1. INTRODUCTION

This book offers the reader a range of perspectives on the theme of local and global internationalisation of higher education from a globally dispersed group of authors. The theme was chosen by Hans de Wit as the topic of his Farewell Seminar on leaving the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, and the chapters in the book have been developed in part out of that seminar. The resulting varied contributions reflect the many facets of the theme and emphasise the notion that, while internationalisation in higher education is strongly connected to the globalisation of our society, it is at the same time deeply embedded in local political, economic and social structures, systems and cultures.

There is little doubt that the internationalisation is receiving ever-increasing attention from institutions around the world. The drivers, mix of activities, and extent of engagement across institutions shows great variation globally, but invariably the impact of internationalisation is becoming more noticeable at the local level. Internationalisation activities are dominated by international mobility of students, staff, and programs, but internationalisation at home also continues to gain momentum as a key aspect of practice.

The book is divided into six sections, in turn dealing with internationalisation in local and global contexts, the drivers for change, internationalisation of the curriculum, the outcomes of international education, and the impact of internationalisation on employability. It concludes with a section of observations on local and global internationalisation at regional or national levels. The section titles make it clear the book highlights that increasing attention given to internationalisation is not simply leading to more of the same, just on a larger scale. Diversification and broadening of internationalisation practice is leading to a deepening of our understanding of what is needed to enhance the educational experiences of our students. In turn, the learning outcomes from internationalisation are increasingly being recognised as contributing to the type of skills needed in a globalised and multicultural society, a clearly discernable thread of the chapters in this volume.

A further thread addresses a number of questions from an academic practitioner perspective: “What is in it for me?” Why should I be interested in internationalisation of higher education, or indeed, why should this topic detract from other important aspects of my work? The often-heard complaint is that internationalisation is seen as something that needs to be added on; something that is new and competing...
for space/time in a course rather than embedded within teaching, learning and assessment practice, with appropriate learning outcomes as a fundamental element of the students’ programme.

The issue of addressing stakeholder needs is clearly articulated in the chapter by Hans de Wit. This has been one of a number of themes in his writing over the years, with the starting point that we do not need more of the same without addressing the question of why we are trying to internationalise. Robert Coelen’s chapter continues this notion and proposes that we need to define internationalisation as a learner-centred activity with clearly articulated learning outcomes. He argues that a greater level of interaction with pre-tertiary education is required in order to take advantage of the international experiences that students bring with them as they enter university.

The increased energy put in internationalisation has created a greater mix of global and local opportunities. This has increased the range and number of stakeholders that play a role in or stand to benefit from it. As Laura Rumbley and Philip Altbach present in their chapter, the challenge for each of the stakeholders is to make sense of this complex kaleidoscope of opportunities. Governments are developing policies based on the internationalisation activities of universities to facilitate building their knowledge-based economy.

In another take on the future of internationalisation, John Hudzik’s chapter discusses how it might help navigate the dramatic changes the world is expected to undergo over the next two decades or so. The influence of the traditional Western higher education powers on internationalisation is expected to wane, whilst those of Asia and later other regions of the world will gain in importance. These thoughts are reflected on more fully by Hanneke Teekens who poses some challenging questions for the ‘West’. In particular, how its higher education institutions will cope with the changing global order and the challenges of urbanisation, ageing, and the effects of technology. Perhaps institutions can take lessons from Montague’s storydoing and Clark’s organisational saga as concepts to enable them to undertake the necessary transformation as Fiona Hunter puts it in her chapter. Or maybe the Collaborative Online International Learning model (COIL), as Jon Rubin explains, could provide part of the answer to engage students in their home context rather than requiring them to study abroad.

Several chapters draw attention to the need for a greater focus on internationalisation of the curriculum at home, in particular those from Betty Leask, Jos Beelen, Elspeth Jones, Bernhard Streitwieser and Gregory Light. Betty Leask makes the argument that academic staff, where necessary, should be given expert support to ensure that Internationalisation of the Curriculum receives sufficient focus to deliver intended internationalised learning outcomes. Jos Beelen considers six themes around internationalisation at home drawing evidence from the 4th Global Survey of the International Association of Universities in comparison with Trends 2015 of the European University Association and the EAIE Barometer of the European Association for International Education.
One of the often-quoted intended outcomes of study abroad is to prepare graduates to be good global citizens. This term suffers from a great diversity of conceptualisations and a lack of clear understanding of how it can be measured or whether it is even useful as a concept. Bernard Streitwieser and Gregory Light reflect on student perceptions of the term and argue for more meaningful debate on intercultural engagement.

Further focus on the learning outcomes of internationalisation is provided in the third section of this book. Jeanine Gregersen-Hermans addresses the development of intercultural competence and argues that universities fall short in their mission to deliver on this through a lack of organisational capability. Indeed, according to Darla Deardorff, universities often fail in their quest to measure the learning outcomes in an adequate way. This is particularly true for intercultural competence and significant attention is required to get this right. Marcel van der Poel takes up the notion of faculty support, earlier addressed by Betty Leask, and describes the development of, and successful experience with, an intercultural training environment for academic staff.

It is becoming increasingly clear that at least the mobility elements of internationalisation are having a positive impact on employability. This is in itself a worthwhile outcome, but requires a more nuanced approach if mobility participation is to be widened as Elspeth Jones comments in her chapter. She offers a mobility model for practitioners and highlights the need to internationalise the curriculum at home so that all students can benefit, not only the mobile few. Uwe Brandenburg, Obdulia Taboadela and Mihaela Vancea consider the outcomes of the Erasmus Impact Study of 2014 and highlights its key findings from the perspective of a range of stakeholders, notably students and employers. Both personal and professional dimensions of mobility are considered, with the conclusion that mobility can be life-changing.

Nannette Ripmeester looks at the skills gained from studying abroad and how they benefit graduates in the work place. She argues that the increasing attention paid to such skills by employers requires students to interpret their experiences in terms that employers will appreciate. Erik Kostelijk and Maarten Regouin present a case study of the added value of international mobility and consider personality factors which may be at play. They contend that profession-specific skills may not be enhanced any more through mobility than through the same period at home, although other kinds of learning clearly do take place.

This book would not be complete without offering the reader a breadth of impressions from a number of countries or regions around the world. This is particularly important in view of the great variation of conceptualisations and state of play in different countries. Jocelyne Gacel-Ávila and Francisco Marmolejo give an overview of internationalisation in Latin America and the Caribbean and how it has been progressing in recent times. Edilio Mazzoleni and Robert Coelen discuss the attempt at transformation of Italian Higher Education through legislation and the opportunities this presents for further internationalisation of the Italian system.
Adinda van Gaalen and Renate Gielesen discuss how internationalisation at home can be further stimulated in The Netherlands based on the results of a study of 54 Dutch higher education institutions. Finally, Adriana Pérez Encinas shows the response to the ERASMUS program at a time of significant economical hardship in Spain and how students see mobility as an opportunity to enhance their employment prospects.

Many of the chapters in this book, in one way or another, address the question posed earlier in this introduction: “What is in it for me?” This question represents a positive driver for the discussion on the societal effects of internationalisation of higher education. Inevitably, a single question leads to a whole range of questions. How can we define more precise learning outcomes that underpin learning and teaching? How do we avoid the societal risks of internationalisation and ensure that internationalisation opportunities and benefits are shared equally? How do we prevent brain drain and commercialisation? What are the values that underlie our actions? These are only some of the questions that will occupy our minds, locally and globally, in the years to come.

This book as well as the Seminar which originated it are joint products of the Centre for Applied Research in Economics and Management (CAREM) of the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, The Netherlands, and of the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) of the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy. Over the past five years, Hans de Wit has been affiliated with both centres as a scholar in the field of internationalisation of higher education, before moving to his current position as Director of the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) at Boston College, USA. We thank the two centres for their support in making this publication possible.
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PART ONE

INTERNATIONALIZATION IN LOCAL AND GLOBAL CONTEXTS
2. THE LOCAL AND THE GLOBAL IN HIGHER EDUCATION INTERNATIONALIZATION

A Crucial Nexus

Analysis of higher education internationalization has typically gone in two directions. Those concerned with the practical aspects of internationalization—such as student mobility programs, campus internationalization efforts, and similar initiatives—have been focused on the “local” aspects of the theme. Policy-makers and others more concerned with strategy for universities or governments, or with broadly understanding internationalization as a trend, have engaged in “global” analyses. Here, the focus has been on broader strategic, structural, socio-economic, and political issues. The dialog between these strands in the discussion has been quite limited.

It is clear, however, that the global and the local are linked both in practical and analytical terms. Broader trends affect campus-based programs and policies. At the same time, decisions “on the ground” at universities impact national policy, and can coalesce into wider developments, as well. We will focus first on some patterns of internationalization playing out at the level of individual institutions and then on some key current global trends. We will then endeavor to address a fundamental question: What are the implications of the dynamic interplay between the local and global dimensions of internationalization?

CURRENT TRENDS IN INTERNATIONALIZATION AT THE INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

Internationalization at the campus level remains rooted in a number of tried and true approaches, but is also evolving in new directions—and facing new challenges. Student mobility remains a bedrock component of the internationalization agendas of most institutions, but there are notable efforts to innovate in this area. For example, in North America and Europe, many program administrators are working (with limited success) to encourage their students to consider outward mobility experiences in “non-traditional” locations, particularly in Asia, but also in Africa and Latin America. Students are also now finding more options to incorporate research, work, and volunteer activities into their overseas study experience (Farrugia, 2013). Programming is also increasingly concerned with taking a “comprehensive” approach to student learning and development. Here, the focus is on endeavoring...
to ensure that students are well-prepared before the mobility experience, well-supported while abroad, and able to make the most of the what they learn as mobile students once they return home.

On the inbound mobility side, there is growing attention paid to assessing the foreign student experience and to providing the necessary supports so that international students can make the most of their time at the host institution. At the same time, while certainly not discounting the enhanced revenue streams that (in some systems) come with the inflow of full fee-paying students, host institutions appear to be increasingly interested in extracting maximal benefits from the presence of international students and scholars in both intellectual and cultural terms.

The question of how best to leverage the resources of an international student and scholar population on campus is directly in line with the growing understanding that international mobility will likely never be something in which all students participate, and that “internationalization at home” (de Wit, 2010) must play a key role in the internationalization agenda. To this end, there is a great deal of experimentation underway across many university campuses, ranging from efforts to expand international perspectives across curricula (Brewer & Leask, 2012), encourage faculty engagement with internationalization (Institute of Education, 2012), and develop strategic partnerships with foreign institutions that allow for collaboration across many different areas of teaching, research, and community engagement (Rumbley & Helms, 2012). Institutional-level internationalization may also include physically expanding operations abroad, through the establishment of all manner of “outposts” of the home institution in foreign locations (Kinser & Lane, 2012).

At the campus level, internationalization is in a growth phase in many countries. This growth may be expressed either in real terms (such as increasing student mobility or growing numbers of international partnerships), or simply in terms of institutions’ articulated aspirations to do more in the international arena. Growth brings new possibilities, as well as challenges.

Some universities with limited resources or visibility find it expedient to work with “third party providers”—i.e., companies or non-profit organizations external to the institution—to achieve their internationalization goals. Third party providers can provide information, support services, and networking resources that an institution alone cannot marshal. However, particularly when working with for-profit agents or other commercial entities, serious questions and conflicts may arise concerning the extent to which the third party provider’s business model is compatible with the mission and objectives of a not-for-profit higher education institution. Much debate surrounds these dynamics today, and many institutions are thus faced with complex choices about how to manage and develop their international footprint. This is especially true in light of the fact that international education is a dynamic, fast-changing, and increasingly competitive area in which individual universities may wish (indeed, need) to distinguish themselves for crucial “market placement” purposes.
EMERGING GLOBAL INTERNATIONALIZATION THEMES

Internationalization has become “big business” globally, in some sense directly, with for-profit entities of all kinds making a business of student mobility, language training for international students, and new “pathways” programs. Likewise, we see the growing importance of agents and recruiters, and other such actors. Uwe Brandenburg and Hans de Wit (2011) have analyzed the growing commercialization of international higher education.

Countries, as well as individual academic institutions, involve themselves in internationalization activities for many complex reasons. Increasingly, among the major motivating forces is the need to earn revenues, as state budgets are reduced and the pressure to serve growing numbers of students and to ensure high quality grows. International student enrollments are increasingly seen as revenue sources. Internationalization is also seen as a way to improve not only an individual university’s place in the global rankings, but also a country’s global profile; visibility on the rankings is understood as a way of building an international name brand.

A significant element of internationalization is regionalization. This trend has a significant tradition. The Erasmus scholarship program to encourage cross-border mobility in Europe started in the late 1980s, while a larger set of initiatives, under the umbrella of the Bologna Process, instituted in 1999 a much larger array of reforms aimed at European higher education integration. Smaller initiatives were launched in North America, and are now taking place in Latin America, Southeast Asia, and Africa. The concept behind these diverse efforts is to better link academic institutions, as well as students and faculty, in a regional context.

Cross-border higher education is a newer element of internationalization. This concept includes branch campuses, joint-degree programs, and a range of other initiatives. Typically, these programs feature the involvement of universities in Europe, North America, or Australia in developing or middle-income countries. However, China, Mexico, and India, among other countries, have their own cross-border initiatives, as well. Often, cross-border programs are intended to earn income for the sponsoring university, and to provide capacity or specific expertise to a particular institution in the host country. The host country may also be looking for more system-wide effects from the presence of foreign providers, to include expanded access to local students, or prestige as a regional “education hub” (Knight, 2014). Without question, cross-border initiatives are growing in scope and complexity and are an increasingly important part of internationalization.

Double and joint degrees are growing in popularity, and present unique opportunities for students and faculty to expand their perspectives and for universities to develop deeper relationships with peer institutions. They can also be fraught with serious difficulties, particularly in regard to issues of quality assurance and credential recognition for graduates. Responsible bodies (often at the national level) tasked with oversight of higher education quality and the evaluation of credentials are challenged to make sense of many new types of programmatic arrangements,
and to apply standards thoughtfully and judiciously in a complex international environment.

Perhaps nowhere is our understanding about the quality and comparability of cross-border higher education more deeply challenged than in the context of MOOCs, or massive open online courses. MOOCs offer enormous potential to transform the higher education landscape, with profound implications for the internationalization of higher education. Technology has already had a significant impact on different aspects of teaching, learning, and research. In the internationalization sphere, this has been particularly notable in terms of the much-enhanced ease of communication and collaboration that has come of greatly improved information and communication technologies in recent years. With the advent of MOOCs, questions about the future of higher education are taken to an entirely new level, bringing with them discussions of such matters as “virtual mobility,” “virtual internationalization,” and the like. Of course, the hype may far outpace the reality of ensuing developments. But a global conversation around these topics is clearly underway, along with much experimentation with new kinds of border-crossing platforms and approaches.

TRAINING AND RESEARCH TO MEET NEW CHALLENGES

The local and the global are clearly intertwined in today’s internationalization of higher education. As we have shown, they are often linked in specific programs and initiatives. Indeed, it seems as if many aspects of internationalization exhibit these two dimensions, or realities, in one way or another. A good example is the branch campus. Branch campus developments are part of a global trend in cross-border higher education, but at the same time they are quite specific to the local context in which they occur and to the institutional actors involved in this international transaction. The nexus between the local and global is increasingly important to international initiatives of all kinds, and understanding this relationship is key to comprehending the increasingly complex nature of 21st century higher education internationalization. Most crucially, dealing effectively with this complexity requires a commitment to the training of thoughtful practitioners in the field, working in tandem with researchers, policymakers, and institutional leaders who are sensitive to the practicalities that reside within the “big issues” dominating so many strategic discussions about internationalization today.

This raises a very fundamental question: where and how are practitioners, researchers, and policymakers trained for the work they do, and to what extent is internationalization a focus of this training? Work recently completed by the Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) to map the global landscape of higher education research and training (Rumbley et al., 2014) provides a number of insights that are in some ways encouraging, but also leaves many questions decidedly unanswered.

Rumbley et al. (2014) found that, globally, there are some 217 research centers around the world focused primarily on higher education, as well as 277 academic
programs granting graduate-level degrees or other credentials in the field of higher education studies. A survey of these centers and programs found that a significant proportion of the both research centers and academic programs in higher education list “comparative or international studies,” as well as “globalization and internationalization,” among their primary areas of specialized focus or expertise (see Table 1).

Table 1. Most frequently selected “primary areas of specialized focus or expertise” for higher education research centers and programs worldwide, by percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centers</th>
<th>Focus areas</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparative or international studies</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration, management, or leadership</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics, financing, or funding of higher education</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization or internationalization</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality assurance, assessment, or accreditation</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Focus areas</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration, management, or leadership</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative or international studies</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and instruction or teaching and learning</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics, Financing, or Funding of Higher Education</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization or internationalization</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Profession</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The global data provide some encouragement for the idea that comparative and international studies, as well as issues of internationalization and globalization, are recognized as important in higher education training and research circles. However, many questions and anomalies come with these data. For example, there does not seem to be the same level of commitment to these issues across different regions of the world. Notably, the United States is home to 70 percent of the degree-granting academic programs in higher education identified by the global inventory. However, just 6.7 percent of programs in North America indicate that comparative and international studies are a key focus area, and a mere 8.2 percent point to globalization and internationalization as primary topics of interest. By contrast, although comparatively smaller in absolute numbers, 53.3 percent of Asian and 22.7 percent of European academic programs register a primary interest in comparative and international studies, while globalization and internationalization are apparently
key focus areas for 31.1 of Asian programs and 31.8 of European programs. Similar variations on this theme can be seen in the analysis of the priorities of research centers.

An examination of the ages (i.e., years of establishment) of the centers and programs included in inventory seems to reinforce the pervasive sense that globalization and internationalization are areas of growing interest. Among research centers focusing to some extent on these topics, 56 percent were established from the year 2000 onwards; 60 percent of academic programs indicating some specialization in globalization and internationalization were also established in the last 14 years.

These numbers begin to scratch the surface of a complex picture of training and research relevant to our deeper understanding of internationalization’s realities, at the local and global levels, and the extent to which personnel working in our universities are trained in these areas. But, there is much we do not know. How many individuals are trained in the academic programs identified by the inventory? Are the courses offered of sufficient quality, as determined by whom? What is the scope and impact of the research produced by the world’s higher education research centers focused on internationalization? What specific topics and issues are being addressed, or skills being cultivated? What is the relationship between research, training, and policymaking? And what about the training that is occurring outside of degree-granting academic programs, by ministries, foundations, corporations, and the like?

THE CRUCIAL NEXUS

The American author F. Scott Fitzgerald (1945) is credited with saying that “the test of a first-rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in mind at the same time and still retain the ability to function.” Internationalization’s global and local dimensions do not represent categorical opposites. They do, however, challenge practitioners, researchers, and policymakers the world over to make sense of a complex panorama of opportunities and imperatives, in a fluid, multifaceted, and potentially high-stakes environment. What is called for then is “intelligent internationalization,” which demands that those participating in the elaboration of internationalization activities and agendas have access to the information, ideas, and professional skill-building opportunities that will enhance their ability to navigate the crucial nexus of internationalization at global and local levels.
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3. MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT (THE END OF) INTERNATIONALISATION

The Current State of Play

In 2011, I wrote two essays, which can be seen as capitalizing on the start of my professorship in Internationalisation of Higher Education at the School of Economics and Management of the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences in 2009.

The first one, together with Uwe Brandenburg, had the provocative title ‘The End of Internationalization’ (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011). We spoke about our concerns of an increasingly more instrumentalist approach, a devaluation of its meaning, lack of innovation, and warned that we should no longer take things for granted and reinvent internationalisation for the future. We made an appeal on four points:

a. We have to move away from dogmatic and idealistic concepts of internationalisation and globalisation;

b. We have to understand these concepts in their pure meanings – not as goals in themselves but rather as means to an end;

c. We have to throw off the veil of ignorance and ask ourselves: why do we do certain things, and how do they help in achieving the goal of quality of education and research in a globalised knowledge society?

d. We should carefully reconsider our preoccupation with instruments and means and rather invest a lot more time into questions of rationales and outcomes.

The most important in our view, though was “to rethink and redefine the way we look at the internationalisation of higher education in the present time.”

In the same year, as part of my Public Lecture as professor, I wrote about Misconceptions of Internationalisation, published also as a separate essay (de Wit, 2011). Building on the previous essay I noted that there is still a predominantly activity-oriented or even instrumental approach towards internationalisation. I mentioned nine misconceptions, wherein internationalisation is regarded as synonymous with a specific programmatic or organizational strategy to promote internationalisation, in other words: where the means appear to have become the goal.

These two essays received quite some attention and created much debate in the field of international education, and certainly have contributed to my recent selection together with my friend Mike Woolf as a leading Provocateur in International Education (http://www.ieleaders.net/). They also contributed to the start of a discussion by the International Association of Universities on rethinking...
internationalisation. I have mentioned eight reasons for this need to rethink internationalisation (de Wit, 2013), again building on the two previous essays:

1. The discourse of internationalisation does not always match reality in that, for too many universities, internationalisation means merely a collection of fragmented and unrelated activities, rather than a comprehensive process;

2. The further development of globalisation, the increasing commodification of higher education and of the notion of a global knowledge society and economy, has resulted in a new range of forms, providers and products, and new, sometimes conflicting dimensions, views and elements in the discourse of internationalisation;

3. The international higher education context is rapidly changing. ‘Internationalisation’ like ‘international education’ was until recently predominantly a western phenomenon in which the developing countries only played a reactive role. Now the emerging economies and higher education communities in other parts of the world are altering the landscape of internationalisation. This shift away from a western, neo-colonial concept, as ‘internationalisation’ is perceived by several educators, means incorporating other emerging views;

4. The discourse on internationalisation is often dominated by a small group of stakeholders: higher education leaders, governments and international bodies. Other stakeholders, such as employers, and in particular the faculty and the student voice are heard far less often, with the result that the discourse is insufficiently influenced by those who should benefit from its implementation;

5. Too much of the discourse is oriented towards national and institutional levels with little attention to programmes themselves. Research, the curriculum, and the teaching and learning processes, which should be at the core of internationalisation, as expressed by movements such as ‘Internationalisation at Home’, often receive little attention;

6. Internationalisation is evaluated too often in quantitative terms through numbers, or input and output, instead of a qualitative, outcomes approach based on the impact of internationalisation initiatives;

7. To date there has been insufficient attention to norms, values and the ethics of internationalisation practice. With some notable exceptions, the approach has been too pragmatically oriented towards reaching targets without a debate on the potential risks and ethical consequences;

8. The increased awareness that the notion of ‘internationalisation’ is not only a question of the relations between nations but even more of the relations between cultures and between the global and the local, the leading theme of this seminar.

In presentations, blogs, articles and books I have been building on these eight rationales, alone and together with others, in particular Elspeth Jones (Jones & de Wit, 2012). With her I wrote about the fact that internationalisation was not so much coming to an end, but that one of the fascinating new developments of the concept is its globalisation.
MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT (THE END OF) INTERNATIONALISATION

The rethinking process has resulted in A Call for Action, ‘Affirming Academic Values in Internationalisation of Higher Education’, by the International Association of Universities, April 2012 (International Association of Universities, 2012).

It also has contributed to the ‘Global Dialogue on the Future of International Education’ organized by the ‘International Education Association of South Africa’ (IEASA) in January 2014, and the Nelson Mandela Bay Global Dialogue Declaration (IEASA, 2014) signed by the key international education associations around the world on that occasion, focusing on three integrated areas of development:

• Enhancing the quality and diversity in programmes involving the mobility of students and academic and administrative staff;
• Increasing focus on the internationalisation of the curriculum and of related learning outcomes;
• Gaining commitment on a global basis to equal and ethical higher education partnerships.

I must confess that the blog for University World News I wrote with Nico Jooste (de Wit & Jooste, 2014) on the dialogue and the declaration, has also most likely contributed to my selection as leading provocateur, but it was and is not my intention nor that of Nico Jooste to deny the relevance of the declaration and the three focus points for the future of internationalisation which were agreed upon.

From the above it becomes clear that over the past years, a most needed intense and stimulating, sometimes provocative debate about the future of internationalisation has taken place. The directions it will take are also taking shape. A long road to their implementation and adaptation to ever more rapidly changing global developments is still to follow. The critical political and economic climate in the world, and in particular in Europe where nationalism seems to become more dominant than Europeanism or globalism, is not a solid foundation for more internationalisation.

There are some positive signs though, such as the development of and increased budget for ERASMUS+ and the new strategy ‘European Higher Education in the World’ (European Commission, 2013).

There is also an increasing number of studies that show a positive impact of study abroad on employability and European and global identity, compared to non-mobile students (for instance European Commission, 2014). But unfortunately, also I notice a continuing focus in national and institutional strategies on most of the misconceptions I identified in 2011: more teaching in English, more recruitment of international students, more study abroad, more partnerships, little assessment of international and intercultural learning outcomes, all for the sake of output and quantitative targets, while failing to focus on impact and outcomes.

If I would add one main misconception to the list of nine, I would say: ‘you cannot define the what, how and outcome of internationalisation strategies without first having answered the ‘Why’. Over the years I have been involved in the preparation and evaluation of many internationalisation strategies, both at the (inter)national, institutional and programme level. And still in nearly all cases this question is not or
is only very superficially and marginally answered. But how can clear objectives and goals be defined, and how can the intercultural and international learning outcomes be defined and assessed, without first having described the specific (inter)national, institutional and/or programmatic context and, based on that context, the relevance of the internationalisation strategy?

Unless we constantly ask ourselves the question ‘Why?’, we are in essence failing to acknowledge our purpose in seeking to internationalise, one could even say we ‘have reached the end of internationalisation’ without achieving our objectives, in reference to the title of the essay of 2011.

Whenever there is discussion of a vision for internationalisation, the question ‘Why?’ should be at the heart of it, but unfortunately that is in general not the case. The recent joint document of the Association of Dutch Universities (VSNU) and the Association of Universities of Applied Sciences (Vereniging Hogescholen), Visie Internationaal (Vision International) of March 2014, as well as the subsequent vision paper of the Dutch Minister of Education of July 15, 2014 (Coelen, 2014), are examples of a lack of focus on the question ‘Why?’ and by that a lack of vision for internationalisation. In themselves, the actions proposed in these two documents are relevant, but by lack of a clear vision, the context, their implementation and the impact of the actions remain unclear.

One might wonder how this is related to the theme of Global and Local Internationalisation. The link between globalisation and localization comes to my mind as one that has many different aspects related to my work over the past 5 years:

1. My work for the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences and its School of Economics and Management in its efforts to internationalise has always been combined with my work in the global arena. The one should feed the other and vice versa;
2. Local, meaning at city level, is becoming increasingly more important than national, ie at state level, in and because of globalisation, and this is certainly also the case with higher education.
3. Local, in the meaning of interculturality and diversity, is bringing the global into our direct environments, and increasingly also into institutions of higher education. The divide between intercultural and international is no longer relevant, just as it is not for local and global.
4. The same applies to the professional field: enterprises, social sectors and organisations increasingly combine local and global dimensions. Take for example the health sector and law, two fields that 10 to 15 years ago were rather local and national, and which have now moved to the forefront of internationalisation.

This increased intertwining of local and global in my view is an essential part of the internationalisation for the kind of future which I referred to earlier. It will require that we, as international educators, more than ever look at what is happening elsewhere and do not stay in our own cocoon. The work of my colleague at CAREM
in Amsterdam, Willem van Winden, on urban management and the knowledge economy, is one example. The work of Darla Deardorff on intercultural competences is another example. The Global Talent Bridge work on Community Engagement by World Education Services, headed by Mariam Assefa, on which board I have had the pleasure to sit for nearly 20 years, is a third example.

It is shocking to observe that in the whole current focus on competition for top talents and skilled immigrants no attention is paid to the presence of a large group of immigrants and refugees in our own countries. With the kind of attention offered by the Global Talent Bridge in the US and organizations like UAF (Universitair Asiel Fonds) in The Netherlands, they can also be members of the new skilled workforce. So here is another example of the misconception that local and global are two different things.

In my current role, as of 2015, as Professor and Director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, following in the footsteps of Philip Altbach, I will continue to be a provocateur in international education. In that, I have been trained by my professor in sociology and friend during my studies, the late Rudy Koopmans, who always taught us: ‘only contradiction brings us further.’
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