in higher education, interest in this topic is widespread and, appropriately enough, global. Thus, for example, research has also focused on Brazil (Guilherme, Morosini and dos Santos 2018), Colombia (Berry and Taylor 2014), Denmark (Fabricius, Mortensen and Haberland 2017), Finland (Ahola 2005, Dobson & Hölttä 2001), Hong Kong (Lo 2018), Ireland (O'Connor 2018), Japan (Horie 2002, Huang 2006, 2015, Tsuruta 2013, Umakoshi 1997), Malaysia (Aziz and Abdullah 2014, Richards 2018, Shafaei and Razak 2016), Mexico (Berry and Taylor 2014), The Netherlands (Huang 2006), New Zealand (Jiang 2010), Norway (Gornitzka and Langfeldt 2008), Russia (Stukalova et al 2015), Singapore (Lo 2018, Loke, Chia and Gopinathan 2017, Richards 2018), Slovenia (Svetlik and Lalić 2016), South Africa (Dolby 2010), South Korea (Moon 2016, Palmer and Cho 2012), Sweden (Söderlundh 2018, Svensson and Wihlborg 2010), Thailand (Dixon 2006, Lavankura 2013) and Turkey (Akar 2010, Tarhan, Samani and Samani 2017). Tellingly, this list includes countries from all continents.

Other authors have examined the position in particular continents or world regions, such as Africa (Jowi 2009), the Asia Pacific area (Ng 2012), Central and Eastern Europe (Dobbins and Kwiek 2017), East Asia (Chan 2013, Chao 2014, Hammond 2016) and Latin America (Gomes et al 2012). Russell (2015) compared two 'emerging market providers', namely universities in Malaysia and Mexico, focusing on their transnational strategies.

It remains the case, however, that the impact of globalization and internationalization on higher education in the western, developed world

has been much more widely researched. This is not, of course, just because these countries contain the largest proportion of higher education researchers publishing in English, but also due to their dominance in the recruitment of international students (and staff):

> The core countries in the world system, the USA, the UK, Australia, France, Germany and Japan, receive most of the international students, whereas semi-periphery countries such as China, India and South Korea, and periphery countries, Malaysia and Vietnam, send most of the international students to other countries. (Barnett et al 2016, p. 549)

A particular feature of this focus has been the interest in developments within the European Union, especially the effects of the Bologna process and the creation of the European Higher Education Area (e.g. Dvir and Yemini 2016, Enders and Westerheijden 2011, Primeri and Reale 2012, Rivza and Teichler 2007, Teichler 1998, 2009, Valimaa 2011, van der Wende 2001, Zmas 2015). Some have also researched the impact of the Bologna process outside of the European Union: e.g. Ferrer (2010) has examined its effects on Latin American countries. Other western international organizations or associations, such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), have also attracted research attention for their work in encouraging globalization and internationalization (Buckner 2017, van der Wende 2007).

While the themes of globalization and internationalization encourage the adoption of a broad approach to research, practical considerations and researcher interests mean that a good deal of published research is rather more focused and localised. This may be in terms, for example, of the disciplines studied (thus Bruner and Iannarelli (2011) examine management education in this context, while Larsen (2016) focuses on teacher education and Morace et al (2017) consider engineering education; all three thus examining examples of professional education and development), or the mode of study (e.g. Hanna and Latchem (2002) consider the potential of open and distance learning).

Interestingly, there appears to have been little direct examination of gender and ethnicity issues as they impact upon, or are affected by, globalization and internationalization in higher education. These issues do, however, crop up indirectly in studies of the impact upon higher education students and staff.

Indeed, by far the most common focus taken in research on these topics has been to examine, usually at a departmental, institutional or national level, the experience of international students; that is, students studying outside of their home countries (e.g. Castro et al 2016, Kirkegaard and Nat-George 2016 (who focus on conflict-induced student migration), Knight 2012, Kritz 2016, Rizvi 2011, Salisbury et al 2009, Sawir 2013, Shafaei and Razak 2016, Shields 2013), particularly in the major western receiving countries. Some of the research on the international student

does, however, take a broader perspective, as, for example, Shields' research into student flows:

> Network analysis reveals that changes to international student flows are multifaceted and complex. However, there are clear trends in this complexity: even with the growth of new destinations for study, the network of international students has become more centralized, less densely connected, and less like a "small world". It shares strong structural similarities with the networks of world trade and the world polity, increasingly with the latter. (2013, p. 628)

International student flows have much in common, then, with other forms of consumption, as well as with migration patterns.

Alongside the interest in the international student experience, a smaller but significant body of research has also built up on the academic staff experience of teaching international students, working with immigrant colleagues or working in other countries themselves (e.g. Bedenlier and Zawacki-Richter 2105, Gheorgiu and Stephens 2016, Teichler 2015). Part of this interest has focused on what has long been termed 'brain drain' (Docquier and Rapoport 2012), the movement of qualified academics from less developed to more developed countries. Increasingly, however, these patterns have become more complex, with universities in, for example, the Gulf states and South-east Asia recruiting large numbers of English-speaking academics from developed countries; both to their own universities and to satellite campuses of western universities.

Interest in the student and staff experience of globalization and internationalization in higher education has led, naturally enough, to research into the impact upon the curriculum and teaching (e.g. Bourn 2011, Bovill, Jordan and Watters 2015, Clifford and Montgomery 2017, Harrison 2015, Korhonen and Weil 2015, Leask 2013, Sanderson 2011, Svensson and Wihlborg 2010, Yemini and Sagie 2016; note how the research foci mirror the developmental stages for internationalization identified by Haigh (2014) and Engwall (2016)). Particular foci here have been on taking a global perspective to teaching and learning, what this implies, and its impact, not just on international students, but on home students (e.g. Machin and Murphy 2017) and teachers (e.g. Murray and McConachy 2018) in the 'international classroom' as well. A recent focus has been on the role of higher education in developing and promoting 'global citizenship' (e.g. Aktas et al 2017, Engel and Siczek 2017, Friedman 2018), the notion that all students now need to be prepared for taking their place in an increasingly global economy and society.

A particular concern here has been with the role of language, with English assuming the position of *lingua franca* in higher education, and universities in countries where English is not a mother tongue being encouraged or directed to offer more and more of their popular courses in the medium of English (Dlaska 2013, Doiz, Lasagabaster and Sierra 2013, Huang 2006, Kedzierski 2016, Robertson and Kedzierski 2016, Rose and

McKinley 2018, Zhang 2018). While making provision more accessible to international students, the effects are not necessarily positive for home students or for 'successful internationalization'. For example, in Denmark:

> Ideally, the internationalization of university education should be about designing study programs that bring together, support and take nourishment from the knowledge, cultural practices, life experiences and linguistic resources of students and staff from diverse backgrounds, in order to develop new ways of studying familiar and not-yet-so-familiar subjects, topics and problems. At present… language policies at Danish universities act as structural obstructions to this form of internationalization, because they institutionalize a non-integrated perspective on the local and the transnational. University language policies that make a sharp distinction between Danish (the local) and English (the non-local) actually nourish the paradoxes we have discussed in this paper, because they encourage a mindset that undermines a successful internationalization process. (Fabricius et al 2017, p. 592)

In addition to examining the student and staff experience, and the impact upon the curriculum, higher education researchers interested in globalization and internationalization have also looked at their effect on research (Kwiek 2015), governance and management (Enders 2004, King 2010, Warwick 2014), and on higher education institutions generally (Maringe et al 2013, Seeber et al 2016). Thus, Maringe et al note the different rationales for and responses to internationalization in different parts of the world:

> internationalisation strategies in universities across the world seem to be based on three emergent value-driven models. In western universities, a commercial imperative appears to underpin the internationalisation processes and understanding. In Confucian and many Middle East nations, there is a deep-seated cultural imperative at the heart of the internationalisation agenda. In the poorer universities of the south, a curriculum-value driven process seems to characterise the internationalisation priorities of universities there. (2013, p. 9)

Not all universities would appear, therefore, to be engaging in internationalization solely or chiefly for financial purposes (or perhaps it is that these opportunities are simply not available to all universities).

However, based on a study of over 400 European higher education institutions, which would mostly fit the first of Maringe et al's models, Seeber et al identify competitive pressures as underlying institutional and individual responses to internationalization:

> the salience of a given rationale for a specific HEI [higher education institution] results from factors at multiple levels. Being embedded in a globally competitive arena for status spurs a conception of

internationalization as instrumental to prestige. It appears that national contexts do not affect HEIs' rationales much, and that the amount of resources is less important than the resources competition for the selection of rationales. The immediate organizational context, both in terms of organizational goals and internal actors' interests, emerge as particularly relevant. (2016, p. 698)

Just as Haigh (2014), discussed earlier, identified a series of stages in the historical evolution of thinking about internationalization in higher education, so Knight, analogously, recognises three generations of international universities:

The classic model or first generation is an internationalized university with a diversity of international partnerships, international students and staff, and multiple international and intercultural collaborative activities at home and abroad. This is the most common model. The second generation is called the satellite model, which includes universities with satellite offices around the world in the form of branch campuses, research centers, and management/contact offices. Internationally cofounded universities constitute the third and most recent generation of international universities. These are stand-alone institutions co-founded or co-developed by two or more partner institutions from different countries. (2015, p. 107)

Clearly, as Knight suggests, most universities have yet to get beyond the first generation, while many of those who have attempted to join the second generation have found that the transition did not go as smoothly or profitably as they had hoped.

Cross-border or trans-national higher education has amassed a substantial specialist literature of its own (e.g. Amaral et al 2016, Bennell and Pearce 2003, Caruana 2016, Healey and Michael 2015, Kauppinen 2015, Knight 2016, Kosmützky and Putty 2016, Levatino 2017, Naidoo 2009, Nnazor 2018, Stafford and Taylor 2016, Youssef 2014). Tellingly, much of this is critical in tone.

Issues and Critique

As will be abundantly clear from the discussion so far, globalization and internationalization in higher education have been interpreted, addressed and researched in a variety of ways: e.g. in terms of system policy, teaching and learning, course design, the student experience, institutional management and academic work. They have also raised many issues and been the subject of a good deal of critique.

Some of these critiques have been largely accepting of globalization and internationalization but have argued that the responses to these trends

have not been good enough. Thus, there have been reservations about the quality of provision, particularly in transnational or cross-border higher education (e.g. Arunasalam 2016), where assertions that provision was of equal standard to that made in the home institution have been severely questioned. Others have doubted the extent to which universities have achieved what they claim in their internationalization strategies (e.g. Ayoubi and Massoud 2007) or queried the ethics of internationalization and its position on sustainability (Pashby and Oliveira Andreotti 2016).

Fabricius et al (2017) identify three paradoxes of internationalization that arise from the dissonance between an unqualified acceptance of it as a 'good thing' and its practical implications and impacts: internationalization and linguistic pluralism (which it tends to reduce), internationalization and intercultural understanding (undermined by national groups of students often sticking together), and internationalization and competitiveness (where the evidence is either lacking or mixed). In short, there is a significant difference between internationalization in theory (or in its ideal state) and internationalization in practice.

Healey (2008) takes a different approach to Pashby and Oliveira Andreotti on the issue of sustainability, arguing that it is the policies and strategies that have led to increasing internationalization of higher education that are contradictory and unsustainable:

> on the supply-side, the internationalisation of MESDC [main English-speaking destination countries] universities is a response to confused government policy, which has temporarily made the unregulated international student market more attractive than a highly regulated domestic market. The pressures that have led the MESDCs down this path are, to a greater or lesser extent, spreading to other parts of the world, notably continental Europe and Asia, as rising participation rates bite against constrained public subsidies for higher education… On the demand side… for mainstream students in developing countries, studying at a MESDC university has come to be regarded over the last 15 years as the only alternative for those who cannot secure a place at one of the leading universities in their home countries and who have the means to pay for a foreign education. As the higher education sectors in developing countries scale up and consumers become more sophisticated, it is likely that demand to study abroad… will decline rather than continue to grow at recent rates. (pp. 122-123)

Subsequent experience over the last decade has not (or at least not yet) borne out Healey's final prediction. What seems to be happening instead is that, while the main western nations remain popular student destinations, more and more countries, both developed and developing, are seeking to become 'hubs' or destinations for the increasing numbers of international students.

Perhaps even more concerningly, the recruitment of international students has been criticised as being inherently racist or neo-colonial. For example:

> the recruitment and reception of international students studying in the West are both structured by racialized logics, as both are embedded within the dominant global imaginary and its colonial myth of Western onto-epistemological supremacy… not only is resentment and interpersonal abuse toward international students framed by this imaginary, but also, ironically, efforts to welcome them as well. (Stein and de Andreotti 2016, p. 235)

This is reflected, on the one hand, in continuing adverse reactions to the presence of large numbers of international students in towns and cities hosting universities (Marginson et al 2010); and, on the other hand, in the persistence of a particular view as to the nature of 'world-leading' universities: 'an underlying entity profile, characterized by institutions with a high reputation, from the U.S. or other English-speaking countries, oriented towards research, that are active in hard sciences, and have extensive budgets' (Safon 2013, pp. 237-238).

A somewhat less trenchant critique of globalization and internationalization in higher education recognises that the position in practice is rather more complex than is often implied. Thus, Marginson and Rhoades, in a much-cited article, stress the linkages and inter-relationships between global, national and local levels or forces:

> We offer a Glonacal Agency Heuristic to frame comparative higher education research. 'Glonacal' incorporates three constituent terms - global, national, local. "Agency" refers to organized agencies and to the agency of human action… Our heuristic highlights the growing saliency of global agencies and relationships, including meta-national regions, in both the national and the local domains. At the same time, it emphasizes the continuing fecundity of local institutions and other agents at the national and global level. And it takes us beyond nation states, national markets, and national systems and institutions of higher education to consider organizational agencies and human agency at various levels. Such agencies and activities operate simultaneously in the three domains or planes of existence - global, national, local - amid multiple and reciprocal flows of activity. (2002, p. 305)

Marginson and Rhoades are surely correct to point out that, in paying increasing attention to global or international forces and developments in higher education, we should not ignore or overlook the continuing importance of national and local influences and practices. Thus, focusing on just one of these levels, Burnett and Huisman (2010) stress the importance of organizational culture in impacting on institutional responses.

However, probably by far the most thoroughgoing critique of globalization and internationalization in higher education – and one that is often delivered in a routine, condensed or shorthand form, almost as an instinctive reaction – is that is simply another expression of neo-liberalism (Harris 2008), or, at least, that the way in which it is being interpreted and practiced is:

> the current disillusionment about the co-opting of internationalization by neoliberal globalization stems from a kind of naïveté that internationalization itself already had a strong theoretical and practical basis for maintaining its own trajectory separate from economic globalization. (Beck 2012, p. 143)

This reading would place globalization and internationalization (as distinct from internationalism) not as 'a good thing' but very much as 'a bad thing': after all, the term 'neo-liberalism' is seldom used in social science research except in disparaging terms.

The pressures of globalization are, perhaps, felt most keenly in developing nations:

> the globalisation of higher education is ultimately based on the market-driven fundamentals of globalisation. Thus it creates more challenges than opportunities, particularly for the non-western developing countries. The most prominent challenges include quality control, information management, its fitness for local societies, and costs and benefits. When all of these aspects accompany each other, it brings the dangers of total lack of… genuine educational values. (Yang 2003, p. 284)

Thus, the national and local may be trumped by the global if a developing nation wishes to improve its status, and hopefully even compete, in higher education internationally.

This is confirmed by Engel and Siczek (2017) – but in the developed world - in their analysis of internationalization strategies in Australia, Canada, Ireland, the UK and the USA (i.e. the English-speaking countries). This identified 'a dominant approach to international education that is primarily competitive in its orientation, with national interest as the key driver' (p. 1).

Different conceptions and approaches are possible, however, as, most notably, Asian-based scholars are beginning to argue:

> Hegemonic understandings of globalization that prioritize western neoliberalism have inspired universities in Asian countries to enact globalization along these lines, but have also been the blinkers that have promoted the scholarship of Asian universities as emulating western universities. However, the Asian Century could become a time for dismantling this hegemony, and for embracing cultural and academic diversity. Researchers, public intellectuals, lecturers,

students and others have an important role to play in opening up the social imaginary of globalization of higher education for diverse understandings. For instance, the recent scholarship of higher education in Asia has critiqued both the now prominent discourse of the notion of westernization of education as well as counter discourses reliant on notions of Asian values, opening the way to critical discussions of hybrid Asian universities. Through discussion and reflexive writing academics can create alternative voices, that without totalizing or overriding "others"' voices, create a space for explorations of the power/knowledge effects of discourses and of the diversity of perspectives. Discussing and writing about hegemony, or about local knowledges, forgotten understandings, radical new ideas, or pioneering philosophies, are essential tools for change. By doing so, debaters and writers map out new territories for thought, critique, elaboration or inspiration. (Geerlings and Lundberg 2018, p. 238)

It is easily possible to imagine a not too distant future in which China and India, for example, become hub destinations for international students and scholars, offering an experience at least somewhat different from that to be had in the contemporary, western, world-leading university.

The western neo-liberal critique of globalization and internationalization in higher education might be viewed, therefore, as something of an 'own goal'. Rejecting globalization and internationalization, or elements thereof, may simply be interpreted as a rejection of progress and modernity. After all, there are few, if any, alternatives currently available that offer anything like the same level of actual or anticipated benefits.

Discussion and Conclusion

What does this analysis tell us about the significance of globalization and internationalization in, or to, higher education and higher education research in particular? I will draw out four main points, as well as a series of sub-points.

First, it is clear that the ideas, concepts or frameworks provided by globalization and internationalization have been, and are continuing to be, highly popular for thinking about and researching higher education, and for informing higher education policy and practice. While it would probably not be true to say that this popularity was genuinely global – there are, after all, nations and institutions where these forces have little influence - globalization and internationalization do draw attention to linkages between different parts of the world, and its developed and developing nations in particular.

However, it is important to emphasize that these trends or forces are not new; what is new is their particular form and intensity. Indeed, recast in an earlier, and subtly different, form as internationalism, globalization and

internationalization could be said to be amongst the key underlying values of higher education (Scott 1998b). From their very beginnings, universities have attracted, and have sought to attract, those interested in studying, from however far away (e.g. De Ridder-Symoens 1992). Indeed, one contemporary university model that is attracting considerable attention, Minerva, could be said to be essentially an up-to-date version of the medieval university (Kosslyn and Nelson 2017).

Furthermore, it is also clear that, while the global and international may be important levels at which to consider trends and developments in higher education, the national and the local levels still remain of critical importance (Marginson and Rhoades 2002). Many national systems, and sub-systems (as, for example, in Belgium, Canada, the UK and the USA), of higher education have retained their distinctive natures while still responding to the demands and opportunities presented by globalization and internationalization.

We need as well, however, to recognise the importance of the regional dimension, in the sense of the supra-national but not fully global. Thus, the European Union, and the European Higher Education Area more generally, offer the clearest example of a strong regional influence on higher education policy and research.

Second, globalization and internationalization, to a far greater extent than most frameworks applied to the study of higher education, draw attention to the division between what may be called pragmatic and idealistic conceptions of the purpose of higher education. At present the pragmatists – or neoliberals as some would currently term them – are in the ascendant, with their concerns for recruiting as many international students as possible, attracting highly qualified staff from other countries, and projecting the power and influence of specific higher education institutions or systems globally. The idealists, while being generally and genuinely critical, yet open to international influences, must largely confine themselves to improving the student experience and curriculum as best as they can, while continuing their critique.

There is often a sense, however, that, when globalization and internationalization (or, more generally, neoliberalism) are foregrounded in the debate, we are really talking about something else. Thus, the focus of policy and/or research is on the nature or quality of some aspect of provision or practice, while it is merely the context that is international or global. If provision or practice is found to be wanting in some way, it is not, then, globalization itself that is at fault, but the actions (or lack of action) of institutions and their employees.

This leads nicely to my third point. That is that the conclusion drawn by Dodds (2008), and discussed earlier, deserves further emphasis. Higher education and higher education institutions have a major role to play in globalization and internationalization. They – and particularly those that are, or aspire to be, 'world-leading' universities - are at least as much

drivers of these developments as responders to them, and the implications of this should not be overlooked. Globalization and internationalization, as the modern versions of internationalism, are simply in the interests of higher education institutions to encourage and exploit.

If the leading universities – and those that aspire to this status – together with most governments and international organizations, are both supporting and helping to drive the forces of globalization, there seems little that anyone – individual, organization or government - can do to stop these trends, even if that were desired. The most we can try to do is to ameliorate some of the unforeseen and disadvantageous consequences.

This does raise the interesting question of whether there is a university model that would simultaneously satisfy, at least to some extent, the wishes of both those who are keen on the contemporary version of higher education globalization and those who remain more wedded to the older ideals of internationalism. I am not aware of such a model, so am doubtful, though it might be argued that the contemporary internationalized university – which pursues the former policies while employing many who believe in the latter – is as close as we are going to get.

Fourth, and finally, in this context it seems curious, then, that higher education research is arguably less globalized and/or internationalized than the systems and institutions it studies. American higher education research, to take the most obvious example, while substantial in size is notoriously inward looking, typically not consulting any research published outside of America (Shahjahan and Kezar 2013, Tight 2014d). Higher education research in other countries is also often 'silo-ed' in this way, though usually to a lesser extent, as researchers in smaller systems need to look more broadly, including to America, to build up a body of relevant research.

Indeed, a similar argument might be made about higher education policy. Policy-makers seldom look far beyond national practices for other possible models of higher education provision. On a global level, only one national model, the American, may be said to have extensive influence, though the models of former imperial powers like France, Germany, Spain and the UK still exert considerable residual influence within their former colonies. The long-term influence of the emerging European model remains to be seen.

In moving our thinking about globalization and internationalization in higher education and higher education research forward, therefore, whether as higher education researchers, policy makers or practitioners, we ourselves need to think and act more globally and internationally.

In conclusion, then, it may be said that while globalization and internationalization have had, and are having, considerable influence on higher education policy and research, this influence forms part of a continuing tradition, and relies heavily on the complicity of the governments and institutions involved. Paradoxically, however, both researchers and policy-makers remain largely focused on national issues.

References

Ahola, S (2005) Global and Local Priorities in Higher Education Policies: a headache at the national level? *Tertiary Education and Management*, 11, 1, pp. 37-53.

Akar, H (2010) Globalization and its Challenges for Developing Countries: the case of Turkish higher education. *Asia Pacific Educational Review*, 11, pp. 447-457.

Aktas, F, Pitts, K, Richards, J, and Silova, I (2017) Institutionalizing Global Citizenship: a critical analysis of higher education programs and curricula. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 21, 1, pp. 65-80.

Albrow, M (1996) *The Global Age: state and society beyond modernity*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Altbach, P, and Knight, J (2007) The Internationalization of Higher Education: motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 3-4, pp. 290-305.

Amaral, A, Tavares, O, Cardoso, S, and Sin, C (2016) Shifting Institutional Boundaries through Cross-Border Higher Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 20, 1, pp. 48-60.

Arunasalam, N (2016) Impact of UK and Australian Transnational Higher Education in Malaysia. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 20, 3, pp. 242-259.

Ayoubi, R, and Massoud, H (2007) The Strategy of Internationalization in Universities: a quantitative evaluation of the intent and implementation in UK universities. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 21, 4, pp. 329-349.

Aziz, M, and Abdullah, D (2014) Finding the Next 'Wave' in Internationalization of Higher Education: focus on Malaysia. *Asia Pacific Educational Review*, 15, pp. 493-502.

Barnett, G, Lee, M, Jiang, K, and Park, H (2016) The Flow of International Students from a Macro Perspective: a network analysis. *Compare*, 46, 4, pp. 533-559.

Beck, K (2012) Globalization/s: reproduction and resistance in the internationalization of higher education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 35, 3, pp. 133-148.

Beck, U (2000) *What is Globalization?* Malden, MA, Polity.

Bedenlier, S, Kondakci, Y, and Zawacki-Richter, O (2018) Two Decades of Research into the Internationalization of Higher Education: major themes in the *Journal of Studies in International Education* (1997-2016). *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 22, 2, pp. 108-135.

Bedenlier, S, and Zawacki-Richter, O (2015) Internationalization of Higher Education and the Impacts on Academic Faculty Members. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 10, 2, pp. 185-201.

Beerkens, E (2003) Globalisation and Higher Education Research. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7, 2, pp. 128-148.

Bennell, P, and Pearce, T (2003) The Internationalisation of Higher Education: exporting education to developing and transitional economies. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 23, pp. 215-232.

Berchem, T (1991) The Internationalisation of Higher Education: the German perspective. *Higher Education*, 21, 3, pp. 297-304.

Berry, C, and Taylor, J (2014) Internationalisation in Higher Education in Latin America: policies and practice in Colombia and Mexico. *Higher Education*, 67, pp. 585-601.

Blanco Ramirez, G (2015) Translating Quality in Higher Education: US approaches to accreditation of institutions from around the world. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40, 7, pp. 943-957.

Bourn, D (2011) From Internationalisation to Global Perspectives. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 30, 5, pp. 559-571.

Bovill, C, Jordan, L, and Watters, N (2015) Transnational Approaches to Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: challenges and possible guiding principles. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 20, 1, pp. 12-23.

Brennan, J, and Teichler, U (2008) The Future of Higher Education and of Higher Education Research. Higher education looking forward: an introduction. *Higher Education*, 56, pp. 259-264.

Bruner, R, and Iannarelli, J (2011) Globalization of Management Education. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 22, pp. 232-242.

Buckner, E (2017) The Changing Discourse on Higher Education and the Nation-State, 1960-2010. *Higher Education*, 74, pp. 473-489.

Burnett, S-A, and Huisman, J (2010) Universities' Responses to Globalisation: the influence of organizational culture. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 14, 2, pp. 117-142.

Caruana, V (2016) Researching the Transnational Higher Education Policy Landscape: exploring network power and dissensus in a globalizing system. *London Review of Education*, 14, 1, pp. 56-69.

Castro, P, Woodin, J, Lundgren, U, and Byram, M (2016) Student Mobility and Internationalisation in Higher Education: perspectives from practitioners. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 16, 3, pp. 418-436.

Chan, S-J (2013) Internationalising Higher Education Sectors: explaining the approaches in four Asian countries. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 35, 3, pp. 316-329.

Chao, R (2014) Pathways to an East Asian Higher Education Area: a comparative analysis of East Asian and European regionalization processes. *Higher Education*, 68, pp. 559-575.

Clifford, V, and Montgomery, C (2017) Designing an Internationalised Curriculum for Higher Education: embracing the local and the global citizen. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 36, 6, pp. 1138-1151.

De Ridder-Symoens, H (ed) (1992) *A History of the University in Europe. Volume 1: universities in the middle ages*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, M (2006) Globalisation and International Higher Education: contested positionings. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10, 4, pp. 319-313.

Dlaska, A (2013) The Role of Foreign Language Programmes in Internationalising Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18, 3, pp. 260-271.

Dobbins, M, and Kwiek, M (2017) Europeanisation and Globalisation in Central and Eastern Europe: 25 years of changes revisited (1990-2015). *European Educational Research Journal*, 16, 5, pp. 519-528.

Dobson, I, and Hölttä, S (2001) The Internationalisation of University Education: Australia and Finland compared. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 7, 3, pp. 243-254.

Docquier, F, and Rapoport, H (2012) Globalization, Brain Drain and Development. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 50, 3, pp. 681-730.

Dodds, A (2008) How does Globalisation interact with Higher Education? The continuing lack of consensus. *Comparative Education*, 44, 4, pp. 505-517.

Doiz, A, Lasagabaster, D, and Sierra, J (2013) Globalisation, Internationalisation, Multilingualism and Linguistic Strains in Higher Education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38, 9, pp. 1407-1421.

Dolby, N (2010) Internationalizing Higher Education: the development of practice and policy in South Africa. *Teachers College Record*, 112, 7, pp. 1758-1791.

Dvir, Y, and Yemini, M (2016) European Commission Mobility Policies for Schools and Higher Education. *Journal of Education Policy*, DOI: 10.1080/02680939.2016.1243259.

Enders, J (2004) Higher Education, Internationalisation and the Nation-state: recent developments and challenges to governance theory. *Higher Education*, 47, pp. 361-382.

Enders, J, and Westerheijden, D (2011) The Bologna Process: from the national to the regional to the global, and back again. pp. 469-484 in King, R, Marginson, S, and Naidoo, R (eds) *Handbook on Globalization and Higher Education.* Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.

Engel, L, and Siczek, M (2017) A Cross-National Comparison of International Strategies: global citizenship and the advancement of national competitiveness. *Compare*, DOI: 10.1080/03057925.2017.1353408.

Engwall, L (2016) The Internationalisation of Higher Education. *European Review*, 24, 2, pp. 221-231.

Ennew, C, and Greenaway, D (eds) (2012) *The Globalization of Higher Education*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

Fabricius, A, Mortensen, J, and Haberland, H (2017) The Lure of Internationalisation: paradoxical discourses of transnational student mobility, linguistic diversity and cross-cultural exchange. *Higher Education*, 73, pp. 577-595.

Ferrer, A (2010) The Impact of the Bologna Process in Ibero-America: prospects and challenges. *European Journal of Education*, 45, 4, pp. 601-611.

Fischer, S, and Green, W (2018) Understanding Contextual Layers of Policy and Motivations for Internationalization: identifying connections and tensions. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 22, 3, pp. 242-258.

Friedman, J (2018) The Global Citizenship Agenda and the Generation of Cosmopolitan Capital in British Higher Education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 39, 4, pp. 436-450.

Gacel-Ávila, G (2005) The Internationalisation of Higher Education: a paradigm for global citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9, 2, pp. 121-136.

Geerlings, L, and Lundberg, A (2018) Global Discourses and Power/Knowledge: theoretical reflections on future higher education during the rise of Asia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 38, 2, pp. 229-240.

Gheorgiu, E, and Stephens, C (2016) Working with 'The Others': immigrant academics' acculturation strategies as determinants of perceptions of conflict at work. *The Social Science Journal*, 53, pp. 521-533.

Giddens, A (1999) *Runaway World: how globalisation is shaping our lives*. London, Profile.

Gomes, A, Robertson, S, and Dale, R (2012) The Social Condition of Higher Education: globalisation and (beyond) regionalisation in Latin America. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 10, 2, pp. 221-245.

Gornitzka, A, and Langfeldt, L (eds) (2008) *Borderless Knowledge: understanding the 'new' internationalisation of research and higher education in Norway*. Dordrecht, Springer.

Guilherme, A, Morosini, M, and dos Santos, P (2018) The Process of Internationalisation of Higher Education in Brazil: the impact of colonisation on south-south relations. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, DOI: 10.1080/14767724.2018.1440351.

Haigh, M (2014) From Internationalisation to Education for Global Citizenship: a multi-layered history. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 68, 1, pp. 6-27.

Hammond, C (2016) Internationalization, Nationalism and Global Competitiveness: a comparison of approaches to higher education in China and Japan. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 17, pp. 555-566.

Hanna, D, and Latchem, C (2002) Beyond National Borders: transforming higher education institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6, 2, pp. 115-133.

Harman, G (2004) New Directions in Internationalizing Higher Education: Australia's development as an exporter of higher education services. *Higher Education Policy*, 17, pp. 101-120.

Harris, S (2008) Internationalising the University. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 40, 2, pp. 346-357.

Harrison, N (2015) Practice, Problems and Power in 'Internationalization at Home': critical reflections on recent research evidence. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 20, 4, pp. 412-430.

Healey, N (2008) Is Higher Education *really* Internationalising? *Higher Education*, 55, pp. 333-355.

Healey, N, and Michael, L (2015) Towards a New Framework for Analysing Transnational Education. *Higher Education Policy*, 28, pp. 369-391.

Horie, M (2002) The Internationalization of Higher Education in Japan in the 1990s: a reconsideration. *Higher Education*, 43, 1, pp. 65-84.

Huang, F (2006) Internationalization of Curricula in Higher Education Institutions in comparative perspective: case studies of China, Japan and the Netherlands. *Higher Education*, 51, pp. 521-539.

Huang, F (2015) The Internationalization of Japan's Academy across Research and Non-research Universities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 19, 4, pp. 379-393.

Jesson, J, Matheson, L, and Lacey, F (2011) *Doing Your Literature Review: traditional and systematic techniques*. London, Sage.

Jiang, X (2010) A Probe into the Internationalisation of Higher Education in the New Zealand Context. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 42, 8, pp. 881-897.

Jokila, S (2015) The Internationalization of Higher Education with Chinese Characteristics: Appadurai's ideas explored. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 35, 1, pp. 125-139.

Jowi, J (2009) Internationalization of Higher Education in Africa: developments, emerging trends, issues and policy implications. *Higher Education Policy*, 22, pp. 263-281.

Kauppinen, I (2015) Towards a Theory of Transnational Academic Capitalism. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 36, 2, pp. 336-353.

Kedzierski, M (2016) English as a Medium of Instruction in East Asia's Higher Education Sector: a critical realist cultural political economy analysis of underlying logics. *Comparative Education*, 52, 3, pp. 375-391.

Kehm, B, and Musselin, C (eds) (2013) *The Development of Higher Education research in Europe: 25 years of CHER*. Rotterdam, Sense Publishers.

Kehm, B, and Teichler, U (2007) Research on Internationalisation in Higher Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 3-4, pp. 260-273.

King, R (2010) Policy Internationalization, National Variety and Governance: global models and network power in higher education states. *Higher Education*, 60, pp. 583-594.

King, R, Marginson, S, and Naidoo, R (eds) (2011) *Handbook on Globalization and Higher Education.* Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.

Kirkegaard, A, and Nat-George, S (2016) Fleeing through the Globalised Education System: the role of violence and conflict in international student migration. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 14, 3, pp. 390-402.

Knight, J (2012) Student Mobility and Internationalization: trends and tribulations. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 7, 1, pp. 20-33.

Knight, J (2015) International Universities: misunderstandings and emerging models? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 19, 2, pp. 107-121.

Knight, J (2016) Transnational Education Remodeled: toward a common TNE framework and definitions. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 20, 1, pp. 34-47.

Korhonen, V, and Weil, M (2015) The Internationalisation of Higher Education: perspectives on self-conceptions in teaching. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 14, 3, pp. 198-212.

Kosmützky, A, and Putty, R (2016) Transcending Borders and Traversing Boundaries: a systematic review of the literature on transnational, offshore, cross-border and borderless higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 20, 1, pp. 8-33.

Kosslyn, S, and Nelson, B (eds) *Building the Intentional University: Minerva and the future of higher education*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Kritz, M (2016) Why do Countries differ in their Rates of Outbound Student Mobility? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 20, 2, pp. 99-117.

Kwiek, M (2015) The Internationalization of Research in Europe: a quantitative study of 11 national systems from a micro-level perspective. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 19, 4, pp. 341-359.

Larsen, M (2016) Globalisation and Internationalisation of Teacher Education: a comparative case study of Canada and Greater China. *Teaching Education*, 27, 4, pp. 396-409.

Lavankura, P (2013) Internationalizing Higher Education in Thailand: government and university responses. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17, 5, pp. 663-676.

Leask, B (2013) Internationalizing the Curriculum in the Disciplines: imagining new possibilities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17, 2, pp. 103-118.

Levatino, A (2017) Transnational Higher Education and International Student Mobility: determinants and linkage. A panel data analysis of enrolment in Australian higher education. *Higher Education*, 73, pp. 637-653.

Li, M, and Bray, M (2007) Cross-border Flows of Students for Higher Education: push-pull factors and motivations of mainland Chinese students in Hong Kong and Macau. *Higher Education*, 53, pp. 791-818.

Liu, H, and Metcalfe, A (2016) Internationalizing Chinese Higher Education: a glonacal analysis of local layers and conditions. *Higher Education*, 71, pp. 399-413.

Lo, Y-W (2018) After Globalisation: a reconceptualization of transnational higher education governance in Singapore and Hong Kong. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 72, 1, pp. 3-14.

Loke, H-Y, Chia, Y-T, and Gopinathan, S (2017) Hybridity, the Developmental State and Globalisation: the case of Singapore's universities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42, 10, pp. 1887-1898.

Machin, S, and Murphy, R (2017) Paying Out and Crowding Out? The globalization of higher education. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 17, pp. 1075-1110.

Magyar, A, and Robinson-Pant, A (2011) Special Issue on University Internationalisation: towards transformative change in higher education. Internationalising doctoral research: developing theoretical perspectives on practice. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 17, 6, pp. 663-676.

Marginson, S, Nyland, C, Sawir, E, and Forbes-Mewett, H (2010) *International Student Security*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Marginson, S, and Rhoades, G (2002) Beyond National States, Markets and Systems of Higher Education: a glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education*, 43, 3, pp. 281-309.

Maringe, F, and Foskett, N (eds) (2010) *Globalization and Internationalization in Higher Education: theoretical, strategic and management perspectives*. London, Continuum.

Maringe, F, Foskett, N, and Woodfield, S (2013) Emerging Internationalisation Models in an Uneven Global Terrain: findings from a global survey. *Compare*, 43, 1, pp. 9-36.

Maringe, F, and Woodfield, S (2013) Contemporary Issues on the Internationalisation of Higher Education: critical and comparative perspectives. *Compare*, 43, 1, pp. 1-8.

Mok, K-H, and Han, X (2016) From 'Brain Drain' to 'Brain Bridging': transnational higher education development and graduate employment in China. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 36, 3, pp. 369-389.

Moon, R (2016) Internationalisation without Cultural Diversity? Higher education in Korea. *Comparative Education*, 52, 1, pp. 91-108.

Morace, C, May, D, Terkowsky, C, and Reynet, O (2017) Effects of Globalisation on Higher Engineering Education in Germany: current and future demands. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 42, 2, pp. 142-155.

Murray, N, and McConachy, T (2018) 'Participation' in the Internationalized Higher Education Classroom: an academic staff perspective. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 11, 3, pp. 254-270.

Mwangi, C, Latafat, S, Hammond, S, Kommers, S, Thoma, H, Berger, J, and Blanco-Ramirez, G (2018) Criticality in International Higher Education

Research: a critical discourse analysis of higher education journals. *Higher Education*, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0259-9.

Naidoo, V (2009) Transnational Higher Education: a stock take of current activity. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13, 3, pp. 310-330.

Ng, S (2012) Rethinking the Mission of Internationalization of Higher Education in the Asia-Pacific Region. *Compare*, 42, 3, pp. 439-459.

Nnazor, A (2018) A Sociological Framework for Understanding the Participation of African Higher Education Institutions in Transnational Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, DOI: 10.1177/1028315318786441.

O'Connor, S (2018) Problematising Strategic Internationalisation: tensions and conflicts between international student recruitment and integration policy in Ireland. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 16, 3, pp. 339-352.

Palmer, J, and Cho, Y (2012) South Korean Higher Education Internationalization Policies: perceptions and experiences. *Asia Pacific Educational Review*, 13, pp. 387-401.

Pan, S-Y (2013) China's Approach to the International Market for Higher Education Students: strategies and implications. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 35, 3, pp. 249-263.

Pashby, K, and Oliveira Andreotti, V de (2016) Ethical Internationalisation in Higher Education: interfaces with international development and sustainability. *Environmental Education Research*, 22, 6, pp. 771-787.

Primeri, E, and Reale, E (2012) How Europe shapes Academic Research: insights from participation in European Union framework programmes. *European Journal of Education*, 47, 1, pp. 104-121.

Richards, C (2018) Higher Education Privatisation, Internationalisation and Marketisation: Singaporean versus Malaysian models of Asian education hub policy. *Compare*, DOI: 10.1080/03057925.2017.1413638.

Rivza, B, and Teichler, U (2007) The Changing Role of Student Mobility. *Higher Education Policy*, 20, pp. 457-475.

Rizvi, F (2011) Theorizing Student Mobility in an Era of Globalization. *Teachers and Teaching*, 17, 6, pp. 693-701.

Robertson, S, and Kedzierski, M (2016) On the Move: globalising higher education in Europe and beyond. *The Language Learning Journal*, 44, 3, pp. 276-291.

Rose, H, and McKinley, J (2018) Japan's English-medium Instruction Initiatives and the Globalization of Higher Education. *Higher Education*, 75, pp. 111-129.

Russell, E (2015) The Internationalisation of Emerging Market Higher Education Providers: exploring transnational provision. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 16, 2, pp. 261-280.

Safon, V (2013) What do Global University Rankings really Measure? The search for the X factor and the X entity. *Scientometrics*, 97, pp. 223-244.

Salisbury, M, Umbach, P, Paulsen, M, and Pascarella, E (2009) Going Global: understanding the choice process of the intent to study abroad. *Research in Higher Education*, 50, pp. 119-143.

Sanderson, G (2011) Internationalisation and Teaching in Higher Education. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 30, 5, pp. 661-676.

Sawir, E (2013) Internationalisation of Higher Education Curriculum: the contribution of international students. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 11, 3, pp. 359-378.

Scott, P (ed) (1998a) *The Globalization of Higher Education*. Buckingham, Open University Press.

Scott, P (1998b) Massification, Internationalization and Globalization. pp. 108-129 in P Scott (ed) *The Globalization of Higher Education*. Buckingham, Open University Press.

Seeber, M, Cattaneo, M, Huisman, J, and Palerari, S (2016) Why do Higher Education Institutions internationalize? An investigation of the multilevel determinants of internationalization rationales. *Higher Education*, 72, pp. 685-702.

Sellar, S, and Gale, T (2011) Globalisation and Student Equity in Higher Education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 41, 1, pp. 1-4.

Shahjahan, R, and Kezar, A (2013) Beyond the 'National Container'. *Educational Research*, 42, 1, 20-29.

Shafaei, A, and Razak, N (2016) International Postgraduate Students' Cross-cultural Adaptation in Malaysia: antecedents and outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 57, pp. 739-767.

Shields, R (2013) Globalization and International Student Mobility: a network analysis. *Comparative Education Review*, 57, 4, pp. 609-636.

Söderlundh, H (2018) Internationalization in the Higher Education Classroom: local policy goals put into practice. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, DOI: 10.1177/1028315318773635.

Stafford, S, and Taylor, J (2016) Transnational Education as an Internationalisation Strategy: meeting the institutional management challenges. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 38, 6, pp. 626-636.

Stein, S, and Andreotti, V de (2016) Cash, Competition or Charity: international students and the global imaginary. *Higher Education*, 72, pp. 225-239.

Stromquist, N, and Monkman, K (eds) (2000) *Globalization and Education: integration and contestation across cultures*. Lanham, MD, Rowman and Littlefield.

Stukalova, I, Shiskhin, A, and Stukalova, A (2015) Internationalization of Higher Education: a case of Russian universities. *Economics and Sociology*, 8, 1, pp. 275-286.

Svensson, L, and Wihlborg, M (2010) Internationalising the Content of Higher Education: the need for a curriculum perspective. *Higher Education*, 60, pp. 595-613.

Svetlik, I, and Lalić, A (2016) The Impact of the Internationalisation of Higher Education on Academic Staff Development: the case of Slovenian public universities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 41, 2, pp. 364-380.

Tarhan, B, Samani, M, and Samani, H (2017) Modernization, Nationalization, Globalization: Turkish higher education and academics with a perspective on the problem of identity. *Quality and Quantity*, DOI 10.1007/s11135-017-0611-7.

Teichler, U (1998) The Role of the European Union in the Internationalization of Higher Education. pp. 88-99 in P Scott (ed) *The Globalization of Higher Education*. Buckingham, Open University Press.

Teichler, U (2004) The Changing Debate on Internationalisation of Higher Education. *Higher Education*, 48, 1, pp. 5-26.

Teichler, U (2009) Internationalisation of Higher Education: European experiences. *Asia Pacific Educational Review*, 10, pp. 93-106.

Teichler, U (2015) Academic Mobility and Migration: what we know and what we do not know. *European Review*, 23, S1, pp. S6-S37.

Tight, M (2012) *Researching Higher Education*. Maidenhead, Open University Press, second edition.

Tight, M (2013) Discipline and Methodology in Higher Education Research. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 32, 1, pp. 136-151.

Tight, M (2014a) Discipline and Theory in Higher Education Research. *Research Papers in Education*, 29, 1, pp. 93-110.

Tight, M (2014b) Theory Development and Application in Higher Education Research: the case of threshold concepts. pp. 249-267 in J Huisman and M Tight (eds), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research II*. Bingley, Emerald.

Tight, M (2014c) Collegiality and Managerialism: a false dichotomy? Evidence from the higher education research literature. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 20, 4, pp. 294-306.

Tight, M (2014d) Working in Separate Silos? What citation patterns reveal about higher education research internationally. *Higher Education*, 68, 3, pp. 379-395.

Tight, M (2015a) Theory Development and Application in Higher Education Research: the case of academic drift. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 47, 1, pp. 84-99.

Tight, M (2015b) Theory Development and Application in Higher Education Research: tribes and territories. *Higher Education Policy*, 28, 4, pp. 277-293.

Tight, M (2015c) Theory Development and Application in Higher Education: the case of communities of practice. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 5, 2, pp. 111-126.

Tight, M (2016a) Phenomenography: the development and application of an innovative research design in higher education research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 19, 3, pp. 319-338.

Tight, M (2016b) Examining the Research/Teaching Nexus. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 6, 4, pp. 293-311.

Tight, M (2018a) Tracking the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*, 2, 1, pp. 61-78.

Tight, M (2018b) *Higher Education Research: the developing field*. London, Bloomsbury.

Tight, M (2019) Mass Higher Education and Massification. *Higher Education Policy*, 32, 1, pp. 93-108.

Torgerson, C (2003) *Systematic Reviews*. London, Continuum.

Trahar, S, and Hyland, F (2011) Experiences and Perceptions of Internationalisation in Higher Education in the UK. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 30, 5, pp. 623-633.

Tsuruta, Y (2013) The Knowledge Society and the Internationalization of Japanese Higher Education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 33, 2, pp. 140-155.

Umakoshi, T (1997) Internationalization of Japanese Higher Education in the 1980s and early 1990s. *Higher Education*, 34, pp. 259-273.

Urban, E, and Palmer, L (2014) International Students as a Resource for Internationalization of Higher Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 18, 4, pp. 305-324.

Valimaa, J (2011) European Higher Education and the Process of Integration. pp. 256-272 in King, R, Marginson, S, and Naidoo, R (eds) *Handbook on Globalization and Higher Education.* Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.

Walker, P (2014) International Student Policies in UK Higher Education from Colonialism to the Coalition: developments and consequences. *Journal of Studies in Higher Education*, 18, 4, pp. 325-344.

Wamboye, E, Adekola, A, and Sergi, B (2015) Internationalisation of the Campus and Curriculum: evidence from the US institutions of higher learning. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 37, 4, pp. 385-399.

Warwick, P (2014) The International Business of Higher Education: a managerial perspective on the internationalisation of UK universities. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 12, pp. 91-103.

Wende, M van der (2001) Internationalisation Policies: about new trends and contrasting paradigms. *Higher Education Policy*, 14, pp. 249-259.

Wende, M van der (2007) Internationalization of Higher Education in the OECD Countries: challenges and opportunities for the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 3-4, pp 274-289.

Wit, H de (2011) Globalisation and Internationalisation of Higher Education. *Revista de Universidad y Sociedad del Conocimiento*, 8, 2, pp. 241-248.

Wu, H (2018) Three Dimensions of China's 'Outward-Oriented' Higher Education Internationalization. *Higher Education*, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0262-1.

Yang, R (2003) Globalisation and Higher Education Development: a critical analysis. *International Review of Education*, 49, 3-4, pp. 269-291.

Yemini, M, and Sagie, N (2016) Research on Internationalisation in Higher Education: exploratory analysis. *Perspectives: policy and practice in higher education*, 20, 2-3, pp. 90-98.

Youssef, L (2014) Globalisation and Higher Education: from within-border to cross-border. *Open Learning*, 29, 2, pp. 100-115.

Zhang, Z (2018) English-Medium Instruction Policies in China: internationalisation of higher education. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 39, 6, pp. 542-555.

Zmas, A (2015) Global Impacts of the Bologna Process: international perspectives, local particularities. *Compare*, 45, 5, pp. 727-747.