DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 450 662 HE 033 838

AUTHOR	Barrows, Leland C., Ed.
TITLE	Internationalization of Higher Education: An Institutional Perspective. Papers on Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Bucharest (Romania). European Centre for Higher Education.
ISBN	ISBN-92-9069-158-1
PUB DATE	2000-00-00
NOTE	95p.; Assistant editors were Maria-Ana Dumitrescu and Rachel Fancy. First three papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the European Association of International Education (Stockholm, Sweden, 1998).
AVAILABLE FROM	The Administrative Officer, CEPES/UNESCO, 39, Stribei Voda St., R-70732 Bucharest, Romania ($15).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Foreign Countries; Global Approach; *Higher Education; *International Education; International Relations; Learning; Research; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Internationalism

ABSTRACT

The papers in this collection focus on ways higher education institutions might better promote strategies for the internationalization of teaching, learning, research, and other services. The papers explore the rationale of internationalization, the main barriers to internationalization, the distinction between globalization and internationalization, and the growth of transnational education. The papers are: (1) "Changing Rationales for the Internationalization of Higher Education" (Hans de Wit); (2) "Missing in Action: Leadership for International and Global Education for the Twenty-First Century" (Josef A. Mestenhauser); (3) "'The Show Is Not the Show/But They That Go': The Janus-Face of the Internationalized University at the Turn of the Century" (Dorothea Steiner); and (4) "Transnational Education and Recognition of Qualifications" (Lesley A. Wilson and Lazar Vlasceanu). The first two papers contain references. (SLD)

Papers on Higher Education

UNESCO
CEPES

INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION:

AN INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Bucharest
2000

UNESCO

CEPES

Papers on Higher Education

INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION:

AN INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Bucharest

2000

CEPES Papers on Higher Education

edited by

LELAND C. BARROWS

Assistant Editors:

Maria-Ana Dumitrescu

Rachel Fancy

ISBN 92-9069-158-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

Internationalization has been considered to be one of the major trends in the development of higher education in recent years. However, many would agree that, particularly at institutional level, there is often a gap between the *rhetoric* and the *reality* of internationalization. How to promote internationalization strategies and how to cope with various pressing trends and challenges at institutional level are questions which are still begging for appropriate replies, and from these replies, appropriate solutions.

A broad debate on the role of the increased internationalization of higher education in responding to the challenges facing universities at the beginning of the Twenty-First Century took place during the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education held in Paris, in October 1998. UNESCO-CEPES has taken the initiative in stimulating debate on this issue in the Europe Region, both as part of the preparations for and the follow-up to the World Conference. Specifically in this context and on these issues, UNESCO-CEPES organized sessions at the 1997 and 1998 Annual Meetings of the European Association of International Education (EAIE). At the 1997 session, in Barcelona, participants pinpointed the need for formulating and implementing internationalization strategies at institutional level. At the Stockholm meeting in 1998, UNESCO-CEPES therefore organized a follow-up session concentrating on the ways in which higher education institutions might better promote strategies for the internationalization of teaching, learning, research, and other services. It was in this session, chaired jointly by Lesley Wilson, former Director of UNESCO-CEPES, and Marianne Hildebrandt, of the Swedish National Agency for Higher Education, that Professor Hans de Wit, Vice-President for International Affairs of the University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands, Professor Josef Mestenhauser of the College of Education and Human Development of the University of Minnesota in the United States of America, and Professor Dorothea Steiner, the Chairperson of English-American Studies at the University of Salzburg in Austria presented papers which are now being published by UNESCO-CEPES in its series, *Papers on Higher Education*. The final article included in this publication, by Lesley Wilson, now Head of the Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit of the European Training Foundation in Turin, Italy, and Professor Lazăr Vlăsceanu, the Assistant Director of UNESCO-CEPES, takes up another key aspect of internationalization at institutional level not dealt with in the first three articles, namely that of the growth of transnational education and of its impact on the recognition of qualifications.

The views put forward by the different authors prove to be highly complementary. From his own experience and from the results of his research, Hans de Wit explores the different rationales for internationalization (economic, political, cultural, educational), and the various interests of the different groups of stakeholders, which, of course, tend to change over time. He underlines the importance for institutions to develop their own proactive strategies for internationalization in the new, global situation, in which universities are tending to be more autonomous and therefore freer to operate and to form strategic alliances and in which partners and competitors are both local and global. University leaders have to be encouraged to view internationalization as a core function of their institutions and to develop and to implement policies and practices corresponding to their own particular missions.

Josef Mestenhauser outlines the main barriers to internationalization. In addition to conceptual problems resulting from confused definitions of *internationalization* and *globalization*, he defines three main categories of barriers: *(i)* those related to knowledge, and thus crucial in terms of the curriculum, *e.g.*, the excessive "compartimentalization" of knowledge, often implying reluctance of faculty to become involved with the broader issues involved in internationalization, the failure to appreciate new modes of knowledge production, the "knowledge gap" between what the organization knows, and what it needs to know, "scarce knowledge", referring to knowledge about lack of knowledge; *(ii)* those related to change and reform *e.g.*, university structures and planning mechanisms, preparing students to cope with change, etc.; and *(iii)* those related to educational leadership, *e.g.*, university structures – vertical and hierarchical – which do not reflect the way that global knowledge should be managed.

Dorothea Steiner responds to these two papers by picking up some of the key points, for example, those related to the conceptual confusion deriving from the terms, globalization and internationalization. She points to the global as the context, and to the international as the privileged relations and skills to be developed within this context, but always from a basis within a particular local/national environment. The development of international skills and competencies are keys to dealing successfully with the global environment.

It is within this global international environment that the phenomenon of transnational education is rapidly developing and becoming important for the debate on the internationalization of higher education. If transnational action is taken, by its very definition, as that which goes beyond, or that which transcends the nation-state, while at the same time being closely connected to – and indeed influenced – by it, it seems clear that education is becoming increasingly transnational in character. Transnationalism cannot be completely identified with, or considered as a product of, internationalization or internationalism. Its appearance is linked to globalizing trends already evident in the domains of finance and economics and supported by new developments in information technology.

Transnational education is still a relatively new phenomenon. Specifically for the purposes of this publication, transnational higher education is understood as those programmes or courses of study in which students are located in a different country from the one in which the awarding institution is based. Although often closely linked to the development of new information and communication technologies, to the growth of corporate educational provision, and to the developing global market for borderless higher education provisions, its wider impact and consequences still have to be explored. Questions will, for example, have to be asked about the nature of teaching and learning (who, for and by whom, and how), and about how to maintain standards of quality in course and degree offerings – all the more so if one considers, as many providers do, that education is increasingly becoming a "commodity" and therefore takes the view that learners are prospective consumers rather than prospective critics and citizens. These questions are closely linked to the changing roles of the state as well as that of international governmental organizations in higher education. Governments with almost sole responsibility hitherto for public education in many countries, as well as traditional higher education providers, are increasingly having to rethink their positions, for the transnational reality is with us, and thus the need to find appropriate responses to the challenges it poses. Transnational education poses a similar challenge, albeit with different implications, to employers.

In practical terms, transnational delivery raises important questions for individual higher education institutions, especially in relation to the quality and the standards of study programmes offered and the degrees awarded. It is these practical issues that are the focus of the article that closes this volume.

Jan Sadlak
Director UNESCO-CEPES

CHANGING RATIONALES FOR THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION[1]

Hans DE WIT

Internationalization is high on the agendas of national governments, international bodies, and institutions of higher education. Is higher education at the beginning of a future in which it, in the words of Clark Kerr (1994, p. 9), is returning to the "universalism of learning: the universal-university world"? Is a revival of the cosmopolitan university of medieval times underway, but within the context of a new modern world and new age – the information age – in which society, economy, and knowledge are part of a global environment, a mix of local and global influence?

Those medieval days during which universities could hide themselves in their Ivory Towers are far behind us. Since the Reformation and over the past five hundred years, universities have broken with the "hitherto accepted value that knowledge is universal" (Neave, 1997, p. 15). Education came to serve the administrative and economic interests of nation-states and has since become an essential aspect of the development of national identity. The scholar evolved from being a wanderer to being a citizen. But in the second half of the Twentieth Century, learning has once again become international. Not only are nation-states

1 This article is an extended and revised version of another article, "Rationales for Internationalization of Higher Education", *in*, **Millenium: Revista do Instituto Superior Politecnico de Viseu** 3 11 (1998), pp. 11-19, that in itself is partly based on an address delivered at the conference, "International Universities: Global and Local Roles", Richmond, the American University in London (3-5 April 1998).

and their international bodies placing a stronger emphasis on international co-operation and exchange, individual institutions are developing their own strategies to internationalize their research and their teaching.

Why and how is this happening? What are the rationales behind this revival? What strategies are being developed? And what is its future? Is internationalization only the flavour of the month, soon to be superseded by other fashions such as lifelong learning, distance and open education, multi-media? Or will internationalization stabilize itself and become an integral part of higher education policies? Is internationalization the solution to all the current problems of contemporary multicultural and international society? Will internationalization definitely bring the local and the global into perfect harmony, or should one limit one's optimism and only view internationalization as one of the many ways in which multiculturalism, peace, and mutual understanding can overcome these problems? How will the international university look in the new millennium?

MEANING

What is meant by the "internationalization of higher education"? To present and to discuss the many different definitions, terms, and approaches to internationalization present in literature and higher education practice would go far beyond the scope of this article. In the course of a comparative study that Jane Knight of Ryerson Politechnic University (Toronto, Canada) and the author have been writing for the Programme on Institutional Management of Higher Education (IMHE) of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), they have come to the following working definition:

> Internationalization of education is the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institutions (1997, p. 8).

This definition includes several important elements:

- internationalization as a process;
- internationalization as a response to the international, to globalization, not to be confused with the globalization process itself;
- internationalization as including both international and local elements (intercultural).

This way of looking at and of defining the internationalization of higher education is quite different from what frequently occurs in studies dealing with this theme. In most studies, the internationalization of higher education is narrowed down to one or to a few activities, academic mobility, global or multicultural education, area studies, study abroad, etc.

In these and in other studies, internationalization is confused with a *rationale*: a political rationale such as peace and mutual understanding, or an economic rationale such as the needs of a labour market that is becoming increasingly internationalized. Most of the studies ignore the link between international and local, between studying in an international environment and the fact that the environment includes the local environment. Such studies view internationalization, not as a process, but as an activity with a beginning and an end. For these reasons – and in ways that are very confusing – the term, "international education", is frequently used interchangeably with "internationalization of higher education" and its different activities and approaches. International education assumes that education has already become international, whilst we are only in a process of internationalizing and the end, that will be international, is remote and difficult to define.[2]

[2] The term, *international education*, has become so common that it is not easy to avoid. It is used frequently as an alternative for internationalization of higher education, such as in the **Journal of Studies in International Education** of which the author is the editor and in the name of the European Association for International Education, of which he was a co-founder.

RATIONALES

Why are institutions of higher education, national governments, international bodies, and increasingly, the private sector (banks, industry, foundations), so actively involved in international educational activities? There is no single answer to that question, as is often thought.

The study undertaken by Jane Knight and the author distinguished four groups of rationales: academic, social/cultural, political, and economic (1997, pp. 9-14). Rationales can be described as motivations for integrating an international dimension into higher education. They address the "why" of internationalization. Different rationales also imply different means and ends to internationalization.

When analyzing rationales, one needs to take into account the diversity of stakeholder groups in higher education: the government sector, the private sector, and the educational sector. Within the last group, it is necessary to distinguish among three subgroups: the institutional level, the academics and their departments, and the students.

It is important to keep in mind that:

- There is a strong overlap in rationales within different stakeholder groups, the main differences being in the hierarchy of priorities.
- In general, stakeholders do not have one exclusive rationale but a combination of rationales for internationalization with the above-mentioned hierarchy of priorities.
- Rationales may vary both between and within stakeholder groups.
- Priorities in rationales may change over time and according to country and region.
- Rationales are in general more implicit than explicit motives for internationalization.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOMINANCE OF RATIONALES

In the course of the history of higher education, in European medieval times and in the Arab higher education world even earlier, academic and social/cultural rationales were dominant: the wandering scholar seeking knowledge from and understanding of other cultures. These rationales, although less dominant now and changed in character and in emphasis, have always been and still are present in higher education. The role and the character of the political and economic rationales for the internationalization of higher education have, over time, undergone more radical changes.

Political Rationales

Later, during the development process of the nation-state and the era of colonial expansion, political rationales became more and more present. By reproducing the European models of higher education in colonies in the Americas, Africa, and Asia, European nations were looking for political, cultural, economic, and academic dominance.

With the rise of the political and economic influence of the United States of America as an international power in this century, and in particular after the Second World War, this political rationale gained a new dimension. For Americans to maintain and to expand their influence, the knowledge of other cultures, languages, and systems became of crucial importance.

Universities in the United States were stimulated with federal funding, mainly from the budgets of the State and the Defense Departments in order to develop area studies, foreign language training, and study abroad. Although viewed by many in the rest of the world as a sign of American imperialism – matched by a similar trend in the former Soviet Union - this type of internationalization was presented as a stimulus to peace and mutual understanding. Quotations from United States Senators and Presidents of the postwar period make this position clear. Senator William Fulbright spoke of educational exchange as being "from the standpoint of future world peace and order, probably the most important and potentially rewarding of our foreign policy activities." Fulbright was followed by others, such as President George Bush, who stated in 1989 that "International exchanges are not a great tide to sweep away all differences, but they will slowly wear away obstacles to peace as surely as water wears away a hard stone".

This optimistic view of international education as a peace-making force, that has been dominant in American politics and higher education over the past fifty years, is still rather widespread in the United States, and has found supporters elsewhere (de Wit, 1998b). For instance, the policy statement of the International Association of University Presidents speaks of "promoting vigorously the internationalization of their institutions and the global competence and literacy of their students as being essential to the long-term pursuit of a more peaceful world in which international understanding and co-operation in solving problems will be increasingly critical for the quality of life and sustained economic, social, and cultural development."

Although it is quite tempting to sympathize with such a view of internationalization of higher education, one should be hesitant in adopting such a pure political rationale for internationalization: whose peace and whose understanding of the world? Was and is higher education in the rest of the world in a position to place its understanding on equal terms with that of the American and European academic world? Does such a view provide space for a national identity?

In their comparative study of internationalization strategies in the Asia-Pacific countries, Jane Knight and the author did find as one of the most clear rationales for the internationalization of higher education, not so much global identity, but national identity (1997, pp. 23-27). This local or national impact of internationalization seems to have become overshadowed in Europe and the United States, where globalization and uniformity appear dominant. Despite this trend, as early as 1952, the Czech-born political scientist, Karl Wolfgang Deutsch, wrote at Harvard: "there is an excellent chance that among the hundreds and thousands of foreign students at the universities today, there may be a considerable number of young men and women who may go back one day to their countries with a deeper emotional attachment to their own nation and often with a deeper nationalism than the one with which they came" (Deutsch, 1997).

Many national leaders have undertaken their education abroad, and, in that other cultural environment, have become more attached to their own national identity than before. International education is not only a confrontation with the other, but also, and maybe even more so, with one's own culture.

In regard to international education, what Mark Twain said about travel is true, namely, "that it is fatal to prejudice, bigotry, and narrow mindedness", and what Paul Theroux wrote: "Being mistaken is the essence of the traveler's tale". Most studies indicate that studying abroad does not much change the attitude of the student towards his or her host country, but there are, however, clear indications that overcoming the mistakes and prejudices of one's own culture is as important an effect of studying abroad as overcoming those of other cultures.

The political rationale also does not always end with the results intended by the donor and/or the receiver. The author recollects from his days as a student in Lima, Peru, that Peruvian students from lower income groups who studied, courtesy of scholarships, in the former Soviet Union were said to have come back as convinced capitalists, and that students from rich families who studied in the United States came back as the leaders of the radical left. So each group was influenced in a way quite opposite from that intended by their host countries, and returned with a different world view than their sponsors - at that time the left wing military regime and the conservative oligarchy, respectively - had anticipated.[3]

The political rationale dominated in the post-Second World War initiatives to internationalize higher education. But after the end of

[3] This anecdote would also suggest that rationales for and perspectives on internationalization may vary from stakeholder to stakeholder.

the Cold War, the emphasis changed from the political to the economic.

Economic Rationales

Economic rationales were and still are the driving force behind European programmes for co-operation and exchange in research, technology, and education, such as the Research and Development Programmes, COMETT and ERASMUS, even though they always - and today even more than ten years ago - combine with the political rationale to stimulate the development of a European citizenship.

This change from the political to the economic is clearly demonstrated in a recent study on "National Policies for the Internationalization of Higher Education in Europe", by the Swedish National Agency for Higher Education (1997). All the reports on the Northern European countries: the Scandinavian countries, Austria, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands, but also those on Central and Eastern Europe, indicate a shift from the educational, cultural, and political, to the economic as the dominant rationale for internationalization. The only exception was found in Southern Europe (Greece), an indication that in that region higher education is still more driven by traditional rationales, those that are academic, cultural, and political.

The economic rationales are expressed in several ways, such as:

- an emphasis on Internationalization due to the requirements of the modern, more global labour force that is needed;
- joint international Research and Development projects needed to compete internationally in new technology;
- more attention to the marketing of higher education on the international market: higher education as an export commodity, etc.

These economic rationales for internationalization have an impact on the local context. For instance, in business education, international business seems to have become the main curriculum of business schools, responding to a perceived need for an international labour force. The fact that, even in a more and more global economy, the large majority of the labour force will still be working in a local context, tends to become forgotten. In the emphasis on Research and Development, research oriented to social, cultural, and local issues is in danger of receiving a lower priority and fewer opportunities. The growing competition for international students may have a negative impact both on the quality of the education - by lowering selection standards - and on the basic financing of higher education institutions for the training of local students. The funding provided to individual higher education institutions is increasingly influenced by the recruitment of foreign students, a vulnerable international market, as the financial crisis in Asia has recently made so clear.

The political and in particular the economic rationales that are at present pushing institutions of higher education to become more international are mainly external factors.

THE INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY IN THE NEW MILLENNIUM

What has been written above should not lead one to think that universities have no incentive from inside to become more international. The academic environment itself has changed radically in the past fifty years. Higher education has become more deregulated, diverse in terms of its sources of income, privatized, and market oriented. The entrepreneurial university of today feels an internal need to become increasingly international. The academic rationales, in addition to the traditional search for universal knowledge and understanding, has become increasingly modernized.

More emphasis on professional education, on continuous education, on new areas such as environmental studies, information science, etc., requires a comparative and international dimension, coming from outside, but also from the demands of faculty members and of students. These internal factors, as well as the external factors described above, will radically change the university as well as its international orientation in the future. The way universities have looked at their international dimension has moved from *ad hoc* and marginal to strategic and central in the past fifteen years. Still, the international dimension is considered more as an added value than as the core of the university.

The role of bilateral and multilateral international agreements and networks within the international strategies of universities are an illustration of this mutation.[4] Most of the international agreements of institutions of higher education are bilateral and single purpose: for research co-operation, for student exchange, for staff exchange, or for technical assistance. Insofar as these agreements are multi-purpose, they are more intentional than real, and more leadership- than faculty-driven. There are very few cases of successful, long-standing, multipurpose, bilateral agreements between institutions of higher education and even fewer multilateral networks.

The multilateral Joint Study Programmes in the ERASMUS scheme can be considered as exceptions. These were discipline-based, faculty-driven, multipurpose agreements focused on student and staff exchanges and curriculum development. Their success was mainly the result of the existence of external funding from the European Commission, and their strength was more in student exchange than in the other two areas. As soon as these programmes were forced to become integrated into leadership-driven institutional agreements in the new SOCRATES programme, and the money coming from the European Commission was reduced, the majority of them came to an end.

Still, there is a trend towards leadership driven, multilateral, institutional networks, that first existed within the European Union, and which can now also be found at the global level. The European networks resulted from the success of Joint Study Programmes.

4 These critical observations of the economic rationales for internationalization of higher education, so dominant at the moment, do not imply a plea against them; they are only presented as concerns to be considered when internationalization strategies are developed on the basis of economic rationales.

The Coimbra Group, an institutional network linking the two oldest universities in each of the countries of the European Union, was the first of these networks. Later came the Network of Universities in the Capitals of Europe (UNICA), the Santander Group, the Utrecht Network, the Santiago de Compostela Group, the European Consortium of Innovative Universities, the European Consortium of Universities of Technology, and others. They are different from the discipline-based networks in the sense that they are leadership driven (top down) and multipurpose. Student exchanges, staff exchanges, administrator exchanges, joint tenders, and joint research co-operation, are the most common activities that these networks intend to undertake. Although strongly driven by European Union funding, these networks have extended their membership to the rest of Europe. Others have a more interregional scope (Haug and Race, 1998). Although there are fewer cases of institutional networks in other regions of the world, there are similar examples to be found elsewhere, such as the Association of East Asian Research Universities (AEARU).

Recently, global networks are also emerging. Examples are: Universitas 21, an initiative of the University of Melbourne; the David C. Lam Institute for East-West Studies, an initiative of Hong Kong Baptist University; and the League of World Universities, an initiative of New York University. The last-mentioned is a more informal network of presidents/rectors of large, comprehensive, urban universities. The David C. Lam Institute is a membership network in which the link between the individual members and the center institution, Hong Kong Baptist University, is stronger than among the other members.

Universitas 21, established in March 1997, is an international association of comprehensive, research-intensive universities. The Director of the Universitas 21 Secretariat, Chris Robinson, describes it as "an active, effective association, small enough to permit high levels of commitment, familiarity, collaboration, and inter-operability between the member institutions, yet large enough to capture the benefits of international diversity. The underlying concept is of a small, tightly knit association of kindred institutions with immense potential to secure and improve international opportunities and positioning for its members" (de Wit, 1998a). In addition to the activities that are common in other networks, Universitas 21 strives for bench-marking and development of new teaching and learning technologies, modalities, and delivery systems.

These institutional, multipurpose, and leadership driven networks are facing similar problems: with their identity, their size, the commitment of their faculty and students, their objectives, and their goals. Are these regional and global institutional networks the key to the next stage of internationalization, in which not only the mainstream activities and programmes of the university, but the whole of the institution become international? Can we expect that in the Twenty-First Century universities will finally take the same path that banks, industry, and even nation-states have taken in the past century: move into joint ventures, merge across borders, share their human resources, create common products? That seems a logical, unavoidable step, but even a network like Universitas 21 is still far from such a concept of internationalization, and has a strong activity orientation.

The next century will witness cases of international mergers and joint ventures of institutions of higher education, first at the interregional level in the European Union, later also at the global level. At the same time, an increasing number of faculties and schools will combine efforts in consortia, beyond such institutional mergers and joint ventures. This effort will be the result of the principle that partnerships at the institutional level cannot always and completely match the needs at the de-central level.

Even though institutional networks at present seem to be rather weak, lacking commitment at the departmental and school level and not very effective in their operations, they are more likely to be the motor for future mergers than the current discipline-based networks and consortia. Only central leadership is able to make the radical decisions needed to move away from fragmented, activity-oriented co-operation to real mergers and to joint ventures. It is only a question of time until such decisions will be made.

REFERENCES

DEUTSCH, K. W. "Nationalistic Responses to Study Abroad", **International Spectator** 6 3 (Spring 1997).

DE WIT, H., "Academic Consortia in Higher Education: A Typology", address presented at the Workshop on Academic Consortia, David C. Lam Institute for East-West Studies, Hong-Kong, 19-21 November 1998a (publication of an article based on the address is forthcoming).

DE WIT, H. "Ducks Quack Differently on Each Side of the Ocean: International Education in the US and in Europe", *in*, DE WIT, Hans, ed. **50 Years of International Co-operation and Exchange Between the United States and Europe: European Views.** Amsterdam: European Association for International Education, pp. 13-20, 1998b.

HAUG, G. and RACE, J., "Inter-Regional Co-operation in Higher Education in Europe", *in*, **Journal of Studies in International Education** 2 2, 3-34 (Fall 1998).

KERR, C. **Higher Education Cannot Escape History: Issues for the Twenty-First Century**. New York: State University of New York Press, 1994.

KNIGHT, J., and DE WIT, H. **Internationalization of Higher Education in Asia Pacific Countries**, Amsterdam: European Association for International Education, 1997.

NEAVE, G., "The European Dimension in Higher Education, an historical analysis", Background Conference Document, Enschede (April 7-9, 1997).

MISSING IN ACTION: LEADERSHIP FOR INTERNATIONAL AND GLOBAL EDUCATION FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

Josef A. MESTENHAUSER

The title of this paper was coined in response to the following question: "What is the state of the art in institutional implementation of international education in light of the challenges facing universities in the Twenty-First Century and in the framework of the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education?" More specifically, the question asks whether or not institutions of higher education have achieved their self-proclaimed objectives of placing high priorities on internationalization and globalization.

The answer to the question depends, of course, on how the question is phrased. Much of the literature in the field appears to be answering the following questions: "Do you have international programmes?", or "What projects do you have that are international?" However, what should be asked is "Do you educate students to face the future challenges of the Twenty-First Century?".

Harari and Reiff (1993) attempted to answer the question in a recent article with an intriguing title: "Half Way There". The thought that the title inspired is that if it took fifty years (that is, the age of modern international education in the United States, while international education is some thirty years old in Japan and perhaps only ten years old in Europe), would it take another fifty years to achieve the other half? And is there time for such slow progress?

Given the increasing complexity of life and the speed of change, it might take much more than fifty years, if the field is not reconceptualized, if internationalization continues to be viewed as an adjunct to everything else, and if the same organizational literacy that created the barriers, that are described in this paper, continues to be employed. An internationalized institution of the future will have to have in place a comprehensive, multi-dimensional, and institution-wide programme that is system-oriented, integrated, well-conceptualized, sound from a curricular point of view, and well-utilized and respected by all client groups. Despite valiant efforts by the OECD, the American Council on Education, and several European organizations, a serious, dynamic, and comprehensive dialogue about how higher education institutions should be led, organized, and performing has yet to begin.

The missing link, from the perspective of this chapter, is *leadership*, a concept that is in itself future- and goal-oriented. Hence the title of this paper, which takes the perspective that organizations usually reflect the ways in which the people involved in them think about leadership, goals, structures, and division of labour. When it comes to international education, there is much evidence that there is an unacceptable number of barriers operating at the levels of leadership of institutions that make more rapid progress in this field difficult, and that the major barrier from which others flow is the absence of appropriate cognitive mental models. Therefore, this chapter endeavours to identify the major barriers and sources of resistance to internationalization with the hope that it will open a new debate about the leadership and structures of this field. As Bolman and Deal (1997) suggest, the "first step in managerial wisdom is to understand the present situation" (p. 22), how and why we got where we are, and why more has not been accomplished, despite all indications that the education and training offered to students today is inadequate.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

Most scholarly articles carry with them a baggage of usually implicit assumptions. The author, too, holds at least eight assumptions that need to be made explicit. Without an understanding of them, his conclusion would not make sense.

The first assumption is that many people make their own assumptions about the field of international education and the definition of internationalization, and that these are most often not being made explicit. Even within the same university, different parts of the structure and the curriculum make different assumptions about knowledge, about how to organize, about influence, about lines of authority, about perceptions of global reality, and about how well they are accomplishing international goals.

The second assumption flows from the first, that the majority of education programmes in this field are incomplete, inadequate, unintegrated, fragmented, enclosed, and operating on a simple frame of cognitive complexity. They are often reduced to what de Wit (1998) calls "the flavour of the month" or what might be called the "minimalist" approach, *i.e.*, "even very little is better than nothing". Most educators appear to assume that international education is a small appendage to higher education and that it already has a sufficient place in the larger scheme of educational programmes. They often repeat that enough is being done, that students have their own options -- and responsibility – to go beyond the minimal offering, and that the list of projects in which universities are involved is already very impressive.

The "action" noun in the title of this article, "missing in action", therefore, refers to these many projects that characterize current approaches to international education. They are indeed full of action, but on deeper examination, these actions come in spurts, are poorly conceptualized and theoretically founded, are not doing enough, are not reaching sufficient numbers of people, and are not usually sustained beyond the duration of spurts or grants, or the tenure of some dedicated faculty member(s). Most of these projects have not been examined critically and publicly, because they often do not state anticipated outcomes explicitly and because they are too complex to study easily and inexpensively through established research and evaluation practices and methodologies. Many projects are never evaluated or assessed by directors of institutional research, even though the job responsibilities of these persons include evaluation.

The third assumption is that the minimalist approach conveys a message that international education is a relatively simple add-on, insulated from *business-as-usual* education, and that it reduces international preparation to a few courses in so-called liberal studies requirements in the United States, to take an example, and to general education in European gymnasia or Japanese high schools; to a few years of (inadequate) language training; and to a few months spent in a sheltered "island" study abroad programme (de Wit, 1998).

In fact, international education is complex, multi-dimensional, and interdisciplinary. When speaking of global perspectives, it is not sufficient to assume that the entire world is simply the context into which one extends the operation of academic disciplines and knowledge as they are currently organized and conceptualized. Each time a new variable is added, such as another country and another field of study from which most international and cross-cultural concepts come (such as education, democracy, culture, learning, psychology, communication, etc.), it becomes necessary to raise the level of analysis and to employ higher level intellectual skills to accommodate these variables.

The fourth assumption again follows from the previous one, namely, that universities have not encouraged or developed an in-depth examination of what is being done in international education and what gaps exist between what is and what ought to be. Thus, despite enourmous amounts of rhetoric, the lack of meaningful dialogue, so important in democracy and in education, has not yet taken place so that educational leaders do not have the opportunity to develop and understand a multi-dimensional and systemic mind-set. As a result, the frames of mind, the conceptual models under which most educational leaders and faculty operate, are fragmented, incomplete, and inadequate. The world cannot make much sense, and the pieces of information that one has about it cannot be organized without a mental model (Senge, 1990). Because such a mental model (or models) has not been developed, one has nevertheless been imposed anyway, that the world is fragmented, hard to understand, but clear and predictable within the framework of one's profession or discipline.

The fifth assumption follows, that there are several levels of international education and several curricular implications to adding a global perspective to learning, and thus several levels of analysis from simple to very advanced (Mestenhauser and Ellingboe, 1998). However, curricula are addressing only fragments of what students should know, understand, and acquire in terms of intellectual and practical skills. While it may be correct to assume that large numbers of graduates of American higher education institutions will opt to include only the minimum required courses in their degree programmes, it is also true that they will, as a result of this choice, graduate from universities with only minimal preparation, knowledge, and skills.

In fact, one should not assume that even the minimum amount of course work and brief study periods abroad will provide even that slight preparation. Research indicates that when students make minimal choices, they also inadvertently choose minimal outcomes (Koester, 1987). Such graduates may obtain adequate entry level jobs, but may not have what a growing number of our students expect from their overall careers, namely, choices, options, growth, and opportunities. The minimalist approach is not educating students so that they can practice their professions effectively anywhere in the world. To be able to obtain such positions and to perform in them with increasing efficiency requires skills and perspectives that are not currently being provided to the majority of American students.

The sixth assumption is that international education is for the future; yet the way in which educational leadership is organized and practiced means that changes are resisted and that the *status quo* is reinforced at a time when various private enterprises and consulting companies anticipate future needs and increasingly siphon off educational grants from educational institutions.

The seventh assumption is that while international education confronts universities with everything that they do, from organization, to methods, to contents, it is also a wake-up call that can help provide a "super-ordinate goal" and rejuvenate both institutions and academic disciplines. American institutions, that are supposed to be the intellectual leaders in society, should take a special interest in assuring the highest quality of international education, as thoughtful scholars of international relations suggest. Instead of thinking complacently that "they have won the cold war", and rest on that glory, American universities should recognize that American hegemony is being challenged, not only by Japan and Europe, but also by the Islamic world and by Central and Eastern Europe (Lai, 1997).

Europeans should also heed the need to move international education to higher grounds. Regionalism may work well in the short-term, but in the long-term undermines the next challenges of working with developing countries (Stallings, 1995) and with the large number of other small nations that are also increasingly challenging all other hegemonies which they regard as a new version of "colonialism". European systems of education, that pride themselves on providing high quality general education in their secondary schools, may indeed impart a large number of facts about other countries, but research also indicates that such knowledge is either soon forgotten, or is irrelevant to the development of such cognitive skills as complex, critical, and integrative thinking. In short, this seventh assumption is based on the notion that present-day graduates are unprepared to face and work in such future conditions of interdependence and competitiveness, conditions that require system and multiple-frame thinking and a great deal of interdisciplinary knowledge which includes fields outside of their specializations.

Finally, the eighth assumption is that the missing link in the educational changes that are needed is the quality of leadership. While this chapter focuses primarily on top level administrators, leadership in organizations as complex as universities exists at all levels that are very interdependent. One does not function well without the other.

Some limited but meaningful research (Ellingboe, 1996) at one large public research university suggests that the most resistance comes from higher level officials and central administrators. Nine resistance factors were found in faculty ranks as well as among deans and central administrators; however, higher ranking officials exhibited the most resistance (Mestenhauser and Ellingboe, 1998).

The materials upon which this chapter is based are taken from extensive examinations of the literature that deals with internationalization and globalization in general and from the author's experiences in teaching, doing research, and consulting. The author also draws on general organizational and disciplinary literature on cognition, management, change, and on his knowledge and experiences with one of the most dynamic and dramatic transitions, that occurring in Central and Eastern Europe.

The chapter does not ignore the enormous amount of work that has been accomplished in international education. What has already been accomplished is suggestive of the famous quote from Winston Churchill to the effect that never have so few accomplished so much in such a short time under such meager circumstances. However, most commentators agree that such work is random, un-integrated, lacking in conceptual foundation, and grossly uneven in the knowledge assimilated by various constituencies (de Wit, 1998; Altbach and Peterson, 1998).

Before making recommendations as to how to fill the missing link of leadership, it is necessary to begin with the problem-solving approach by identifying the barriers and sources of resistance to successful internationalization. As indicated, the main purpose is to draw attention to a deep understanding of the present situation in order to frame the needed dialogue. As Fullan (1995) suggests in connection with educational reform, the "spirit of inquiry and continuous learning must characterize the whole enterprise" (p. 21).

The context in which all concepts of international education appear is the dramatically changing world scene to which the educational systems must continuously adjust. As Bolman and Deal (1997) suggest, these "shocks of change have changed the rules and yesterday's organizations into antiquities" (p. 5). All these external changes are so enourmous and complex that educational institutions as they are currently organized are suddenly caught in situations in which the demands made on them far exceed the potential to deliver educational services to their respective societies. The relative lack of attention to globalization is thus a symptom of the conservatism of higher education institutions which hinders valuable reforms at a time when other organizations, notably businesses, corporations, governments, and NGOs are in the middle of dynamic re-examinations of their structures, functions, and goals.

TWENTY BARRIERS TO INTERNATIONALIZATION

The main contribution of this chapter is its emphasis on the barriers and sources of resistance to international education. Without understanding and diagnosing the problems, it would be impossible to suggest improvements, propose solutions, and offer remedies as to how to improve leadership and administration of international education.

The following barriers, listed at random, are based on research and experiences. The author was motivated to prepare such a list because he considers that a surplus of lists exists documenting positive results and many stellar accomplishments of abundant international projects.

That is the problem. International education is not a sum total of projects, especially since most have been produced by only a few exceptionally dedicated and talented people who have had to exert an extraordinarily difficult and untiring effort. These accomplishments then give the false impression that enough is being done. Similarly, they disguise the fact that the sustained and hard work would have made a much larger impact on educational institutions, had it not been for the barriers to which reference is made below.

The author's associate, Brenda Ellingboe (1996, 1998), provided the frame of reference for studying internationalization that she utilized in preparing her Master's Degree thesis. In it she identified nine resistance factors. These are incorporated into a larger scheme;

others are the objects of elaboration. Some of these barriers may appear to be less significant than others, but even small problems may "break the camel's back" when they accumulate.

Indeed smallness is, in fact, the first barrier that results from the analytical educational tradition that dissects issues into the smallest units of analysis, without connecting them to others and without assessing the impact of cumulated causes and the consequences of actions taken. The result is that the proverbial right hand does not know what the left hand is doing, that there is frequent duplication of efforts and poor utilization of resources, and that the overall costs of such inefficient use of resources may indeed break the camel's back through high costs. The tendency to look at single problems in isolation makes system thinking difficult.

Related to this barrier is the second one that assumes that the knowledge system works like a machine the parts of which can be disassembled and again reassembled in the same linear way. The global society does not function the same way as the universities, and the knowledge about the world that they convey cannot be organized without "mental models" (Bolman and Deal, 1997). When visitors, researchers, or graduate students interview deans and higher level officials, they realize that a variety of mental models is lacking and is not an object of search.

The third barrier is the general conceptual confusion about what international education is and what knowledge is "international" or "global". The very term, "international", has been around for almost a century and has still not gained general acceptance. Some observers suggest that another term should be sought or a new language developed which would explain it more meaningfully. This chapter uses the term, "internationalization", as an umbrella concept of which "global" education refers to the world-wide context in which it works. Of course, it carries the assumption that thinking globally implies a major cognitive shift in order to develop a global "consciousness" (Hanvey, 1978). There is now an enormous amount of literature on this subject that needs to be meta-analyzed for the use of educational administrators. De Wit (1998) suggests that the term "international" be distinguished from global because it includes domestic variables and determinants of international relations.

To overcome the conceptual confusion and to begin the long overdue dialogue, it is necessary to begin posing questions to faculty, deans, and central administrators of a sort that traditional scholarship has avoided, such as: What, how much, with what focus, and how should students acquire international knowledge; who should teach it; at what level of sophistication; what intellectual skills accompany it; and what should be the scope of it, *e.g.* single country, region, or many countries; is knowledge of a foreign language sufficient to produce it, and if so, which language and to what degree of competence; are technical knowledge and skills from professional fields sufficient to function in a global setting; how does knowledge of one's own country and culture determine the learning of others; is knowledge not universal; could the culture-specific knowledge be acquired only when it is needed; or must it be stored in already overcrowded memory, in case it is needed; is such knowledge sequenced in some way, and is it graduated from simple to more advanced; is such knowledge readily available in a university or elsewhere such as in the media or in libraries; how does transfer of knowledge from one culture to another work; how does it work from one discipline to another; are there essential concepts in the social sciences and the humanities that need to be transferred to the hard sciences and to technology; which are the defining disciplines, and are they already "internationalized"; whose responsibility is it to acquire international/global knowledge? The "new generation" of international scholars from both the United States and elsewhere are beginning to ask these questions, but their answers have not found their way into the mainstream of academic discussions. The literature is rich and growing and should no longer be neglected simply because it does not fit into neat disciplinary compartments.

Then there is the fourth issue, that of academic freedom, that actually serves as a barrier to globalization. It gives teachers the freedom to teach what they know and what their departments "package" in degree programmes. With the autonomy that they enjoy historically, who is to tell them what academic and research interests to pursue, which ones are really important and significant or esoteric, how to incorporate new global knowledge into their lectures, how to adjust the style of teaching or the content of instruction, how to prepare themselves for an academic career to begin with, and whether internationalizing the curriculum is infringing on academic freedom. The key questions are how to teach the teachers, whose responsibility it is, and how the global knowledge can be integrated with the disciplinary knowledge. Some professional and academic disciplinary societies are beginning such debates, but they appear to have great difficulty stepping outside of their disciplinary borders (Groennings and Wiley, 1990).

Similarly, the students, as consumers of knowledge, create the fifth barrier related to their own freedom to chose their specializations as well as "elective" and "enrichment" courses that occasionally include study abroad. In effect, these choices are driven by the "market" and beg the inevitable question of how to insure that the international and global education of students will be integrated within the requirements for their disciplinary majors.

The sixth barrier is made up of the borders built around the knowledge organized by departments and disciplines. Knowledge about other countries comes, some claim, from many disciplines. Students and scholars face increasing numbers of choices about which disciplines are more defining than others, which parts are essential, how these parts fit with parts from other disciplines, and how these can be integrated into a meaningful pattern. As knowledge in all disciplines grows exponentially, who knows the full scope of knowing that has a bearing on the process of globalization? Furthermore, is the knowledge of the "process", as compared to the content driven "product" learning, also included in the teaching? The key concepts needed in international education from what is called the "defining disciplines" is described elsewhere (Mestenhauser, 1998; Mestenhauser and Ellingboe, 1998).

The seventh barrier with which international educators have trouble dealing is the perception that a "cultural convergence" is occurring that obviates the need for intimate knowledge of other countries. After all, people travel in great numbers, negotiate, study together, conduct business, and in many different ways interrelate with each other – to all indications so successfully – that any more knowledge is a topping and luxury that can be skipped if priorities require different kinds of professional knowledge and competencies.

The difficulty is that one has little conceptual background to recognize which globalizing forces are "convergent", which continue to be "divergent", which are "mixed", and how they are mixed.

Senge (1990) distinguishes between "convergent" and "divergent" complexity. For the author, the questions about how to educate students internationally fall into the category of "divergent" complexity. The culturally reinforced need to seek similarities. To overemphasize convergent forces neglects most seriously these "divergent" ones. The "devil is in the divergence".

The dualistic way of thinking, typical of the West, tends to urge people to make choices, to reach closure, and to think in terms of dialectical choices - either one or the other - rather than stressing system and multi-dimensional thinking. In other words, everybody's own culture is the eighth barrier to globalization because it imposes cognitive limits to how one thinks about it.

If global knowledge is simply for enrichment but is not essential, this idea leads to the ninth barrier, the lack of both fiscal and psychological incentives and motivation. The lack of incentives faces the faculty as well as the students. Universities generally do not have motivational policies for students because they assume that students alone are responsible for their learning. Similarly, the reward structure for faculty members in international activities depends primarily on intrinsic rather than on extrinsic motivation (Włodkowsky, 1985; Włodkowsky and Ginsberg, 1995).

Under these conditions, there is a great deal of ambiguity as to how to articulate goals, the tenth barrier, and how to develop educational strategies leading to their accomplishment. Even when policy exists, gaps between policy and implementation may exist. To make matters worse, there are also gaps between theory and practice – if there is theory at all. The mission statements of most universities are too general to be implementable, and if they are specific, they allow subordinate units to redefine them to suit other priorities (Zander, 1996).

The history of international education in the United States indicates very rich goals in a rich past: to seek international understanding and to avoid wars and conflicts. That past, however, was dominated by the Cold War. Now a different major paradigm of global competitiveness has emerged. Although most commentators explain competitiveness as a form of co-operation, competition tends to be closer to real or latent conflict, because more than one party wants the same thing, but only one can achieve these goals. One thoughtful writer suggests, in addition, that "economic and political competitiveness are antecedents for prejudice" (Kohn, 1992).

When competitiveness becomes the dominant goal, we have the eleventh barrier to global education in that it promotes short-term goals while global education is by definition a long-term affair. Furthermore, competition is not a conceptual and educational goal, but merely an instrumental one, which means that results are measured by tangible benefits. International education appears to be the only long-term goal of our educational policy, and thus has great difficulty in providing evidence of the "quick fix" and immediate and demonstrable results.

The ambiguity between short-term and long-term goals – we need both – is no larger a paradox than is the twelfth barrier stemming from the role of universities that are supposed to preserve and nurture tradition at the same time as they are expected to lead the movement for change. Institutional inertia which is at home in most institutions often works strongly to support the status quo. And, unfortunately, it is difficult to identify a university president, rector, or other university constituents who carry the movement for international education beyond rhetoric.

It was, therefore, especially gratifying to read the "welcome to the new school year" speech given by Dr. Mary Sue Coleman, President of the University of Iowa, last September 1998, which she devoted entirely to international education. In it she described with pride and approval all the many programmes in which the University of Iowa is involved, but concluded that even such illustrious achievement was by far not sufficient. Such occurrences are immediately noticed by international educators, because few presidents and deans make such significant speeches in public. Instead they appear to hide international education under other more significant educational programmes or explain it on the grounds of income derived from grants and foreign student enrollments.

The thirteenth barrier consists of the perceptions that people hold about themselves and about the world around them, based on how they learn selectively from experiences from which they make attributions about causes of events, the characters of the persons with whom they associate, and on how they compare themselves with others. Different "stakeholders" and constituencies hold different perceptions of global realities, nature of institutional power and authority, and distribution of resources. In other words, international education has its own social psychology, but it is seldom discussed in relationship to the "real" knowledge that is supposed to come only from the contents of various academic disciplines. Still, these perceptions provide the conceptual map by which many universities are run and organized.

Within universities, for example, various constituencies make attributions about the importance of their own fields of study, about which disciplines are "harder" or "softer", and about the consequent division of university "citizenship" among "first-class", second-, or third-class citizens.

But there are other aspects of the social psychology of international education. To demonstrate their analytical usefulness, two are selected from the personal experiences of the author. For example, one perception is called "the flood gate syndrome" which occurs when decision-makers reject an international policy on the ground that it would open the proverbial flood-gate so that everybody would demand the same treatment. The argument goes, "if I support you the way you ask, then I would have to do the same thing for the whole university" or "take it away from somebody else". This syndrome, like other similar ones, are evidence of the conceptual poverty that perceives global education as a pressure group that has to compete for attention with every other educational goal and programme.

Three implications stem from this syndrome. One of them is that progress in global education would have to occur at the expense of other worthy educational goals. This widespread perception forces international educators to adopt two inappropriate strategies: one, a concerted effort to prove that they are part of the mainstream and support goals of institutional or national interest, and the second is to paint what Senge (1990) calls a "future scenario", that is, an appeal for support on the grounds that what they are advocating will be needed in the future. He suggests that the future scenario usually contradicts the experiences of educational administrators and are thus discarded. Instead, he opts for a strategy that would encourage the questioning of the mental models according to which people function in order to modify them.

The second implication is that many improvements in international education could be made automatically and without very much cost at all, if only people changed their mental models and mind-sets.

The third implication is that most people perceive international education to be a small part of the total so that it can claim fiscal support only in proportion to the size that it is perceived to have in the institutional hierarchy. The idea that international education should be mainstreamed into the entire institutional functioning has not penetrated the mental mind-set.

The author is concerned especially with the first implication that appears to suggest that international education programmes undermine the academic standing of the institutions. The paradox of this social psychology is that so many international educators believe strongly that they are doing exactly the opposite, supporting their institutions which they are trying to upgrade across the board to make them and their constituencies more significant and relevant.

Another favoured syndrome is the "chicken and the egg" metaphor that is often at the heart of the "absence of decisions" concept expressed by Goodwin and Nacht (1983) about globalization. Central administrators often claim that there is no demand for global education from the bottom up, and that the students and faculty who promote it expect them to impose an unwanted programme on everybody. Consequently the egg does not hatch because the central administrators do not feel it is their egg on which they themselves should sit, while faculty members and others feel that their egg has been abandoned by central administration leadership. Consequently the absence of decisions in effect means that decisions about international education are made by default.

Space does not permit an identification of other perceptual barriers, but they can be easily recognized within the following comments: "We have to educate our students first"; "What is wrong with studying our own culture"; We are already doing it"; "We cannot throw the baby out with the bath water"; "Our first priority is to domestic minorities"; "My course is 100 percent internationalized. I teach statistics".

There are other such perceptions, and most seem to have a negative connotation: that international programmes are pressure groups; that the field is being imposed from the outside to benefit these "others" rather than our immediate constituencies; that we are doing enough; that it might rock the boat; and that it is too expensive. The only positive sounding perception that is actually dysfunctional for many international programmes is called by Senge (1990, p. 385) the "success breeds success" syndrome, which puts most available resources into just one or two programmes that are deemed "successful", while ignoring and starving others. In the United States, international studies and foreign languages are the "successful" programmes that appear to have a monopoly in the curriculum and in the funding priorities of the foundations and of federal legislation.

Then there is the fourteenth barrier to globalization associated with the fragmented knowledge that has already been mentioned but deserves additional attention. Students are somehow expected to know and to experience what most faculty members do not know and have not experienced themselves. The major long-term problem for international educators is: who is teaching the teachers. As long as there is only a minimum expectation that students will be exposed to a one-shot programme at the lower levels of undergraduate education or high schools, there will continue to be a fatal shortage of truly globally educated faculty members who have both the cross-cultural experiences and the shared knowledge of other defining disciplines. Thus, international education has been fixed into the undergraduate curriculum; the higher the degree one pursues, the less emphasis there is on the international dimension of learning (Harari and Reiff, 1993), presumably on the grounds that the students have already been internationally educated.

This discrepancy illustrates one of the major differences between international education in the United States and in Europe (de Wit, 1998) where most of the scholarly attention is directed at what Americans call graduate or postgraduate education. Since newly hired American faculty members do not receive preparation for international education at a high level of abstraction through their graduate studies, they must accept the responsibility for continuing professional education on their own because few universities have policies for international development of the faculty short of traveling to international conferences. The conceptual and organizational fragmentation of universities is another barrier. It causes "disciplinary reductionism" and limits the development of perceptual vision that would stress system thinking.

The fifteenth barrier to international education is the frequent turnover of personnel in higher education administration, including deans who are responsible for international affairs, and thus a lack of continuity caused by the relative absence of institutional memory in this field. Because international education is not a department in itself and does not have a collective memory and a set of common concepts, newly appointed administrators do not have access to the files, decisions, and histories of this field. This situation is accentuated by the fact that administrators in the United States are selected on the grounds of other competencies than international, and in Europe and Japan, administrators are usually elected through a political process. Consequently, many international education problems and issues are solved through what Argyris (1978, 1990) has termed the "single loop problem solving frame", typical of other institutions and organizations, with the result that the field cannot develop sustaining programmes and continuity. In popular language, it is also known as the "Band-Aid" problem solving method. Senge (1990) calls it "institutional disability" that leads to "learned incompetence" (p. 25).

Learning psychologists tell us that people tend to organize the way they think, and that they process new knowledge in relationship to existing frames of reference. Organizational knowledge can thus be recovered only in the same frame in which it was deposited. Thus organizations learn, store, and classify knowledge and distribute functions, labour, and responsibilities. How universities manage knowledge determines how infusion of learning from different frames of reference can be accomplished, how learned knowledge can be recalled, if and how errors of knowledge application are recognized and corrected, and what cognitive screens exist in the search for new knowledge. While most people are concerned with access to knowledge, the opposite barrier is also one of concern, namely exclusion of significant areas of knowledge, due to an inability to develop new frames of reference regarding how to deal with an enourmous knowledge explosion. There are ample examples of such cognitive and administrative reductionism that also exist in higher levels of university administration.

Thus the sixteenth barrier is related to the nature of knowledge itself and deals with transfer of knowledge. Universities are not only repositories but also producers, consumers, and disseminators of knowledge. As they become increasingly global institutions, they are in the business of importing and exporting knowledge, transferring it, selling it, adopting it, and utilizing it for practical applications. The very paradigm of competitiveness suggests that successful transfer of knowledge gives an institution competitive advantages; so, it is not surprising that universities are involved in various forms of agreements and educational exchanges designed to implement these transfers. Experiences indicate, however, that successful international consortia and collaborative ventures are very difficult to maintain and that partner institutions often complain about the uneven contributions they make to the venture and the asymmetrical benefits they obtain from it. Some of these asymmetries are the result of perceptual problems because one tends not to trust knowledge that one has not produced oneself (National Academy of Engineering, 1987), and in co-operative ventures, to think that one is making a much larger contribution than are the partners. Experience shows that academic (or business) establishments do not have the diagnostic skills and concepts of how these efforts work, what problems they have, how to assess failure or success, and how to develop a face-saving "exit strategy". Consequently, the sharing of knowledge is uneven, pragmatic, selective, reductionist, limited to narrow specializations, and involving only a very few scholars.

The dialogue about international education would be enriched by three additional concepts that need to be taken into account in the formulation of the curriculum and curricular policy for globalizing institutions. The first has been suggested by an international "collective" of sociologists of knowledge (Gibbons *et al.*, 1994) who are critical of the traditional, positivist mode of knowledge production they call mode A, characterizing it as a scholarly activity of reducing knowledge to the smallest units of analysis through "digging the well deeper and deeper". This mode has, according to this collective, not produced major breakthroughs, especially not in the social and behavioural sciences and in the humanities. This finding led them to suggest a new theory of knowledge production, mode B, in which new knowledge is produced from already known knowledge and its bits and pieces by combining and recombining them, arranging and re-arranging them, and configuring them – all in the process of application to human problems and situations.

The authors claim that this theory is actually already at work in industry and that it requires a great deal of interdisciplinary knowledge from global sources in order to know where the pieces are, what they are pieces of, and which pieces can be combined. This theory obviously requires some intellectual skills that have traditionally not been taught, or not taught well, especially comparative thinking, but also creative thinking, networking, cognitive complexity (of the divergent type, see above), differentiation, and integrative thinking. Although mode B may not be in open conflict with mode A, many proponents of the traditional "academic" curricular model see it that way and feel threatened by it. How ironic it is that this kind of knowledge production is actually happening in international education departments, the professional staffs of which have to function in mode B almost daily, but whose work is perceived as being only "service".

The second concept is called the "knowledge gap" and means just that, that there is a gap between what the organization knows and what it needs to know. These gaps may not be obvious to insiders. International educators who deal with people and knowledge from everywhere, often have the skills to identify these gaps and to propose ways of bridging them, but they face a dual problem of developing persuasive communication and pedagogical skills with which to convey both practical and difficult theoretical concepts.

For example, if the gap is perceived to be simply a quantum of knowledge about some other countries, it can be easily bridged by steering students to an appropriate academic department in which the knowledge needed is available. This conceptualization appears to be the dominant solution to internationalization because it does not "disrupt" the status quo. On the other hand, if the knowledge gap is one of understanding another way of perceiving and learning, it is more difficult to bridge and requires for its solution an infusion of new interdisciplinary and multidimensional knowledge and an intervention that employs meta-thinking strategies.

Finally, if the gap is paradigmatic, that is, between two entirely different paradigms, to put in a bridge may require the re-thinking of the whole educational process and the restructuring of the learning organizations. Such paradigmatic changes are now occurring in Central and Eastern Europe, but they are being largely ignored on the outside on the assumption that one western model is simply replacing another in a linear fashion. The author believes that the whole of higher education is in the middle of such a basic paradigmatic change, the symptoms of which are turmoil in academic disciplines, evidence of academic reductionism, and the general crisis of higher education (Coombs, 1985; Schwartz and Ogilvy, 1979). Depending on the way knowledge gaps are defined, the university may need to develop several levels of global education from elementary to advanced levels. There is no "one-size-fits all", Readers Digest solution. As Fullan (1995) suggests, the "best pedagogical solutions remain to be developed" (p. 21), but such a task can hardly be accomplished without attention, experimentation, thinking, and educational leadership.

The third concept is called "scarce knowledge". It is knowledge held, consciously or unconsciously, about lack of knowledge. It occurs when the established practices are no longer able to resolve problems without the infusion of new knowledge. In globalizing situations, such scarce knowledge is a very complex concept that makes one feel uncertain and insecure about what one has just discovered one does not know and how much more there is to know that one does not even know exists (von Krogh *et al.*, 1996). The resulting uncertainty can affect one's problem-solving abilities and the performance of tasks (Kahneman and Tversky, 1982).

Some scholars have suggested that uncertainty avoidance is a major cultural variable that functions differently in different cultures (Hofstede, 1984). The object of scarce knowledge is usually knowledge that somebody else has that one needs, but it has been suggested recently that the object also relates to recognition that one lacks knowledge about oneself or, in other words, that there is a gap between how persons know themselves in comparison with how others know them (Gergen, 1994). Skills needed to handle scarce knowledge include sophisticated communication abilities, diagnostic skills, and abilities of cognitive alterations and self-perceptions. From these concepts flow enourmous implications for the curriculum and for research that require higher cognitive skills than those currently taught in most universities. As is indicated below, changing the curriculum and research practices also requires a higher level of thinking about university administration and leadership.

To complicate things for organizational knowledge, some new research in biological and neurological sciences suggests that the computer-based metaphor of information processing is no longer adequate to explain other ways in which the brain stores and connects information. Apparently there is a small and hitherto unknown and unexplored area in the brain that contains certain nodes the functions of which are to connect various pieces of information located in other parts of the brain. However, these nodes are not active all the time, and need to be activated by an also unknown process (Lakomski, 1998). With more research, it may be possible to deal with individual as well as institutional complexity. This new theory, called "connectionist" theory, studies the ways in which the nodes are activated and connected. Practical experiences (but not just any kind) rather than training exclusively in concepts, may be the activator. In some ways, this possibility resembles the mode B of knowledge production cited above. This new theory also suggests that non-linear knowledge is "connected" differently than linear knowledge, but does not do the connecting automatically. This reality might explain why cultural information, which is non-linear, is largely neglected in international education.

Academics appear to be "learning disabled" because these and other learning approaches are not applied to leadership in and administration of higher education. The learning barrier tends to limit discussion about the organization of global education to whether it should be centralized or decentralized, and whether international educators have access to the presidents, the rectors, or the budget officers. In practice, neither centralization nor decentralization works well, because seats of decision-making are diffused in the web of fiefdoms called faculties and departments; because centralized management does not encourage individual initiative and sense of ownership; and because decentralization compartmentalizes learning and sabotages coordination, interdisciplinary co-operation, networking, and integration. The goals of educational institutions tend to be too general and diffused; even when they are focused, as in private, proprietary, or single field institutes. The dynamics of organizations allow all levels of the institution to re-interpret organizational goals to suit their own particular roles and psychological dispositions.

Before considering additional structural and organizational barriers, it is first necessary to address the problem of change, reform, and/or transformation which is the seventeenth barrier to internationalization that flows from the previous one. For the lack of other terms, this barrier can be called academic ethnocentrism.

For many years, international educators had to be extremely careful not to appear too critical of their administrators and faculty for lacking sophistication and support for international education. They had to make every effort to be "part of the mainstream team" and to demonstrate that internationalism does not undermine local and national interests. Too much criticism might turn off the very people whom they wanted to influence and whose perspectives they wanted to change. International educators certainly did not want to suggest "required" or "ideologically correct" re-training of faculty which multi-cultural education is perceived to be, but other academically acceptable alternatives either did not exist or international educators were not invited to participate in policy formation. After many years of arguing "softly", it is now necessary that this issue be faced squarely.

The main problem is that all people are ethnocentric. The issue is not a moral one and should not be regarded in pejorative terms; rather, ethnocentrism, according to Hanvey (1979), is the normal human condition everywhere, resulting from many centuries of socialization to one's own local societies and nation-states. Hanvey quipped that human society still lives in the stone age because persons have only a fifty mile psychological radius fixed in their perceptions. In the light of what is known about the knowledge gap concept as a foundation for change, it is essential to look at ethnocentrism as an antecedent of international education. The problem – and thus a barrier – is that people have been socialized to this state of affairs subconsciously and do not necessarily recognize that their views of others are preconditioned by previous background, including academic preparation. Many scholars have already come to recognize that others with whom they interrelate behave and believe in harmony with their cultural backgrounds, but it is difficult to understand that this reality is also true in reverse. Such ethnocentrism is manifested in a variety of ways, through such statements as the following made by American academics: "Our institutions are the best in the world". "Others keep coming to us for learning". "We have very little to learn from others". "Learn about us and our culture, because what happens here now will happen in your countries sooner or later". "Knowledge is universal". "We are not exporting anything; others insist on coming here". Ethnocentrism also operates at a much deeper level of learning and causes culturally untrained people to learn only things that fit into their culturally determined categories. This point will be evoked later on in connection with "etic" thinking.

While Japanese and European (de Wit, 1995) universities are humbly assessing how attractive their institutions are to others, Americans often hide behind this ethnocentric perspective and take things for granted. They should not. To make such statements as those quoted above suggests that the speaker has detailed inside knowledge about all other universities around the world, that he or she knows what he or she is doing, and how other universities rank. Not only is this perspective unfounded, but it is also dangerous when university staff and faculty work abroad. One only needs to read the study conducted by the National Academy of Engineering (1987) which concluded that many engineering programmes abroad are well ahead of those in the United States, but that the American academics concerned do not know about them because they do not trust things that they have not produced themselves. The most recent and devastating evidence showing how "foreign aid breeds arrogance in donors, resentment in recipients, and waste and corruption around the globe", has just been published by Wedel (1998). Her study, that implicated one of the most prestigious institutions in the United States, "reminds of the danger of trying to impose change upon societies without understanding how they really work".

The phenomenon whereby people carry their own cognitive maps everywhere they go is not surprising. Linguists and anthropologists have even coined a term for it, "etic thinking", which means looking at others as if from the outside looking in, and observing what is seen from pre-existing frames of relevance and categories. These scholars claim that the etic approach is also the entry point to other cultures (Headland, Pike, and Harris, 1990).

The eighteenth barrier is the absence of a common language for the complexity of international education and for the need to employ multi-perspective and system-oriented thinking. This barrier is not unique for educational institutions. As Senge noted in his influential work on the work of organizations (1990, p. 71), the most common problem is failure to distinguish between "detailed" and "dynamic" complexity. The dynamic complexity which is characteristic of international education is based on divergent thinking, while most organizations look for convergent thinking that is in line with traditional rational choice theory of organizations (Zey, 1998). Educating international students in the United States and sending American students to other countries are examples of dynamic complexity. It is one of the greatest paradoxes of the field that professionals in educational exchange programmes, who have the most global and multi-faceted experiences and knowledge, are least involved in the dialogues about international education because they are "stuck" in the box dealing with educational services and immigration rules. Another paradox is that high level educators and administrators understand domestic complexity very well, but ask for simple solutions to global programmes. Yet, they also consider that international competitiveness is the major goal of international education. How can Americans compete globally with simplicity?

Related to this barrier is the nineteenth source of resistance, another level of complexity that arises out of the need to employ a variety of disciplinary perspectives simultaneously with knowledge of global affairs. Organizational theorists suggest that institutions have about seven layers of functions, each one of which requires a higher level of complexity from the bottom up (von Krogh *et al.*, 1996). Apparently, complex thinking is required only from the fifth level on, which means that the organizational hierarchy of educational institutions does not employ the level of complexity available from international service units because these are usually placed below the magic fifth layer. On the other hand, it is also unlikely that the higher level administrators will understand the level of complexity in international education because they do not have corresponding international experience and interdisciplinary knowledge. This paradox is complicated by the "Pygmalion" effect according to which the "service units" themselves have accepted their roles and have thus not been able or willing to develop their cognitive skills beyond the level of their "service" mentality. As a result, they often argue their cases on the basis of the "future scenarios" (*viz.* Senge, p. 189) when they should be learning how to challenge the top administrators to rethink the educational concepts and cognitive models in this field.

This difficulty leads on to consideration of the twentieth barrier, conceptual confusion about educational change. The globalization of educational institutions is a programme of change, but neither literature nor practice appears to be driven by understanding of what change is, what causes it, where it comes from – whether from internal or external sources, how fast it can go, whether it can be controlled, whether change in one area can affect change in others, and how it may affect individuals and institutions. The absence of concepts makes the process of globalization even more random and *laissez-faire* than other educational changes that are occurring within given societies. In addition, the add-ons simply hang on in the institutions without challenging and integrating themselves with other structures and functions. As educational institutions tend to be very conservative, other sectors of public and especially private life are overtaking and bypassing them, thus adding more fuel to another kind of competitiveness – interinstitutional competitiveness. Yet, international education supports change, and the very nature of the curriculum suggests that international education ought to be teaching students skills that they can use in the future. That future will be, of course, constantly changing, so that teachers ought to prepare students not only in the subject matter, but also to live in a constantly changing environment.

Unfortunately, much of the curriculum leaves the impression that there is some degree of certainty that students who graduate have already learned how to solve problems. There are several concepts and theories that, it seems, have not been applied to international education. Van der Wende (1996) integrated these concepts in her seminal study on the internationalization of the Dutch higher education system. Some concepts are based on studying continuity or discontinuity between "old to new"; others study spontaneous changes resulting from natural social processes; still others seek to apply democratic theories of incremental planned changes the dynamics of which generate more changes, so that one strategic innovation produces additional ones. Ideas about these various change theories can be easily found in various policy sciences in the research undertaken by futurists, in strategic thinking activities in business and industry, and not to be neglected, in theories of educational change and reform.

Evidence that these theories are at work is not difficult to find in many other ways. For example, creative thinking as intellectual skill is based on ideas of change and innovation. Counseling programmes assume that there is a need for services to help people adjust to changes. Some leadership theories distinguish between "transactional" and "transitional" leadership in organizations. Development theories can be found in at least three different meanings: development of the developing countries, theories of cognitive and moral development of people, and professional development of talents in life-long learning and re-training. Most changes are complex. The theories upon which they are based agree that change is complex, that it may produce uneven benefits at least initially, that it cannot be accomplished without the simultaneous training of people in new skills, and that it also has several different levels of sophistication, ranging from simple to drastic structural and conceptual interventions.

Some changes are easier to make, such as technological innovations, while others are embedded in culture and require more sophisticated attention. Universities themselves are agents of change in people and in societies, and yet one seldom hears about what concepts of change are the theories-in-use in institutional reforms and in training students to live and work in changing environments. With respect to the curriculum, of particular interest are cognitive skills that are not necessarily taught by traditional content-based disciplines, but by innovative, often experiential, learning of such skills as creative and comparative thinking, cognitive complexity, cognitive alteration, alteration of self-perceptions, integrative thinking, and other as yet unknown skills. The paradox is that international education, especially educational exchanges of students and scholars, can produce much of this kind of learning that the author has described elsewhere (Mestenhauser, 1998).

Above all, the most important aspect of change is that it is produced best in conditions in which ideas and knowledge flow freely, are questioned and debated, and offer possibilities for experimentation on smaller samples. Such conditions exist only in democratic societies. While it may have appeared that democracy is the trend of the future, some of the uncertainties brought about by events and conditions, including globalization, are undermining the very processes of democratic functioning that need to be safeguarded. Not only are the strengths of certain rigid ideological movements that undermine democracy of concern, but also the status of affairs in the institutions, including American universities, that are supposed to promote freedom of inquiry. It is very disappointing to know that discordant views about international education are not only not being encouraged, but are often actively excluded. It is also discouraging, as our European friends note with concern (de Wit, 1998), that the American academic community has not risen unanimously in support of the Fulbright appropriations or in urging the American government to return to UNESCO.

REMOVING BARRIERS TO INTERNATIONALIZATION AND GLOBALIZATION THROUGH ADMINISTRATIVE AND CURRICULAR LEADERSHIP

A number of implications flow from the analysis, given below, of barriers to internationalization. Foremost among them is the need to challenge the presidents and rectors, their cabinets and their deans, and to develop multi-framed mental models about international education as a system that should pervade the entire institution from policy to structures. No matter which other limited model is selected, the pressures of globalization and interdependence will continue to chip away at universities that do not respond. Interdependence is not anything about which a vote can be taken (Stanley Foundation, 1996) – the traditional method of decision-making in American higher education.

Decisions should not be made by majorities on the basis of perceived competition for funds with all other units, but on the basis of knowledge provided by the various frames, without exclusion.

There is overwhelming evidence that the minimalist approach is not adequate, is fragmented and incomplete, and that present structures do not fit the needs. It seems moreover that the federated system is inefficient and that the "laissez-faire" attitude is dysfunctional. Without mental models, the emphasis is on persons, structures, and budgets.

There are several ways of informing the process of development of the mental models. One might be to commission a meta-study of the literature about the internationalization of universities and to use such a study on campus and in nationwide discussions. This step should begin the dialogue that has not yet taken place. The short-lived effort of CAFLIS (the Coalition of Associations of Foreign Languages and International Studies), that was supposed to lead to the establishment of a national foundation for international studies and foreign languages, was a failure because, among other reasons, it did not develop multiple mental models.

Another method might be to develop study committees within the universities seeking to establish international education as a super-ordinate goal that strengthens all its units. Such committees, preferably set up by institutional presidents, might seek to re-examine the existing structures, to identify duplications, and to suggest ways in which international education as a "divergent complexity" programme might be administered differently from the standard structures. Bolman and Deal (1997, pp. 60-61) describe certain organizational dilemmas of corporations that could be applied to educational institutions. Maintaining a balance among these dilemmas is a source of continuing struggle in organizations. Such dilemmas also exist in international education but are extenuated by the fact that the international dimension acts as an organization within the organization that then confronts everything else: people, structures, functions, production, morale, and past commitments. These dilemmas include the following: differentiation versus integration; gaps versus overlaps; under-use versus overload; lack of clarity versus lack of creativity; excessive autonomy versus excessive interdependence; too loose versus too tight; diffuse authority versus over-centralization; and goalless versus goalbound. A solution to the balanced management of international education clearly lies in the framework of the entire system.

Most university structures are vertical, while the needs of international education are lateral and horizontal, requiring different patterns of teaching, learning, networking, communication and policy environment, and should not be frozen into a standard one-size-fits-all structure. The standardization of international education which treats it in the same "standard" way in which all other "vested interests" are treated reinforces centralization. Some writers of organizational behaviour suggest that a new pattern of holographic management is already appearing in industry that might be very relevant to administrative changes in international education. All units would be connected because all would contain parts of the whole. At present, they tend to be isolated and insulated, thus creating a fertile ground for misunderstanding, miscommunication, duplications, inefficiency, and conflicts. The international committees could also undertake a study of institutional memory in international education. The author has visited many institutions the leadership of which was unaware of past study and consultation reports and publications that featured international education. The reports remained hidden in lost files and thus failed to provide institutional learning about lessons from past approaches, such as how many people were reached by the programmes and why, how past grant objectives have been implemented after their termination, whether previous reports have been implemented, how well foreign students are integrated into the life of the institutions, how frequently students attend special international lectures, why students do or do not study abroad, etc. Frequently, such past reports used only one or two frames. The fact they remained unknown has encouraged discovery of the proverbial wheel by each new administration or appointment.

This analysis leads to the question of the cost of international education which is the major source of the "flood-gate" syndrome. The problem is, as suggested above, that it is not international programmes that are too costly, but that institutions everywhere are in effect paying the price for their inability in the past to think globally and to make the necessary conceptual and organizational shifts in this direction. The perceived cost of international education will continue to be high, perhaps even increase, the longer the need to conceptualize the models of operation is avoided. Viewing the matter from this frame, the cost is therefore not much of a factor. Add to this the often hidden costs of duplication, jurisdictional disputes, competition for funds between departments, lost opportunities for outside funding, and other losses that are unknown because they are hidden.

Canon (1976) studied the cost of such jurisdictional disputes within only one unit of a university and concluded that the costs of these duplications was, to his shock, enourmous. In crude shorthand, the antecedent of international education is ethnocentrism and provincialism, but the tendency is to blame the messenger for the message. On the other hand, Americans like to think of themselves as global leaders in higher education, but have not yet conceptualized the responsibilities which flow from such global leadership status. It requires more knowledge than American education presently has about communicating with many diverse populations outside the traditional disciplinary societies, and possessing corresponding knowledge about them and about themselves. Leadership does not result from the unilateral declaration that Americans are such leaders, but from establishing, maintaining, and earning such status that grows not only from tasks to be performed, but also from relationships. Not only the American leadership as such but American academic leadership is on probation, even among friends. American universities thus have a multiple role to play, first as transnational institutions, secondly as educators of the next generation, and third, as cultural diplomats.

The costs of international programmes should also be attributed to the consequences of past failures to mainstream international education at times when major foundation grants were readily available. Instead, many universities took the grants and their often generous overheads for standard expenditures and in effect created a pattern that international programmes should be funded primarily from such soft funding. Many universities continue in this mode. One only needs to follow announcements of job searches for deans of international offices whose skills must include the ability to raise funds. Still, the costs can be minimized substantially by learning to articulate the goals differently using multiple frames, by developing co-operative relationships within the institutions, by innovative instructional programmes, by policy changes, and by insuring that international education is integrated into all units, from student life to public relations departments.

Most organizations are goal oriented, with goals usually looking toward the future. Universities have their own institutional mission statements while different sub-units have theirs. These statements are often ambiguous, lack implementation mechanisms, and do not identify expected results or the time frame for achieving them. Thus they allow many people and units to believe that they are acting in accordance with institutional goals, whatever they may be, by their frames. It would be more helpful to develop shorter-term strategic plans with incremental objectives to be accomplished over time. International education goals are not simply one thing for all times. Like most programmes of educational change, these changes should be incremental. Programmes should be evaluated one year at a time because several sub-goals may have either positive or negative unintended consequences, and because some changes produce more changes spontaneously. There should be a direction and allocation of responsibilities for all units. One of the important functions of such strategic plans should be to identify the expected roles of various constituencies, including academic departments and students.

Students are not told what is expected of them in the domain of international education. They should be informed not only about the different options that they have for their global education, but also the likely consequences of their choices. An institutional policy regarding these expectations should become a strong motivating force with which to recruit students, offer them language instruction, relate them to foreign students, and encourage them to study abroad. Similarly, the present lack of institutional policy about recruitment and retention of faculty does not provide strong incentives for faculty to take greater responsibility for international activities for themselves and for their departments.

Although institutional presidents do not have direct roles in curricular affairs, they should provide strong transformational leadership. The deans often say that they respond to presidential initiatives more than to those that come from below. Curricular decisions should be based on the need to educate globally a much larger number of students than are currently being educated and that concept-training is not adequate enough to prepare students for global activities. Practical experiences – but not of simply any kind – are urgently needed to complement the curriculum, and could be provided through a large number of resources that are already available, such as the presence of international students and scholars, study dyads, study circles, dormitory living, and attendance at campus conferences and seminars. Perhaps a system of "continuing education credits", eventually convertible to academic credits, might provide the motivation for such activities and strengthen them in the process as well. Non-teaching staff could be deputized to monitor such learning experiences. There is also a need to reexamine the liberal-general education requirements as well as the structures of "minors" and "collateral" fields. One institution with which the author is familiar is now in the process of discontinuing its traditional "minors" and replacing them with "clusters", many of which will be internationalized and included as mandatory parts of degree programmes.

One of the strengths of the American higher education system was that it was composed of small *bytes* of digestible knowledge in which everybody did just one thing at a time and eventually collected sufficient credits to graduate. There is now a need to look for opportunities for learning in which it is possible to accomplish several educational objectives at the same time, or as the saying goes, "have your cake and eat it too". There is a great deal of synergy in classrooms with foreign students in which assignments require students to work together. Study abroad is also such an opportunity, but is poorly realized because students are asked to study things that fit into their home university programmes, often under their own instructors.

Studies about the impact of study abroad indeed indicate how many opportunities are missed, yet it is assumed that simply sending students abroad provides them automatically with global perspectives. Study abroad programmes are presently primarily market driven and thus conceptually underdeveloped. Both study abroad and international student programmes need to be integrated and to become "academic" or they will waste the resources they have precisely because they lack mental models that could otherwise provide opportunities for educational synergies.

There are hundreds of ideas about curricular enrichment programmes, but none will be helpful unless they include concepts as to why they should be employed. Similarly, none should neglect efforts to re-examine academic programmes themselves and to urge the academic departments, the disciplines they represent, and their academic societies, to look seriously at their status of knowledge in comparison with that of other countries and cultures. Each academic "major" should have at least one required course focusing on the international dimension of the field. Team teaching across departments and colleges should be encouraged for such courses. Most universities have the resources to provide interdisciplinary and international input into such courses. Such curricular concepts are described elsewhere (Mestenhauser and Ellingboe, 1998) in a volume devoted to curricular reform efforts offering multidisciplinary and multidimensional perspectives on internationalization. Presidents, chief executive officers, deans, and department chairpeople have crucial roles to play and need to be persuaded to treat international education not as "business as usual", "everybody in his and her place", but as complex learning concepts that need to be infused laterally throughout institutions. Mechanisms for such lateral transfers of knowledge might yet have to be discovered, such as a selected group of knowledgeable faculty members to be placed into a Consortium of Senior Fellows for International and Global Studies, or as an informal committee of curricular officers from all major departments charged with the responsibility to re-examine courses, majors, and collateral fields. Similarly, all deliberative bodies, including faculty governance, should have built-in "conceptual alarm clocks" that would ring when the hundreds of decisions that are being taken are not reflecting international and global dimensions.

CONCLUSION

Global universities of the future will probably require entering students to have a command of at least one foreign language and to take part in more sophisticated and lengthy study abroad than that which exists today. While abroad, American and third-country students would study not only their own disciplines, but perform practical tasks related to cross-cultural communication, networking, and the search for cultural meanings. They would thus establish long-lasting networks with other students and faculty and would come to understand the basic issues involved in sustained transfer of knowledge, not by imitation, but as the foundation for creating new knowledge. When such students graduate, they should have, in addition to strong professional competencies, sufficient knowledge of their own country to explain themselves to others and in turn have them do the same in reverse. They should have skills, knowledge, and attitudes that will allow them to function and to practice their professions in any country of the world, on short notice, and without the need for prior preparation and orientation.

Most discussions about future learning is focused on technology and the concept of virtual universities. Nothing in this study suggests that learning has to occur only in the traditional classroom setting. However, nothing suggests that virtual universities should replace what only interpersonal environments can accomplish. When knowledge of learning theories and social change are taken into account by administrators, it becomes clear that global changes have profound effects on interpersonal and intergroup relations and that learning under conditions of uncertainty causes errors of judgment that can have untold negative consequences.

As suggested earlier, for the kind of global transfer of knowledge and interpersonal networking that will be needed in global institutions, it will be necessary to safeguard the environment of freedom of expression and search for meanings. The author is more than ever convinced that democracy is the only system, as variously as it may need to be practiced across the world, and believes that globalization alters substantially the concepts of citizenship and responsibility to which American have been accustomed in the past. To expand the concept of national citizenship to include (but not to replace) global citizenship, requires a giant cognitive shift. Not making this shift encourages disruptive nationalism. Students need to be educated to insure that they will accept personal responsibilities that flow from a pluralistic global society. Such responsibilities mean behaving responsibly and sensitively and accepting larger goals than one of simple personal gain from higher education. It goes without saying that to achieve this goal will require more than goodwill and the best of intentions.

There were times, in its early history, when international education seemed to be the best answer to a troubled world through the furtherance of mutual understanding. That concept has lost its punch, and competitiveness seems to be replacing it. Still, cultural diplomacy is an important part of such programmes as the Fulbright Programme, the programmes of DAAD, the British Council, the Japan Foundation, the Sasakawa Foundation, the Alliance Française, and the European Commission. Perhaps the time has come for our universities to broaden their own institutional goals to include cultural diplomacy of a global scope, especially now in light of the UNESCO Year of Higher Education. To paraphrase the preamble of the UNESCO charter, barriers to globalization also reside in the minds of educators and their constituencies. The world may still be an insecure place, full of terrorism, ideological extremism, and uneven distribution of wealth and quality of life, but we have never been closer to a potential to create a truly global peaceful existence. Never before in history have so many individuals had so much control over their destinies, and never before have they had so much knowledge with which to further these objectives.

This point, that international education is about knowledge, must be stressed over and over again. Existing leadership and structures are, however, concerned more with power, influence, standardization, costs, and balance of interests. In the new international scheme of things, the power and authority of international education should not be vested in persons, offices, and traditional governance, but in the authority of knowledge, albeit multi-perspective knowledge, integrated into the structures differently than at present. Such distinction "is crucial to the functioning of complex modern institutions" (Zey, 1998, p. 84). As Einstein suggested, problems cannot be solved by the frames of reference that created them to begin with. International education is an institution within an institution. It touches every level and aspect of it, and therefore does not fit any of the boxes into which existing practices place it.

The recent wave of interest in international education has indeed helped to bridge the gap between the old academic tradition and the rapidly moving global environment. Unfortunately, the terrain that has been encountered on the other side of that gap is unexpectedly hilly, rocky, in places impassable, full of at least twenty more barriers, and may possibly contain more hidden gaps. The short-cuts used to bridge the gaps no longer exist. There is a need for better road maps, better aerial reconnaissance of these barriers, better equipment, better roads, and better ideas. This article is intended to contribute to the diagnosis of the terrain in hope that the phases still ahead of us will not take fifty more years.

REFERENCES

ALTBACH, P. O., and PETERSON, Patti McGill, eds. "Internationalize Higher Education", **Change** (July-August 1998).

ARGYRIS, C. **Overcoming Organizational Defenses**. New York: Prentice Hall, 1990.

ARGYRIS, C., and SCHOEN, Donald A. **Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective**. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley, 1978.

BOLMAN, L. O., and DEAL, T. E. **Reframing Organizations**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.

CANON, H. J. "IA Development Model for Divisions in Student Affairs", **Journal of College Student Personnel** 17 3 (1976): 178-180.

COLEMAN, M. S. "Crossing Borders", Speech at the Presidential Convocation to Students and Staff at the University of Iowa, Iowa City, 28 September 1998.

COOMBS, P. H. **The World Crisis in Education: A View From the Eighties**. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

DE WIT, H. **Strategies for the Internationalization of Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Australia, Canada, Europe, and the USA**. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education, 1995.

DE WIT, H., ed. **50 Years of International Co-operation and Exchange between the United States and Europe: European Views**. EAIE Occasional Paper No. 11. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education, 1998.

ELLINGBOE, B. "Divisional Strategies on Internationalizing Curriculum: A Comparative Five-College Case Study of Deans and Faculty Perspectives at the University of Minnesota", Thesis for the Master of Arts Degree, University of Minnesota, 1996 (Unpublished).

Ellingboe, B. "Divisional Strategies to Internationalize a Campus Portrait: Results, Resistance, and Recommendations from a Case Study at a U.S. University", in, Mestenhauser, J. A., and Ellingboe, B. **Reforming Higher Education Curriculum: Internationalizing the Campus**. Series on Higher Education. Phoenix: ORYX Press and the American Council on Education, 1998.

FULLAN, M. "Evolution of Change and the New Work of the Educational Leader", *in*, WONG, Kam-Cheung, and CHENG, Kai-Ming, eds. **Educational Leadership and Change: An International Perspective**. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1995.

GERGEN, K. **Toward Transformation of Social Knowledge**. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 1994.

GIBBONS, M., LINOGES, C., NOWOTNY, H., SCHWARTZMAN, S., SCOTT, P., and TROW, M. **The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies**. London: Sage, 1994.

GOODWIN, C. D., and NACHT, M. **Absence of Decisions: Foreign Students in American Colleges and Universities**. New York: Institute of International Education, 1983.

GROENNINGS, S., and WILEY, J. **Group Portrait: Internationalizing the Disciplines**. New York: The American Forum for Global Education, 1990.

HANVEY, R. "Cross-Cultural Understanding: Its Potential and Limits", Paper presented at the NAFSA: Association of International Educators Meeting, in Ames, Iowa, 6 June 1978.

HANVEY, R. **An Attainable Global Perspective**. New York: Global Perspectives in Education, Inc., 1979.

HARARI, M. and REIFF, R. "Half Way There – A View from the Bridge", *in*, **International Educator** 3 1 (1993): 16-19.

HEADLAND, T. N., PIKE, K. L., and HARRIS, M. **Emics and Etics: the Insider/Outsider Debate**. Frontiers of Anthropology, Vol. 7. Newbury Park, California: Sage, 1990.

HOFSTEDE, O. **Culture is Consequences: International Differences in Work and Related Values**. Beverley Hills: Sage, 1984.

KAHNEMAN, D., and TVERSKY, A. **Judgement under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

KOESTER, J. **A Profile of the U.S. Student Abroad: 1984-1985**. New York: Council on International Educational Exchange, 1987.

KOHN, A. **No Contest**. Boston: Houghton and Mifflin, 1992.

LAI, D. **Global Perspectives**. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner, 1997.

LAKOMSKI, Gabriele. "Training Administrators in the Wild: A Naturalistic Perspective", **U.C.E.A. Review** 29 3 (1998).

MESTENHAUSER, J. A. "International Education on the Verge", **International Educator** 7 2-3 (Spring 1998).

MESTENHAUSER, J. A., and ELLINGBOE, B., eds. **Reforming Higher Education Curriculum: Internationalizing the Campus**. Series on Higher Education. Phoenix: ORYX Press and the American Council on Education, 1998.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF ENGINEERING. **Strengthening U.S. Engineering through International Co-operation: Some Recommendations for Action**. Washington, D. C.: National Academy of Engineering, 1987.

SCHWARTZ, P., and OGILVY, J. **The Emergent Paradigm: Changing Patterns of Thought and Beliefs**. Menlo Park: Stanford Research Institute, 1979.

SENGE, P. M. **The Fifth Discipline**. New York: Doubleday, 1990.

STALLINGS, B. ed. **Global Change: Regional Response**. Cambridge: University Press, 1995.

STANLEY FOUNDATION. **New American Global Dialogue: The Impact of Globalization: Shaping the Greater Twin Cities Response**. Muscatine, Iowa: The Stanley Foundation, 1996.

VAN DER WENDE, M. C. **Internationalizing the Curriculum in Dutch Higher Education: An International Comparative Perspective**. The Hague: NUFFIC, 1996.

VON KROUGH, O., and ROOS, J. **Managing Knowledge: Perspectives in Co-operation and Competition**. London: Sage, 1996.

WEDEL, J. R. **Collision and Collusion**. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

WŁODKOWSKI, R. J. **Enhancing Adult Motivation to Learn**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

WŁODKOWSKI, R. J., and GINSBERG, M. B. **Diversity and Motivation**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

ZANDER, A. F. **Motives and Goals in Groups**. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction, 1996.

ZEY, M. **Rational Choice Theory and Organizational Theory: A Critique**. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 1998.

"THE SHOW IS NOT THE SHOW/ BUT THEY THAT GO": THE JANUS-FACE OF THE INTERNATIONALIZED UNIVERSITY AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY

Dorothea STEINER

A DOUBLE RESPONSE

As an American-Literature-and-Culture person by profession, I cannot resist the temptation to choose a poetic motto for my response to the scholarly articles of two experts on internationalization in higher education, Joseph A. Mestenhauser and Hans de Wit. This riddle is the beginning of a minimal poem by Emily Dickinson, the Nineteenth Century recluse from New England, who sensed that she was too radical in vision and in verse to "go public" as a woman in her age of "Victorian propriety". She decided to stay "local" and, from there, to create a poetic "empire". Firmly rooted, she reached out to her virtual audiences-to-be. Her poem continues with the lines: "Menagerie to me/ My neighbor be -/ Fair Play -/ Both Went to see –". What is the relevance of this poetic statement for our topic?

In the arena of international education as in the space of a poem, the perceiving and speaking person starts out from a particular place and set of circumstances. The "Other" is considered to be "out there", beyond the fence, even as the strange animal behind bars from which we keep a safe distance. Not "I" am, but "it" is, off limits. I am the self-defined spectator of "you", the object of my study and amusement, I am curious to watch you, but I like the barrier because I consider you as a potential threat to my identity. Dickinson's poem suggests - subversively - that both partners are equal, that they are neighbours to each other; they are mutually held by expectation and fear - they are each other's "show". The solution to the "riddle" lies in the re-conceptualization of the fence as combining the aspects of separating and linking, by blurring the boundaries between learner and object of learning. It is a new space of challenge beyond the old binaries.

The supreme irony of the poet translates well into the central agenda of international education, where the learning encounter involves both the awareness and the crossing and re-crossing of borders. This action is recognized as an intercultural encounter, while seeming primarily intended as scientific interaction on a comparative, interdisciplinary, and of course international level. It needs to be stressed that the whole assumption of international education rests on the democratic principle of free travel of people and ideas.

I am indebted to the educational scientist from the University of Minnesota, Joseph Mestenhauser, for giving us in his article, "Missing in Action: Leadership for International and Global Education for the Twenty-Firstt Century", a comprehensive analysis and a set of tools with which to approach the issue of international education. He writes from his United States-based academic experience, with a perspective modified by extensive transatlantic travel and educational consulting in post-1989 Europe, including Russia. His arguments will be brought into a framework with Hans de Wit's ideas delineated in his article, "Changing Rationales for the Internationalization of Higher Education". As Vice-President for International Affairs at the University of Amsterdam, he speaks to us as a European holding a strategic position in the university management. He proposes that a new academic world order is called for, in which the multilateral interconnection and collaboration of institutions be supported by a strong leadership guided by the axiom that internationalization as an academic rationale requires radical and large-scale internationalization policies. While de Wit focuses on action to be taken by the leadership, Mestenhauser opens up for us the conceptual processes necessary so that leaders no longer be "missing in action". Both articles are revised and enlarged versions of papers presented at the 1998 European Association for International Education (EAIE) Conference in Stockholm, on the Track 13.11-Panel titled "Institutional Implementation of Internationalization Strategies - of Marginal Significance or All Pervasive?".

What triggered the panel was the general sense at the end of the 1997 EAIE Conference in Barcelona that the notion of internationalization as a priority in the academy required policy steps from the leadership in order to take it beyond lip service. In a spirit of elation and frustration, the participants had pondered the role of faculty, the question of English as a linking language of instruction, and the growing global impact on national institutions and their international engagement. Joe Mestenhauser's statement that higher education does not build bridges (as the conference theme was suggesting) but that "higher education is the bridge" made many of us want to continue the discussion about the "international issue" along that line. In the meantime, European Ministers of Education from thirty countries signed a "Joint Declaration" (Bologna, June 19, 1999) to create a "Europe of Knowledge" in which the cultural role of the university is heavily emphasized and concrete measures are to be taken toward a system of higher education that will be unified enough to grant inner-European mobility and transferability and to make Europe better equipped to meet the challenges of international competition and global change.

The reason why evocation of the Bologna Declaration is important for the present consideration is that it is an act of political leadership in favour of the necessary internationalization of higher education. On the basis of such an action, university leaders can now build their actions so that universities may finally reform themselves from inside in order to become more truly international. Why have they not done so so far? Because the international issue has been largely considered marginal, a luxury, an added-on duty which involved some faculty members who got little credit for it and the Foreign Relations Offices which act largely as administrative managers of exchanges and advisors of exchangees. What has been missing is the intellectual climate in which the internationally-minded can grow, flourish, become creative, and infuse their immediate academic surroundings with their idealism. It has, however, been proven that institutions cannot rely for ever on such idealism but that the leadership must take on the responsibility to institutionalize the international dimension as an integrative element for the evaluation of its students, its faculty, and itself as an institution in the wider context. If the first two of these integrative elements require ingenuity on the part of leaders in terms of fostering motivation and creating reward strategies, the third is geared toward the mature self-conception of the institution and image-making in an interconnected world of market interests which pose an immense challenge to the traditional identity of the university. According to that tradition, a university was by definition international because scholarship is international and, beyond that, scholars meet at international conferences and invite one another to their home institutions.

At the turn of a new millennium, when physical student mobility has become a daily reality and when the borderline between teachers and learners has become blurred owing to the leadership of the young generation in electronic competency, internationalization as an integrative principle of higher education must be defined, defended, supported, and officially declared by university leaders as binding on all. Such implementation of internationalization, while requiring acts of formalization, also requires a whole new consideration of leadership accompanied by the creation and the encouragement of a respective discourse within the institution. Such a discourse will need to transcend traditional hierarchical thinking and privileges of status and, instead, address and engage individuals across the board and across the boundaries of age, status, and discipline and, most certainly, give due consideration to the issue of sexual difference as a vital category in internationalism. All this gives the institution the chance of "fair play" in acknowledging the input made from all sides. In an atmosphere of liberality and trust, a readiness to face change will come more easily and will motivate an open discussion about finding ways together to meet it. Many involved in this internationalization process find it hard to take that while they are struggling to develop a conceptual framework for international activities, they need to do so under much tougher conditions than ever expected. It is necessary to combine the international agenda with the global agenda which speak very different languages.

The international agenda is by definition dialog and establishes relationships between partners. These partnerships can consist of individuals, teams, institutions, or whole national educational systems. The question of the interaction of European higher education with partners abroad is an intriguing one because European higher education is not a national entity but consists of such. Hence, European higher education is by nature international, whereas in its interaction it is "intercontinental". Internationalism is different from global, which does not aim at dialog but at communication and transfer, worldwide sharing, and exchange of information. If internationalization, according to de Wit, "includes both international and local elements", one can see why it carries an intercultural dimension. By contrast, globalization does not primarily refer to interculturality. Propelled, as it is, by information technology, it allows global traveling of information, quasi neutrally, and without the concern of turning this technology into one of cultural knowledge or understanding.

Looked at more closely, however, we realize that what travels freely is not so neutral as we may think, as it travels with the help of two common languages, both of them Western: English and technology. That both are strongly linked in our consciousnesses to "modernity", American style, should make us at least see an ambivalence about its implied peace building function. As de Wit points out in the context of discussing "political rationales", the giver of the model may have the best peacemaking intentions, yet imperialism cannot be overlooked as a hidden agenda. This peace is a "Western peace" and seems to have a particular national identity.

While it seems thus that the global and the national are not completely separate from each other, it still seems reasonable to maintain that no dialog is intended or likely to result from an encounter between such global-qua-national forces. Impact here is rather a by-product of the interconnectedness and shared literacy which makes the technology tick. And Hans de Wit makes us aware of how necessary it has become to function globally in the context of what he calls the "economic rationale" for internationalization.

The situation becomes interesting, however, when moving beyond the economic and the political rationales and on to what he calls the "international university in the new millennium", an institution fully in tune with the "trend for leadership driven, multilateral, institutional networks", he provides an impressive list of both European and global initiatives. What is meant by "global" is that the partners involved are drawn from far-away places, that the global networks span the globe. This could be the "next stage of internationalization" in which higher education institutions will "behave" much like banks or industries, by merging and engaging in joint ventures and, in the following, turn out "common products". Although this seems like a "logical", even "unavoidable", development, de Wit thinks that this will hardly happen on a large scale very soon. Yet, he is convinced that this move will prove stronger than the continued development of "discipline based networks and consortia". The question that should be raised is whether or not in this future prospect the "intercultural" dimension, following from the encounter of the "local" with the "international", is implicit. Following his earlier definition of internationalization, which assigns it the characteristics of "process", "response to the international, (and) to globalization", and "intercultural (ity)", could it not be that we are not facing a confusion of terms, whereby internationalization suffers an inflation of its meaning.

Let me return to Dickinson's equal partners who, in their encounter across the boundary, wish for "fair play", and turn to Josef Mestenhauser's set of analytic tools for the whole problematique of the internationalization process, bringing us back to the question of knowledge. When the European Ministers agreed on a "Europe of Knowledge" as vital for the new millennium, they meant it as a "factor for social and human growth", an enrichment of citizenship, an "awareness of shared values and belonging to a common social and cultural space". Knowledge, accordingly, is primarily seen as perceptual and conceptual gain and potential for maturity, not so much as knowledge for some intellectual, disciplinary, professional, or scientific purpose. Thus it is appropriate to raise the question of the boundary and to introduce two variants of it; the barriers, of which Mestenhauser sees no fewer than twenty blocking or at least slowing down the internationalization process, and the concept of the "gap". I see a basic difference between the barrier as obstacle standing in our way or blocking our view, hard to step over or remove; and the gap which marks an empty space rather, one that can be filled or bridged. A gap requires a horizontal direction of thinking, while a barrier requires a vertical mode. The gap seems easier to deal with. Mestenhauser identifies three variants: inadequate knowledge production (deep analysis of a small sector instead of creative knowledge production involving "cognitive complexity"); the knowledge gap between what is known and what ought to be known (in terms of facts, concepts, and paradigms); and "scarce knowledge" (the gap between how we know ourselves and how others know us). All three are highly central to success or failure in international education, as knowledge is the process achieved through learning, and international learning includes cultural knowing, only to be approached through non-linear connecting. International education thus requires special communication skills that are not developed when pure information is acquired.

Mestenhauser stresses such topics so much that organizational questions get completely pushed into the background. To him, the university has the need to reform itself from within by paying heed to what theoretical and practical input the institution needs to give the student so that his/her international experience may be successful and useful for the university. He suggests using not only returnees but international students present to further the intercultural learning processes of local students. To this effort to create synergy can be added other concrete steps toward internationalizing the local scene: like introducing course requirements in which international perception or competences are taught, or giving educational credits to be used toward academic credit requirements. It is quite clear that for Mestenhauser internationalization is unthinkable without the interpersonal, intercultural dimension, from which it follows logically that the role of the modern university must go beyond educating the next generations academically. It must also work transnationally and fulfill its responsibility as "cultural diplomat". Together, these three roles could form a mission the realization of which by the leadership would necessitate a conceptual shift and a well-balanced division of responsibility among students and teachers. To involve people on all levels of the institution is the *conditio sine qua non* without which the leadership at the top will not move anything.

This approach is a very different one from that which Hans de Wit takes, who sees the change toward internationalization above all in the complex linkages between institutions regionally and globally and the synergies to be derived therefrom. The role of the leadership seems fairly autocratic and outward-bound rather than democratic-motivational and bound toward inner reform. In de Wit's internationalized academic success story, the leader is the author, in Mestenhauser's version, the whole institution writes the book, while the leader initiates, does the fundraising, and ensures publication.

A look at the barriers Mestenhauser wants to see removed will be helpful in leading back to the poetic point of departure, namely, to the fairness required by the partners engaging in mutual cultural viewing. After all, Joe Mestenhauser's prime concern is with the missing cognitive model, which makes the leadership so precarious.

I wish to pick out just a few obstacles and frame them as questions fit to stimulate the discussion.

i) If international learning is cultural learning, "are there essential concepts in the social sciences and the humanities that need to be transferred to the hard sciences and to technology" (*cf.* Barrier No.3)?

ii) In view of the assumed "cultural convergence" furthered by people's increased international traveling and by the many occasions in the modern world for human interrelation in joint study, business, and other activities: How can international educators justify the real need to teach "divergent complexity" as the basis for intercultural competence (*cf.* Barrier No.7)?

iii) How does the institution cope with the fact that "international education has its own social psychology"? How do we deal with the fact that individuals engaging in the international learning process are significantly influenced by their own selective approach to experiential knowledge; hence, many highly subjective elements help to frame the international mindset of an institution and influence the drawing of its "conceptual map" of internationalization (*cf.* Barrier No.13).

If one considers that universities are "agents of change in people and in societies", an internationalized higher education institution has indeed a great responsibility toward many heterogeneous stakeholders and citizens, locally, internationally, and globally. On the other hand, one should not forget that the university, as the great storehouse of knowledge, preserved, reshaped, and produced by research-based academics and as the place for deep reflection on basic and long-term projects about human life has, by nature, a constitutional slowness. Reforming teaching in view of the global demand may lead to the conclusion that universities can turn quite easily into fast-food producers. The very fact that new knowledge cannot just be added and that internationalization requires thorough conceptual work speaks against such an assumption. If top-down decisions aim at enhancing the pace of international linking, merging, and collaboration in the academy of the Twenty-First Century, such enhancement can surely be accomplished with the modern tools of a shared technology and a "lingua franca". Partners involved in such global enterprises may, however, misconceive the fake-intimacy of the academic "global village" as a place of genuine interpersonal understanding. Such a village of intercultural understanding would have to insist that its inhabitants acknowledge, address, and deal conceptually with the boundaries and that they come to conclusions about their own identity-in-process.

72

CONCLUSION

When universities implement internationalization strategies, they must be "all pervasive" for the institution. And they must, above all, instill in the minds of the people involved that engaging in internationalization means entering a consciousness in which one is prepared to shift easily from the position of teacher to learner and back, so that one can never be quite sure whether one is "in the show" or simply watching it. To make it possible for many to be in such "creative uncertainties", institutions must provide frameworks that protect the "fair play" of the internationally-minded students, teachers, and administrative actors. The success of the leadership depends on the full understanding of the rule of fair play and the responsibilities of the players engaged at all structural and organizational levels of the higher education institution.

The Janus-face of the title of this article is meant as symbolic for the state of limbo in which institutions still find themselves at the start of a new millennium. After all, they can look back over hundreds of years of a slow-grown and established identity, from the time when international meant for individual scholarly men to travel around Europe and to converse in Latin with their counterparts. For such visitors in search of knowledge, there was always space provided on site. The steady expansion of the academic sector of the realms of learning, technological advances, secularization, and the abolition of barriers of class and sex led to the ever more open scene in which we now live. And yet, as Hans de Wit makes us understand, by the Nineteenth Century, the academy had also narrowed itself down as its image became strongly tied to serving nationalist interests. With the increased decentralization and regionalization of universities in the Twentieth Century, students almost ceased to travel in search of knowledge anymore, until, in Europe, new incentives for mobility came from politics. After the Second World War, the Fulbright programme started, with its exchange of students and researchers, the first organized intercultural programme and, after the unification of Europe, the European Union took up the opportunity of challenging academe to reinvent itself in the spirit of its academic tradition: to make its youth free travelers in search of knowledge in a defined educational space. It is known that mobility schemes succeed only partially, by involving some ten to fifteen percent of students and a fair number of faculty and, lately, by also including administrators in educational mobility projects. Moreover, other important internationalization strategies have been pursued and are being organized internationally with the help of the ENIC-NARICs, like the recognition of qualifications and diplomas. Others, like ECTS or the Diploma Supplement, have not succeeded on a large scale yet, but are in the process of implementation. Universities send and receive students and faculty from all over, knowing that with every one of them the academic community is challenged in its stable assumptions about its own curricular and conceptual ways. Internationalized classrooms lead to a reconsideration of contents, methods, approaches, curricula, etc., but above all, they invite us to a new openness for intercultural learning in the lateral mode. The "Other" enters into a community and the whole community enters into a new stage of self-awareness as well as academic and institutional awareness. These intricate psychological processes happen at home and at the same time in all places to which students and faculty are exported. All of the above is the lore of the last decades of the Twentieth Century. How could one not be thrilled about this brave new internationalized world!

Yet, one also observes that what with all the mobility, an endless undermining of stability has occurred, that things have become a bit random, that organization of the international lacks a creative edge, and that mechanisms rather than strategies or concepts guide our everyday internationalized reality. And for these reasons such sets of ideas and tools as Joe Mestenhauser gives us become most useful sources of inspiration and reflection. Though almost overwhelmingly complex, they manage to persuade us to push our leaders to initiate the necessary processes and to, consequently, let us enact the full cognitive shift demanded by us, locals, and required by both the international and the global challenges. I find it greatly worthwhile to ponder whether his learner-oriented cultural-understanding model can find a home in Hans de Wit's pragmatic vision of a dynamically interconnecting academe. To me, both are radical visions, but Mestenhauser's demands on university leaders will take more of a sustained effort and offer a method toward the goal of internationalization, as it must develop from within the very psyche of the university.

Janus looks into that psyche, while also looking out over the globe. May his two-faced identity signify our acknowledgement of a conceptual border in the internationalization process and may it also be a clear indicator that the "show" must take place on both sides. The "either-or" perspective can no longer serve us in our approach, whether to our historical or future selves or whether to ourselves vis-à-vis our cultural Others.

TRANSNATIONAL EDUCATION AND RECOGNITION OF QUALIFICATIONS[1]

Lesley A. WILSON and Lazăr VLĂSCEANU

Most higher education systems throughout Europe are facing rapid and continuous change in many forms. Some of the most challenging developments are linked to the impact of globalization on higher education. One way in which this process is reflected is through the growth of transnational education. After much discussion, the *Working Group on Franchised Qualifications* of the ENIC/NARIC network suggested the following definition of transnational education: "those programmes or courses of study, or parts of programmes or courses of study, in which the students are located in a different country from the one in which the awarding and/or sponsoring institution is based". The institution or programme in question may belong to the national education system of another country, or it may be independent of any national system ("non-official higher education institutions/ programmes"). While this distinction should not have a bearing on the demands for transparency and quality, it does affect the legal aspects of the

[1] The UNESCO/Council of Europe ENIC/NARIC network (European National Information Centres on Academic Recognition and Mobility/National Academic Recognition and Information Centres) instituted a *Working Group on Franchised Qualifications* at its Helsinki meeting (8-11 June 1997). This group was initiated to analyze and to try to provide internationally agreed upon solutions to some of the ever more complicated recognition problems facing credential evaluators due to the expansion of transnational educational programmes and qualifications in higher education across the Europe Region. This paper has been elaborated in order to respond to the concerns of the Working Group. We express our gratitude to all members of the Working Group for their comments on an early draft.

recognition of qualifications granted under such programmes, as well as the arrangements made for quality assurance.

Transnational education is still a relatively new phenomenon. Although often closely linked to the development of, and to the possibilities offered by, the new information and communication technologies, to the growth of corporate educational provision by multi-national companies, as well as to the developing "global market" of borderless higher education, its wider impact and consequences are still to be explored. However, higher education is becoming global and/or transnational not only via the use of the new information technologies, but also through other, different initiatives. Some have their roots in the more traditional internationalization schemes of higher education, *i.e.*, in twinning/joint award programmes and in other inter-institutional networking mechanisms, based first and foremost on the mobility of students and staff. Others take an altogether new form, where the moving of higher education programmes, rather than of the learners, becomes the imperative.

DIFFERENT LEVELS OF CONCERN

One may identify three inter-related levels of concern:

i) The first level refers to *the delivery mechanisms themselves and to the institutional arrangements* put in place. These mechanisms may take one of the following forms:

- *Franchising*: defined as the process whereby a higher education institution ("franchiser") from a certain country authorizes another institution or organization ("franchisee"), from the same or from another country, to provide its (*i.e.*, the franchiser's) educational services (e.*g.*, the whole or a part of one or more of its approved study programme/qualifications);
- *Various Programme articulations (e.g., twinning, etc.)*: referring to those inter-institutional arrangements

whereby two or more institutions agree to define jointly a study programme in terms of study credits and credit-transfers, so that students pursuing their studies in one institution have their credits recognized by the other, and accepted for transfer in order to continue their studies;

- *Branch campus*: established by a higher education institution from one country in another country in order to offer there its own educational programmes/ qualifications;
- *Off-shore institution*: an autonomous institution which belongs, in terms of its organization and contents, to one particular national educational system, but without necessarily having a campus in the country (or system) to which it belongs, and is established as an institution in another country.
- Other examples are: *large corporations* which organize their own higher education institutions or study programmes offering qualifications, with neither the institution nor the programme belonging to a national system of higher education; *international institutions* offering "international" qualifications that are not part of a specific educational system. Finally, *distance-learning* describes a wide range of learning activities characterized by the separation of the learner from the teacher. These learning activities – or the framework within which they are organized – may or may not belong to the higher education system of a given country.

All these new developments in higher education share certain common characteristics and similarities, mainly in terms of the ways in which they cross the borders of national higher education systems. It is for this reason that they are usually identified by the generic phrase, transnational education.

One form of development refers to a modality of delivering an educational programme (*i.e.*, distance education), others to ways of establishing a programme/institution (*i.e.*, franchising or twinning/branch campus), and yet others, to ways of offering primarily continuing education to certain new groups of students. There seem to be no limits to the proliferation of such modalities or arrangements, so long as the demand for higher education continues to grow and with it the possibilities for a global market.

ii) The second level of concern is that of the type of study programme or institution, *i.e.*, *the institutional or organizational arrangements* resulting from the specific delivery mechanisms chosen. This can be either a new institution, a branch, or a franchised programme or course of study offering an award within an existing institution or other organization. It may, or may not, belong to a national higher education system.

iii) The third level refers to the *awards and qualifications awarded through transnational education*: academic or professional (degrees, certificates, study credits, etc.), and to the quality of these qualifications.

Thus, the transnational institutional arrangements and delivery mechanisms described above generate a whole range of qualifications, which may be similar in many respects to those awarded by the national higher education institutions, but may also vary in certain important respects.

The following matrix (Table 1) represents an attempt to combine these three levels of concern. In order to better understand the qualifications awarded, the "overlap" between the type of delivery mechanisms and the type of institutional framework must be appreciated.

Table 1. Proposed Matrix for Transnational Education

Institutional Forms / Collaborative Arrangements	Higher Education Institutions		Branch Campuses		Programmes		Other Educational Services/ Courses of Study	
	B*	NB**	B	NB	B	NB	B	NB
Franchising								
Twinning			Awarded Qualifications					
Distance education								
....								

* Belonging to a national higher education system.

** Not-belonging to a national higher education system.

EXPLANATIONS FOR AND SELECT CONSEQUENCES OF TRANSNATIONAL EDUCATION

The intention here is to further explore several of the consequences of recent developments in transnational education, while also putting forward certain explanations. If we think in terms of "sending" and "receiving" institutions, then there are almost automatically two basic ways of looking at transnational education. The first view emphasizes the relationship to national systems and traditional institutional or teaching "arrangements", in the sense that it opposes the sending and the receiving entities (*i.e.*, higher education institutions, programmes and/or systems). While the former "sends out" an institution or a programme through the most appropriate delivery mechanisms in order to respond to a certain demand, the latter "receives in" the programme or the institution, without its necessarily being considered as belonging to the national higher education system in question. The other way of looking at the phenomenon of transnational education emphasizes the *awarding role* of the newly established programme/institution, and considers that this role results from the process of merging the interests of both sending and receiving institutions in order to better respond to an increasing demand for higher education (to which the national system is not able to respond for one reason or another).

A key issue in both cases is the status of the resulting "arrangement" in the national higher education system. While traditional higher education institutions have been considered as belonging to a national system, transnational education may generate higher education programmes/institutions that do not belong to any national system. For this reason, they are sometimes labeled as "non-official higher education institutions". Given the expansion of transnational education, and of qualifications awarded by such type of institutions, a growing tension between national education systems and transnational education is emerging. Two of the key questions being raised are: how to ensure that the awards and qualifications offered through transnational provision arrangements are of sufficient quality to be somehow integrated into the receiving system, and, linked to this question, how to evaluate the credentials offered through such programmes or courses of study?

These questions are very closely related to the changing role of the state in higher education. While in some countries the state is the sole source of funding and the "owner" of higher education institutions, in other countries the state assumes mainly a policy steering role, providing the public framework in which institutions should then act, not only autonomously, but also entrepreneurially, both inside and outside the country. Certain systems of higher education have started acting in much more "market-oriented" ways, regulated principally by certain quality assurance mechanisms and procedures. Other systems of higher education strive to preserve well-established traditions of higher education, the state playing a key role in the process of funding, management, and policy design. This stance does not necessarily imply a clear-cut opposition between different developmental models. Of course, state funded institutions are also operating in the "market" to supplement their income, and in many cases are subject to quality assurance mechanisms, which may not be the case for certain non-state and more market oriented institutions. Some such institutions may not yet have put into place appropriate quality assurance procedures, and that is an important part of the problem. It is thus possible to identify a continuum along which higher education systems may position themselves. This continuum is directly linked to the ways in which transnational education is emerging and is viewed in different national contexts.

For some, transnational education may appear as a direct product of the internationalization of higher education. However, it can be argued that its appearance is linked to wider globalizing trends that go far beyond traditional international links, reflecting an emerging new world in which national boundaries are increasingly challenged by powerful, global tendencies already evident in the domain of finance and economics, and supported by new developments in information technology. There is, of course, a growing literature on the issue of globalization, and on its impact on higher education. The suggestion is that it is difficult to predict either the extent of the impact on higher education, or the institutional patterns that may emerge as a result in the future.[2]

By all accounts, transnational education is here to stay and cannot be disregarded in the name of past national glories or considered as a mere temporary phenomenon. As with many new developments, it can have both positive and negative effects. For many, it represents a crucial means of expanding access and of diversifying higher education provision to meet a growing demand. For others it may represent a threat to existing national

2 See Peter Scott, "Massification, Internationalization, and Globalization" in Peter Scott, ed., **The Globalization of Higher Education** (SRHE, OU Press, 1998, p. 129): "...perhaps the most likely outcome is a highly differentiated development – of a few world universities (or, more probably, of world-class elements within them); of networks of existing universities that trade in this global market-place while maintaining their separate national identities (rather as the countries of Europe have come together in the EU); of the growth of hybrid institutions that combine elements of universities with elements of other kinds of "knowledge" organization (probably global corporation and perhaps through joint enterprises); of the emergence of `virtual´ universities organized along corporate lines (and perhaps by a single corporation or a small number of analogous organizations); and, inevitably, of a few global universities on a News Corporation or Microsoft Pattern".

programmes and qualifications in the name of increased profits and trading in education as a service on the global market.

This opinion reflects a certain view of the "purity" of education and the appropriateness of making profits from an educational activity, or a concern for quality. It should be underlined that an institution can, of course, be both profitable and of high quality, the exact opposite, or a combination of the two. Whatever the point of view, a refusal to recognize and find ways of dealing with this new phenomenon, for example by means of attempts at the national level to simply outlaw transnational programme qualifications as such, would in the short or medium term, lead to problems which would not disappear, and would be even more difficult to solve at a later date.

It is from the perspective of the anticipated permanence of transnational education that two key questions are particularly important:

i) What should the relationship between national and transnational education be?

The rapid development of transnational education has in some cases led to a growing tension between national education systems, and those study programmes and/or institutions which cross borders and are thus "transnationally mobile". These tensions arise both in relation to education that belongs to a national education system, but not to that of the country in which the institution is located, and in relation to education provided without reference to any national system. For some, transnational education is viewed as a means of improving access and of enhancing quality, especially with regard to professional education, and more generally, "widening learning opportunities without any prejudice either to the standard of the award or qualification or the quality of what is offered to the students".[3] It is also considered to play an important role in further developing the internationalization of higher education and in promoting increased intercultural co-

3 UK Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, 1999, Quality Assurance Code of Practice: collaborative provision, para.7.

operation. Because it makes full use of the opportunities offered by the new information technologies, transnational education can be considered a natural consequence of many convergent developments in the ever more globalized world of today. Others may see it purely as an attempt by some to increase their sources of revenue through trading in educational programmes as a commodity, the implication being that while such programs may correspond to a growing demand for education in the receiving country, the way in which such programmes are delivered may generate distortions, and a whole range of educational, cultural, legal, and financial problems.

Whatever the stand, it is clear that transnational education is a recent and expanding development which has many different facets and cannot be seen from only one perspective, *e.g.*, purely economic or purely educational and cultural in nature. One approach, which could be and indeed already has proved helpful in some countries in reducing the tension between national and transnational education, is to consider the contribution quality transnational education can make in matching supply and demand in particular areas. Another important element relates to the ongoing negotiations of the World Trade Organization related to the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). Basic to GATS is equal treatment related to the movement of professional and education services across national borders. In this context, Member States and their national higher education systems will be obliged to treat transnational educational offerings in the same way as national educational provision. The same questions arise specifically with regard to the relations between European Union Member States among themselves in the implementation of the appropriate General Directive.

ii) What should the relationship between sending and receiving institutions be?

Transnational education is organized and offered by means of different forms of partnerships or collaborative arrangements. These have been previously described. Whatever the form of collaborative partnership chosen, a distinction is made between the sending institution and the higher education system to which it might belong, and the receiving institution and the system to which it may belong, but which is different to that of the providing/sending institution. While such a distinction may prove operational in dealing with various matters related to transnational education, it would have certain connotations for the active/passive role of the different institutions, which would not necessarily always correspond to reality. The same institution or system might be both a "sender" and a "receiver", in different contexts, and these different roles might be difficult to distinguish. This ambiguity is characteristic at system level, but often the question is one of the recognition of a specific qualification. In that case, an institution is either sender or receiver, but not both. It is therefore for the specific purposes of the recognition of qualifications that the distinction between sending and receiving institutions shall be further used, bearing in mind that both may belong to a national education system and also operate independently of any national system. Another possible distinction would be between awarding and partner institutions, the emphasis thus being put on the ways in which the transnational arrangements are made in order to ensure the quality of higher education provision.

The two issues outlined are the consequences of the expansion of transnational education that have a direct bearing upon the academic quality of courses offered and the recognition of qualifications awarded.

SOME PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

The recent expansion of transnational education raises important practical issues regarding:

- the assurance of quality and standards of both the study programmes provided and the degrees awarded through collaborative partnerships;
- various legislative, cultural, linguistic, financial consequences of partnerships or other collaborative arrangements;

- the recognition of qualifications awarded through such transnational collaborative partnerships.

For UNESCO and the Council of Europe, through the ENIC Network, questions were first raised regarding the recognition of qualifications awarded through transnational education and the extent to which the *Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications Concerning Higher Education in the European Region* (Lisbon, 1997) could be helpful in providing answers to these questions. And, indeed, the conclusion was that the *Lisbon Recognition Convention* does provide the basic normative framework for dealing with most of the important issues involved. In a strict legal sense, however, its validity is restricted to the recognition of qualifications belonging to the higher education system of one of the Parties in another Party to the *Convention*. In practical terms, however, the importance of the *Convention* goes well beyond a strict legal consideration. The *Convention* provides a procedural and methodological framework which can be applied to the recognition of any higher education qualification.

For the reasons set out previously, it is clear that further clarification is needed in order to make transnational education a benefit to all concerned in terms of the learning opportunities provided, the standard of the award or qualification, and the quality of what is offered to the students, in so doing making collaborative arrangements a real partnership, and therefore acceptable from the perspective of both receiving and sending institutions/systems. This need is particularly manifest in terms of academic quality, degree awarding standards, and recognition requirements. In order to deal with matters specific to transnational education, a better understanding of its practices, of its normative basis, and of its consequences for the receiving *and* the sending systems and institutions is needed.

THE REACTION OF THE PROVIDERS – CODES OF PRACTICE

Some of the providers, *i.e.*, the sending institutions, in an attempt to address several of the issues set out above, have elaborated specific codes of practice. Worthy of mention in this respect are:

- *Quality Assurance Code of Practice: Collaborative Provisions* prepared, and monitored by the Quality Assurance Agency in the United Kingdom;
- *Code of Ethical Practice in the Offshore Provision of Education and Educational Services by Australian Higher Education Institutions* elaborated and monitored by the Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee;
- *Principles of Good Practice for Educational Programmes for Non-U.S. Nationals* is a code shared among the regional institutional accrediting bodies of the United States which, in turn, augment these Principles through additional procedures and regionally based criteria for quality. Further, several additional U.S. professional education accrediting bodies and national institutional accrediting bodies adopt codes and procedures related to educational programmes which cross borders.

These documents, of course, address the problems of transnational education from the providers' perspective. They include recommendations for higher education institutions in the United Kingdom, Australia, and the United States respectively, which have established, or are intending to establish, collaborative partnerships with institutions in other countries. Their main concerns are ensuring the quality of education provided by their institutions and the standards of awards and qualifications delivered. How to prevent any harmful effects on the reputation of higher education institutions and systems from the sending countries is thus a matter of the utmost concern.

THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE RECEIVING SYSTEMS

Looking now at the situation in the receiving countries, three main possibilities have been identified:

i) no legal/normative instruments exist, and no "good practice" has been developed in dealing with transnational educational provision;

ii) legal/normative acts do exist, but as yet no "good practice" in their implementation has yet been developed;

iii) attempts to institute appropriate practices have been made, but without any legal basis.

These possibilities are in fact forms of reaction at the national level that aim to solve the problems of transnational education, whether of a legal or of an administrative nature, in terms of changes in the law, or in more practical terms. It is preferable to avoid an artificial polarization of the situation and to promote increased co-operation and exchange of information between the sending and receiving systems as a framework for action to ensure the provision of quality higher education standards and awards. The *Lisbon Recognition Convention* should thus be taken as the international frame of reference and the starting point for further international action.

THE LISBON RECOGNITION CONVENTION

From an international perspective, the Lisbon Recognition Convention, as mentioned, provides a wide normative and methodological framework for dealing in general terms with the recognition of qualifications awarded through transnational collaborative arrangements. The Convention is an agreement between national sovereign states, which provides an appropriate legal framework for establishing the responsibilities of the Parties in regard to the academic recognition of qualifications. It is to be hoped that the broad scope of the normative basis it provides will become even more evident during its further implementation.

However, some important issues remain which need to be addressed more specifically. For instance, the Parties to the Convention are expected to consider "the great diversity of education systems in the European region", the intention being "to enable all people of the region to benefit fully from this rich asset of diversity by facilitating access by the inhabitants of each State and by the students of each Party's educational institutions to the educational resources of the other Parties, more specifically by facilitating their efforts to continue their education or to complete a period of studies in higher education institutions in those other Parties".

It is implicit in this text as well as in all the clauses of the Convention that it applies to qualifications issued under a higher education system recognized by a Party to the Convention (*i.e.*, a State, even though several education systems can exist within a single state, *e.g.*, in federal states). Most of these qualifications will be issued in the State to the education system to which the qualification belongs, but in some cases institutions may belong to a system different from the system of the State in which it is located. In some Parties to the Convention, there are "central authorities" which have the competence "to make decisions in recognition cases", while in others, this competence lies with "components of the Party" or with "individual higher education institutions" (Art. II.1 of the Convention).

Wherever the competence lies, it is clear that the Convention addresses the international recognition of qualifications issued under the education system of a Party to the Convention. Normally, the need for recognition arises when the holder of the qualification moves to another country for the purpose of further study or for purposes of work. The Convention does not deal with the specific recognition issues which are emerging as a result of the rapid development of transnational education. By definition, and in practice, transnational education refers to arrangements made by higher education institutions – or their constituent parts – which, although generally belonging to a particular national system, also function – as providers of education - in another country (-ies). In these cases, international mobility *per se* is not the question, for the student is not necessarily expected to travel abroad. Student mobility is replaced by the mobility of study programmes. Study programmes offered in this way have to function in a particular national context, *i.e.*, in a cultural and linguistic – not to mention normative - context, different from that in which they have originated, a fact that has specific consequences in terms of content, delivery and awards. There is no provision in the Convention for such new developments, at least not to the extent to which it takes place outside of national education systems.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

DE WIT, Hans, Professor and Vice President for International Affairs

Address: Universiteit van Amsterdam, Spui 21, 1012 WX Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Phone: +31-20-525-9111 Fax: +31-20-525-2771 E-mail: hansdw@bdu.uva.nl

MESTENHAUSER, Josef A., Professor

Address: University of Minnesota, College of Education and Human Development, 100 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455-6309, U.S.A.. Phone: +1-612-625-5000 Fax: +1-612-624-6868 E-mail: j-mest@maroon.tc.umn.edu

STEINER, Dorothea, Professor and Chairperson, English-American Studies

Address: University of Salzburg, Akademiestrasse 24, A-5020 Salzburg, Austria. Phone: +43-662-8044-4423 Fax: +43-662-8044-613 E-mail: dorothea.steiner@sbg.ac.at

VLĂSCEANU, Lazăr, Programme Specialist, Assistant Director, and Professor

Address: UNESCO-Cepes, 39, Stirbei Vodă Street, R-70732, Bucharest, Romania. Phone: +401-613-0839 Fax: +401-312-567 E-mail: l.vlasceanu@cepes.ro

WILSON, Lesley A., Head of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit

Address: European Training Foundation, Villa Gualino, Viale Settimio Severo, 65, I-10133 Torino, Italy. Phone: +39-011-630-2230 Fax: +39-0630-2200 E-mail: lesleywilson@etf.eu.int

UNESCO-CEPES PUBLICATIONS

HIGHER EDUCATION IN EUROPE

Quarterly review, in English, French, Russian

STUDIES AND PAPERS

CEPES publishes studies and shorter papers on specific issues of higher education, follow-up studies to meetings, and periodic statistical surveys. Their topics range from general problems of planning and management to the specific teaching, training, research, and service functions of higher education, and its new roles for the advancement of modern society.

CEPES STUDIES

HANDBOOK OF HIGHER EDUCATION DIPLOMAS IN EUROPE (K. G. Saur, 1992, 304 p., ISBN 3-598-11073-1)
To order: K. G. SAUR VERLAG & CO., Postfach 7016, D-8000 Munich 70, Germany.

MULTILINGUAL LEXICON OF HIGHER EDUCATION, Vol. 1: Western Europe and North America (K. G. Saur, 1993, 346 p., ISBN 3-598-11058-8)
To order: K. G. SAUR VERLAG & CO., Postfach 7016, D-8000 Munich 70, Germany.

MULTILINGUAL LEXICON OF HIGHER EDUCATION, Vol. 2: Central and Eastern Europe also including Greece, Israel, and Turkey (K. G. Saur, 1996, 315 p., ISBN 3-598-11059-6)
To order: K. G. SAUR VERLAG & CO., Postfach 7016, D-8000 Munich 70, Germany.

* GAINS AND LOSSES: WOMEN AND TRANSITION IN EASTERN AND CENTRAL EUROPE (English, 1994, 115 p. ISBN: 92-9069-125-5)
* ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY. Contributions to the International Conference, 5-7 May 1992, Sinaia (English, 1993, 309 p., ISBN 92-9069-126-3)
* HIGHER EDUCATION REFORM IN ROMANIA: A STUDY (English, 143 p., ISBN 92-9069-128-X)
* THE DOCTORATE IN THE EUROPE REGION (English, 1994, 225 p., ISBN 92-9069-133-6)
* STANDARDS AND DIVERSITY IN ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION (English, 1996, 353 p., ISBN 92-90690139-5)

CEPES STUDIES ON SCIENCE AND CULTURE

* BIOETICA ÎN ROMÂNIA: TEME ŞI DILEME (Romanian, 1999, 126 p., ISBN 92-9069-155-7)

PAPERS ON HIGHER EDUCATION

* ASSISTING HIGHER EDUCATION IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE: ACTIVITIES OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS - A SURVEY (English, 1992, 31 p., ISBN 92-9069-120-4)
* CEPES - 20 YEARS OF SERVICE (English, 1992, 40 p., ISBN 92-9069-121-2)
* ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY: PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE, 5-7 May 1992, Sinaia (English, 1992, 52 p., ISBN 92-9069-124-7)
* UNIVERSITY PROFILING AND IDENTITY (English, 1994, 21 p., ISBN: 92-9069-130-1)
* ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY: TWO PERSPECTIVES (English, 1995, 85 p., ISBN 92-9069-134-4)
* LA FORMATION PRATIQUE: PRINCIPES ET QUESTIONNEMENT (French, 1995, 52 p., ISBN: 92-9069-138-7)
* REPORT ON HIGHER EDUCATION IN BOSNIA AND HERZGOVINA: HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT, PRESENT STATE, AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT (English, 1996, 127 p., ISBN 92-9069-141-7)
* MUTUAL RECOGNITION OF QUALIFICATIONS: THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES (English, 1997, 124 p., ISBN 92-9069-146-8)
* THE EUROPEANISATION OF EUROPEAN UNIVERSITIES: A VIEW FROM THE EAST (English, 1997, 140 p., ISBN 92-9096-150-0)
* A EUROPEAN AGENDA FOR CHANGE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE XXIst CENTURY (CHANGER L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR EN EUROPE, UN PROGRAMME POUR LE XXI^{e} SIÈCLE) (CEPES Papers on Higher Education/ CRE action) (English and French, 1997, 166 p., ISBN 92-9069-152-7 (UNESCO); ISSN 1011-9019 (CRE))
* A EUROPEAN AGENDA FOR CHANGE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE XXIst CENTURY: TWENTY CASE STUDIES (English, 1998, 390 p., ISBN 92-9069-153-5 (UNESCO); ISSN 1011-9019 (CRE))
* INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION: AN INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE (English, 2000, 97 p. ISBN 92-9069-158-1)

MONOGRAPHS

The series of monographs is intended to cover the national systems of higher education in Europe and North America. The monographs follow a standard structure identifying the main features and explaining the functions of the national systems, while also facilitating easy cross reference and comparison among them. The monographs appear in English, except as otherwise noted.

Available monographs:

* ALBANIA, BELARUS, BULGARIA, ESTONIA, FINLAND; GERMANY, THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC, HUNGARY, THE NETHERLANDS, NORWAY, POLAND, SWITZERLAND, TURKEY, THE UKRAINIAN SSR, THE UNITED KINGDOM

March 2000

UNESCO-CEPES

European Centre for Higher Education

Order Form

Subscription to the English version of Higher Education in Europe must be placed directly with: Carfax Publishing, Taylor & Francis Ltd, Customer Services Department, Rankine Road, Basingstoke, Hants RG24 8PR, UK.

To order other UNESCO-CEPES publications, please use this form.

I would like to order the publications checked overleaf:

20.00 USD per copy for a **Monograph,** a **Study on Higher Education**, or a **Study on Science and Culture** (dispatch included)

15.00 USD per copy for a CEPES **Paper on Higher Education** (dispatch included)

Back copies of publications are available. Please enquire at CEPES.

Your reference: ______________________________

Institution: ______________________________

Address: ______________________________

Country: ______________________________

Contact person: ______________________________

Title/Function: ______________________________

Telephone: ____________________ Telefax: ____________________

E-mail: ______________________________

Please fill in and send this Order Form to:

THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

CEPES/UNESCO, 39, Ştirbei Vodă Street, R-70732 Bucharest, Romania

Date ____________________ **Signature** ____________________

Computer typeset and layout by Viorica Popa

Printed and bound by "METROPOL" Publishing & Printing Company

Bucharest, Romania

UNESCO

CEPES

CEPES is the acronym for **CENTRE EUROPÉEN POUR L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR** (European Centre for Higher Education). It is an integral part of the UNESCO Secretariat. The Centre was created in 1972 to contribute to the development of higher education in the Member States of the Europe Region by promoting international co-operation in this field. CEPES works in three domains:
it gather, processes, and disseminates information;
it organizes meetings and collaborates on joint studies;
it co-operates with other organizations and institutions, both national and international, to accomplish its goals.

CEPES est le sigle du **CENTRE EUROPÉEN POUR L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR**. Il fait partie intégrante du Secrétariat de l'UNESCO. Le Centre a été créé en 1972 afin de contribuer au développement de l'enseignement supérieur dans les Etats membres de la région Europe par la promotion de la coopération internationale dans ce domaine. Les activités du CEPES sont:
- la collection, le traitement et la distribution de l'information;
- l'organisation de réunions et la participation dans des projets communs;
- la coopération avec d'autres organisations et institutions, nationales ou internationales, pour la réalisation de ses objectifs.

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

- [x] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

- [ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").