

Higher Education, Internationalisation, and the Nation- State

Jürgen Enders
CHEPS (Center for Higher Education Policy Studies)
University of Twente

Abstract

'Internationalisation' became a key theme in the 1990s, both in higher education policy debates and in research on higher education. The process is accompanied by a European policy that seems to favour a de-nationalisation of higher education, a growing responsibility of individual institutions of higher education and an increasing popularity of managerialism. This paper addresses the traditional controversial role of higher education as regards internationalisation and the nation-state, comparing the mainland European and the Anglo-Saxon approach. Assessing the different impacts of internationalisation as a challenge to European and German higher education, it analyses the role of the European Union and the Bologna process, as well as the icebreaker function of internationalisation for higher education reform in Germany. A closer look at the complex and dynamic multi-level set-up of internationalisation in European higher education reveals that it not only means varying border-crossing activities that are on the rise, but rather substantial changes towards systematic policies and a growing awareness of international cooperation and competition in an increasingly global higher education market.

Introduction

Three major developments occurred in the higher education systems in Europe during the last two decades:

- Higher education institutions, but more specifically higher education systems at their institutional level, became more important actors. We can observe many initiatives and
-

debates on institutional management in higher education, institutional evaluation, funding of universities and other related tools for institutional adaptation to changing environments.

- Secondly, we note a variety of changes, which can be termed 'internationalisation' of higher education. Two different types of phenomena are frequently referred to in this context: on the one hand, a growth of specific visible international, border-crossing cooperation and operations, such as student and staff mobility, foreign language teaching or cooperative research activities; and, on the other, a trend towards internationalisation, regionalisation or globalisation of the substance and structures of higher education, e.g., convergence of systems in terms of institutional patterns, study programmes or curricula.
- Last but not least, both developments - the emphasis on the institutional level, as well as on the international level of higher education - seem to reflect and to contribute to a loosening of traditional ties between the university and the nation-state that some may welcome as the new freedom of universities, while others may see the university in this context as capitalism's final frontier.

Thus, the restructuring of the nation-state and the rise of internationalisation run parallel to the reform and transformation of universities. A paper prepared for the meeting in Salamanca of European rectors and institutional managers responsible for higher education provides an example of this new

secular religion of institutional autonomy as a tool for the empowering of universities in a competitive global order: “Universities need and want autonomy. In many countries in Europe, over-regulation inhibits progress and innovation and constitutes a serious handicap in the European and worldwide environment. Universities request the power to plan their own futures, striking the right balance between autonomy and responsibility and between diversity and organisation” (Convention of European Higher Education Institutions 2001: 7).

The Nationalisation of Higher Education: contrasting assumptions and significant differences

In talking about a trend towards internationalisation or de-nationalisation, we claim that higher education in the past has not been - or has been less - international than today, and more so in comparison with the anticipated future. A closer look, however, shows that higher education in the past can be described in a seemingly controversial and contradictory way.

The university has always been perceived as a very international institution compared to other major institutions in society. Grand notions of students going from Bologna to Paris to Oxford suggest that from its earliest times the university transcended national frontiers. These medieval memories are reinforced by images of the Renaissance, of Europe in the Age of the Enlightenment, and nowadays of academics as global players in contemporary societies. There always was great appreciation of cosmopolitan values in universities, pride was based on international

recognition and reputation, international cooperation and mobility were not rare, and a universal dimension of knowledge dominated many disciplines and was not viewed as marginal in others. Thus, one could argue that the university always was and still is an international institution and that it has not only been a major force in the secularisation of modern societies, but also in their internationalisation.

But these memories and images may be a mystification if they are taken as a proof that the university always has been, and therefore, always will be, an international institution. The other side of the coin is the prominent historical role of universities in the process of nation-building and their dependence on the nation-state. In his essay about the modern university, Wittrock wrote that “universities form part and parcel of the very same process which manifests itself in the emergence of an industrial economic order and the nation-state as the most typical and most important form of political organisation” (Wittrock 1993: 305). This is what the ‘nationalisation’ of higher education is about. The contemporary university is born of the nation state, not of medieval civilisation, and it was in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that universities acquired their identification with science and technology. Three-quarters of the universities, even in Europe, were established in the last century, half of them since 1945. Hence, their regulatory and funding context was (and still is) national, their contribution to national cultures was (and still is) significant, students tended to be (and still are) trained to become national functionaries, and universities played (and still play) a considerable role in what some have called the industrial-military-complex. In this perspective, they are very national

institutions and therefore we continue to refer to national systems of higher education that are challenged by internationalisation. Paradoxically perhaps, before they became international institutions, universities had first to become national institutions - just as internationalisation presupposes the existence of nation-states.

As Guy Neave has shown in his very stimulating historical study of universities' responsibility to society, we could delve deeper into the traditional role of the university within the nation-state to understand the challenges that European higher education is facing in the light of internationalisation or globalisation. We observe contrasting assumptions and significant differences "beneath the political and social priorities which different referential systems of higher education assigned to the place of higher education in the social fabric" (Neave 2000: 15). The argument is based on a comparison between the continental European Humboldtian or Napoleonic approach of the role of the university in the nationalisation project of modernity and the Anglo-Saxon approach of the United Kingdom and the United States as referential systems. Indeed, a very good case can be made for arguing that the Leitmotif of the development of national systems of higher education in mainland Europe is characterised by assumptions about

- national unity and homogeneity as regards nationally standardised arrangements,
 - uniformity in the services provided,
 - legal enactment of universities as public institutions set around a series of laws, circulars and decrees.
-

In this context, higher education policy was, among other things, designed to emphasise its role as a national entity shielded from external interests by the State.

In contrast, the relationship between government and university in the Anglo-American world was one of

- separation of power,
- a minimal rather than a comprehensive legislative framework,
- a substantial degree of corporate self-governance,
- and a local version of community service and responsibility.

Thus, rules and regulations tended to shield academia from the State.

Obviously, this is a very rough and dichotomous summary of a more complex and varied picture and one could easily go further into the finer nuances of Neave's historical approach. Yet such traditional roots have visible impacts on the most recent developments and patterns of the internationalisation of higher education. Trow (1999) argues, for example, that the American idea of 'university extension', i.e. the development of popular courses at the service of the local and wider community is reflected in the idea of universities offering courses and programmes through new Information Technology (IT). This "echoes the inclusive sentiments and commitments to service and useful instruction that are the defining features of American higher education." (Trow 1999: 208). In contrast, continental European systems of higher education are challenged by an astounding shift from

being 'cultural institutions' to becoming 'service organisations' that "redefine the place of the university in society from being an instrument for political integration within the nation to becoming part of the 'productive' process, an agent for economic integration between nations" (Neave 2000: 17).

The Meanings of Internationalisation

'Internationalisation' and 'Europeanisation', 'globalisation' and 'de-nationalisation' are frequently used interchangeably to identify the international activities and outreach of higher education. Still, there are important differences and Scott (1998) provides a convincing argument for a clearer distinction between the different terminologies.

Here, the concept of internationalisation refers more to the process of greater cooperation between states or to activities across state borders. It reflects a world order in which nation-states (still) play a central role; the emphasis is on strategic relationships based on mutual observations and cooperation. In this system, the boundaries between the state, the market and the university seem fairly clear, albeit constantly contested.

In contrast, globalisation is frequently related to the process of increasing convergence and interdependence of economies and to the liberalisation of trade and markets. Besides, the cultural component of globalisation is recognised, encouraging at the same time the establishment of a (usually Western) global-brand culture, as well as the spread of more indigenous traditions. The process of globalisation is associated with a restructuring of the nation-state in terms of the deregulation of legal and financial controls, the

opening of markets or quasi-markets in higher education, and notions of competition, efficiency and managerialism. In a globalised environment, nation-states have limited control over policies that regulate higher education 'systems'.

Furthermore, the distinction between internationalisation and globalisation could be supplemented by the Janus head of Europeanisation: on the one hand, Europeanisation, at least in higher education, could be described as a process of growing regional cooperation or integration 'on equal terms'. Mutual cooperation and 'horizontal' interaction are more in the forefront than divergent interests and competition based on 'vertical' interaction. On the other, there are good reasons to claim that Europeanisation in higher education is not only a regional version of internationalisation, but also part and parcel of the globalisation process, establishing cooperation among neighbours in order to counteract the pressure from other parts of the world.

As van der Wende (2001a) and Teichler (2000) have argued, internationalisation is becoming an important dimension in higher education policy as developed at the institutional, national and international level, related to the challenges of globalisation, which are increasingly affecting the higher education sector. At the same time, rationales for the internationalisation of higher education seem to shift. Whereas political, cultural and academic rationales were the basis of internationalisation over the last decades, economic rationales now seem to play a more prominent role. This may be due to the motivation of higher education institutions to generate income from international activities. This is most

clearly expressed in the strategies to recruit foreign students. But broader human capital interests are also at stake. In turn, stakeholders of higher education have a keen interest in 'internationalisation', i.e. students who are seeking international competencies in order to increase their employability both in foreign labour markets and in their home countries' markets; employers, who are searching for the value added by these competencies to their standing in transnational cooperation and competition; and national governments, which have an interest in the formation of human resources who are able to face the challenges of the future. "Today, we are seeing the beginnings of a competitive market of higher education on a global scale, which is likely to move economic considerations still higher up the agenda and challenge academic aims and traditions" (Wächter 1999: 17).

Related to this shift in rationales is the shift in paradigms of internationalisation (Moja/Cloete 2001; van der Wende 2001b) across European higher education policies. Besides the traditional focus on international and European cooperation, isomorphism as expressed in the attempts towards a European higher education area and the convergence of systems, as well as the formation of strategic alliances for international competition in the globalised higher education field is emerging.

Internationalisation as a Challenge to Higher Education in Europe: new trends and contrasting paradigms

The relationship between internationalisation policies for higher education and general higher education policy as developed at the national level was

analysed in a study on “National Policies for Internationalisation of Higher Education in Europe” (Kälvermark/van der Wende 1997). One of the main conclusions was ‘Missing links’. Government efforts to internationalise higher education were often still disconnected conceptually, politically and practically from the ‘mainstream’ policies in this area. Likewise, internationalisation was treated as a rather marginal add-on factor and was frequently subject to piecemeal and *ad hoc* policies. More recent studies show, however, the dramatic speed of change in this field in European higher education. According to Teichler (1999), three rather substantial changes or quantum leaps could be observed in international activities in European higher education:

- firstly, from a predominantly ‘vertical’ pattern of cooperation and mobility to the dominance of international relationships on equal terms. In the past, student mobility mainly consisted of international students going from ‘developing’ to ‘developed’ countries. In contrast, a quantitatively substantial exchange of students between industrial countries puts the experience of persons and programmes that are more or less equal in standards on the agenda;
 - secondly, from casuistic action to systematic policies of internationalisation that could comprise a complex picture of international programmes and agencies in higher education, systematic national policies to foster strategic internationalisation, or institutional policies to implement management, infrastructure and services for international activities;
-

- thirdly, from disconnection of specific international activities on the one hand and internationalisation of the core activities on the other, to an integrated internationalisation of higher education, such as the fostering of international mobility of students with internationalisation at the core of higher education, i.e. emphasis on the international dimension in regular teaching.

Van der Wende, another expert in this area, concluded in her recent article on changing relationships between internationalisation and national higher education policy: “In recent years, however, the focus of internationalisation in Europe has widened from an almost exclusive focus on student mobility to strategies that include curriculum and staff development, quality assurance, the use of ICT, a stronger link between international research and education, the establishment of consortia, etc. At the institutional level this signifies a more strategic approach to internationalisation, with more links to other policy areas such as quality management and human resources development and technological (ICT) development. With these more comprehensive approaches, internationalisation is changing from a marginal, add-on aspect of higher education to a central strategic issue at the institutional level and an important dimension in national higher education policy development” (van der Wende 2001a: 2).

The Role of the European Union in the Internationalisation of Higher Education: a successful double-bind

Many experts agree that the European Union (EU) has become a major driving force for internationalisation in higher education. Ironically, the conflict between efforts on the part of the European Commission to constantly extend its field of action, and the national governments' aim to keep the Commission out of the core of higher education, triggered off a European policy of grass-root internationalisation. Facilitating student mobility (and to some extent academic staff mobility) became the key instrument of internationalisation for the EU. The choice of mobility and inter-institutional cooperation as a domain of European policy was not necessarily the most obvious one. Other priorities were discussed and aimed at. The first efforts of this kind were, however, not successful because the national views were too divergent and most national governments objected to moves toward the 'harmonisation' of higher education systems. Thus, European activities in this field could only be embarked upon if the variety of national higher education systems was strictly respected.

The Joint Study Programs inaugurated in 1976 aimed to stimulate temporary study at a partner department, teaching staff exchange, and joint developments of study programmes on a small experimental basis. About a decade later, the ERASMUS programme was launched. It focused on student mobility and included various other means of cooperation. The programme was clearly the core activity that addressed higher education in the EU and

was accompanied by others such as COMETT, LINGUA or TEMPUS.

On the basis of various evaluation studies (Teichler 1998; Enders 1999; Barblan *et al.* 2000), we can conclude that ERASMUS and SOCRATES (as the educational support programmes are now called) caused a breakthrough by transforming an international scope of teaching and learning into a regular and normal element of study at most institutions of higher education, even if international student mobility remained limited to less than 10 per cent of the student population. The major effect of the programme was not only to provide international experience to 100,000 students per year, but also to challenge the substance and modes of teaching and learning with comparatively small financial means. The European Commission, while talking about Europe, has obviously become a powerful actor of internationalisation in higher education, whereby Europe is predominantly a subcategory of less than systematic relevance. From a conceptual point of view, conversations with those responsible for the EU programmes in higher education institutions confirm that most academics who are not confined to national settings consider themselves international or cosmopolitan rather than European or regional. The main thrust of the universities in Europe, in transcending their traditional national emphasis, is international or global rather than European. Also, the policies and infrastructures chosen by the institutions in this context do not generally make clear distinctions between European on the one hand and international or global on the other, neither conceptually nor pragmatically. We also often come across the problem of what is meant by the 'European dimension'. Most

students seemed to appreciate studying in another European country because it offered them the opportunity to acquire experiences that differed from those at home. Very few seemed to be interested in exploring common elements across Europe. If Europe played a role, it provided contrasts on a softer basis - less costly, less risky and less exotic than mobility to countries outside Europe. To put it in a nutshell: the EU programmes in higher education were successful tools for the internationalisation of higher education in a general sense. They did not strongly emphasise a pan-European approach. This success could, however, be counteracted by a narrower concept of Europeanisation developed in the Bologna process.

Inter-Governmental Policies in European Higher Education: cooperation as a means of competition

The pledge for convergence that has been underlined in the Bologna process launched by the European Federal Ministries responsible for higher education is certainly another prominent factor in the internationalisation of higher education in Europe. They stressed that the process was a search for a “common European answer to common European problems”, e.g. a governmental push towards shorter studies, greater autonomy of universities accompanied by initiatives for quality assurance, and, last but not least, challenges from abroad, notably via transnational education. The European dimension in higher education has certainly acquired a new meaning since the Bologna declaration of a “European Higher Education Area”.

In this context, 'Europe' addresses an intermediate level between 'national' and 'global'. But what exactly could or should be understood by a "European Higher Education Area"? No single definition has been provided so far by any of the documents prepared for or resulting from the conferences in Paris, Bologna, and Prague. However, there seems to be a general consensus. It revolves around a certain number of general concepts such as 'harmonisation', 'convergence' or 'coordination'. The main recommendations of the Bologna Declaration, which are, to a certain extent, a follow-up to the Sorbonne conference, can be summarised as follows:

- adopting a system of easily readable and comparable degrees;
 - adopting a system based on two main cycles (undergraduate and graduate) of higher education studies;
 - establishing a system of transferable credits (similar to the European Credit Transfer System, ECTS) as a means to promote student mobility, including credits acquired in non-higher education contexts and recognised by universities;
 - overcoming obstacles to student, teacher, researcher and staff mobility;
 - promoting European cooperation in quality assurance;
 - promoting European dimensions in higher education with regard to curriculum development, inter-institutional cooperation,
-

mobility schemes and integrated programmes of study and research.

The Prague Communiqué (of May 19, 2001) subscribes to these recommendations, making some of them clearer and more precise. At least three points which were not stressed or mentioned in the Bologna Declaration are emphasised: lifelong learning, the importance of the role of students and of higher education institutions generally, and greater concern for the attractiveness of European higher education (including concern for transnational education and its perspectives). It should also be stressed that the Prague Communiqué lays much more emphasis on European cooperation in quality assurance than the Bologna Declaration. Without recommending the setting up of new institutions for that purpose, it clearly calls for a certain coordination (a 'European network').

It is obvious that the Bologna process thus contributes to a development in which common elements of national systems of higher education are gradually eroding. The European pledge for convergence has come at a time of growing diversity within higher education systems that is challenging the tradition of 'structural egalitarianism' in continental European higher education. This is partly due to pressure for diversification in each country that is related to the expansion of higher education and growing non-governmental external - market or stakeholders' - influences. Nevertheless, cooperation and mobility across Europe contribute to this process that tends to replace inter-European variety by intra-European diversity.

Secondly, the trend towards a 'European Higher Education Area' is part of the more general process of globalisation in higher education. Strictly speaking, it is one of its non-economic features, but economic rationales for the Europeanisation of higher education have certainly gained in importance. One of the main aims of the European Higher Education Area is to increase the competitiveness of European higher education. This means strengthening its role in a globalised higher education field. One could therefore say that European cooperation in the Bologna process is a means to be able to compete effectively in a globalised higher education market, as has been argued by Haug (1999) and van der Wende (2001a).

Thirdly, policy in this area is trying to shoot at a relatively new and moving target of multi-level governance. The Bologna process is a very interesting example - that greatly surprised the supra-national level of the EU - of the return of the national governments at an inter-governmental level at a time when the authority of the nation-state in higher education is becoming weaker. But whether it can be efficient without granting more authority to the supra-national level of the EU for the coordination of necessary reform projects remains to be seen.

In this context, it is worth noting that the European Commission, which has not yet been granted further responsibility in the Bologna process, will be the formal representative of the European Union in the negotiations on higher education with the World Trade Organisations (WTO). A number of proposals have been made to include higher education in the General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) by the WTO which up till now have mainly been

supported by the U.S. Department of Commerce's Office of Service Industries. The trade in higher education is, of course, more difficult to codify than bananas. But efforts are now under way to do precisely this - create guidelines and regulations to institute free trade in higher education and to make respective arrangements legally binding. Hence, we must face the fact that the commercialisation of knowledge, added to transnational economic integration, also means "that national systems of higher education now face a challenge, literally on their own turf, from interlopers, branch campuses and franchise arrangements, whose headquarters and accreditation lie far beyond the sea and whose appeal often resides in their willingness to accept what national standards discretely turn their face from" (Neave 1999: 194).

National Differences in Internationalisation: context matters

The challenges and trends described above are beginning to influence the development of higher education policy at national level. They lead to initiatives that go beyond the formulation of the traditional internationalisation policies, which used to be characterised as marginal, add-on activities which mainly focused on the international mobility of students and teachers. Instead, they lead to more structural measures which will influence the higher education system more profoundly. In referring to the above trends, we should bear in mind that the context for internationalisation varies substantially according to country. It is obvious that the economic and political power of a country, its size and geographic location, its dominant culture, the quality of its higher education system, the role its language plays internationally, and

past internationalisation policies in higher education have to be taken into consideration. Internationalisation was clearly viewed differently in the various European countries some years ago, and still is today - although possibly to a lesser extent.

In analysing the results of an international study on the academic profession (Enders/Teichler 1995), we developed four types of national approaches to internationalisation which reflect the different contexts set out above. We called them

- would-be internationalisation: Academics and institutions of higher education want to be partners in international communication and cooperation, but they face problems because they tend not to be considered partners on equal terms. This is still a problem for many academics and higher education institutions in Central and Eastern European countries;
 - life or death-internationalisation: In some countries, international communication, cooperation, and recognition were considered indispensable. Except for a very small number of fields of study, one could not imagine an academic being respected in his or her home country unless she or he was internationally visible. This seems to be especially true for Sweden, but also for several other European countries, such as the Netherlands, and for some countries outside Europe, e.g. Israel;
 - two arenas: In some countries, e.g. Germany or - to take an example outside Europe - Japan, academics in many fields can either strive for more national or more international visibility;
-

- internationalisation by import: In the U.S., and to some extent the United Kingdom, for many years, internationalisation mainly meant hosting foreign students and academics and considering international research only if it was published in English, often only in international publications in these two countries.

In turning from traditional scholarly approaches as regards the international dimension in higher education towards the growing global market in teaching, instruction and learning we observe another pattern. There is a dramatic increase in the use of on-line courses and virtual universities, mainly offered by Anglo-Saxon countries, and an expansionist strategy as regards the attraction of foreign students and graduates for international programmes. “The new global higher education entrepreneur looking for niche markets was inherent in the academic restructuring of the 1980s in the United Kingdom and the United States” (Moja and Cloete, 2001: 249). Various factors obviously gave these countries a competitive edge in the emerging global market that is both knowledge-driven and about knowledge. According to Moja and Cloete (2001), 54 per cent of United States college courses were offered on-line in 1999. In 2000, it was estimated that there were 878 institutions offering virtual courses. In the United States, the Education Commission has identified 650 for profit degree-granting institutions and it is estimated that 70 per cent of Internet distance education material originates in the US. The private for-profit University of Phoenix, the private non-profit National Technology University (NTU), or the Western Governors University (WGU) that is a non-profit, independent corporation created by the Governors of 16 Western American States are

some of the more well-known online providers in the U.S. In 2000, the British government announced a distance learning project called 'e-University', which has a £300 million start-up fund. It aims at encouraging and enabling the United Kingdom to compete with virtual and corporate universities in the United States and globally in order to expand Britain's share of the overseas higher education market.

In continental Europe, a first, instinctive response from some public institutions was to ask the government to intervene and put an embargo on foreign institutions. An example of this protectionist approach was the French Minister of Education's call in 1999 for a counter-attack in the battle over the right to offer distance education across national borders. The argument was, however, not based on economic disadvantages, but on the preservation of national identities, culture and language. The attempt of the Bologna process to stimulate European networking in quality assurance and accreditation can be regarded as another signal to counteract some of the negatively assessed impacts of globalisation on higher education by a regional effort.

But national policies in mainland Europe vary greatly with respect to their aims, interests and instruments used for the internationalisation of higher education (van der Wende 2001b). Some countries, such as Germany, are concerned about the general attractiveness of their higher education systems and the recognition of their degrees abroad. Others are becoming more interested in foreign recruitment of students and graduates in fields which no longer interest national students. In the Scandinavian countries, which traditionally saw the benefit of

internationalisation in the experience of their own student body abroad, now tend to increase the inflow of foreign students. Economic short-term perspectives on generating national and institutional income from foreign students only play a visible role in the UK and the Netherlands, i.e. countries with fee-based systems. Yet other countries in the North-west of Europe try to compete individually on the international market. As a consequence, they may find themselves in competition in markets outside Europe as well as with domestic institutions in other European countries. Obviously, this is not a matter of concern in some Southeast European countries which are not yet able to accommodate the growing national demand for higher education, and where national systems are sometimes oversubscribed and thus give leeway to the development of private providers in higher education, e.g. Portugal.

National Policies for Internationalisation: the icebreaker function of internationalisation in German higher education

Looking at the case of Germany, it could be said that the international argument and the widespread fear of being left behind in the international competition in higher education have an important icebreaker function for reform initiatives. The diagnosis of the perceived problems of the system and the related reform initiatives are in many cases not new. But the international argument gives 'fresh wind' to national debates on higher education reform sailing under the flag of 'internationalisation', i.e. strengthening the national attractiveness in the global competition ('Hochschulstandort Deutschland').

For instance, debates on the traditional academic staff and career structures in German universities have a longstanding tradition, and current reform initiatives such as the introduction of junior- or assistant-professors and the abolition of the *Habilitation* as a second 'opus magnum' can be traced back to the early 1970s (Enders 1996). At present, they are strongly supported by arguments concerning the 'brain drain' of the most talented German junior staff to the U.S. and the hope for competitive advantages with the introduction of some of the characteristics of Anglo-American career patterns. Current debates about possible ways to strengthen management in higher education that are strongly influenced by Anglo-American experiences as well. Implicitly they have far reaching implications for the role of academic staff: Is the academic a potentially lazy professor who has to be kept at work by short-term incentives and visible sanctions; a *homo oeconomicus* who can easily be steered by a cost centred management that is locally shaping rules, regulations and instruments for efficient work and output; a self-willed professional staff member who occasionally needs soft supervision by a wise leadership; or a deeply socialised scholar that is best left alone and only symbolically represented by institutional leadership?

Another example of the growing international awareness in German higher education was the introduction of the bachelor-master system in 1998. It runs parallel to the existing degree system and has led in two years to the development of several hundred, often English-taught, programmes. These were not only expected to attract more foreign students to the country - a new grant scheme was introduced and programmes of the German Academic Exchange

Service (DAAD) such as the international marketing of German higher education provide active support in this context -, but also to reduce the time German students take to obtain their degree. Although the German approach to the bachelor-master system did not abolish the existing degree structures, this initiative can be expected to have an impact on the mainstream national system. It puts pressure on the binary system, since Fachhochschulen can now offer master programmes. In connection with this initiative, the German accreditation council was established in 1999 to guarantee the quality of these new programmes. In principle, accreditation by foreign accrediting agencies and mutual recognition of accreditation should be possible in this model that is accompanied by attempts to introduce credit systems.

Further examples of higher education reform sailing under the flag of 'internationalisation' could be added, and we shall not argue against these initiatives here. For a policy analyst in comparative higher education it is, of course, of special interest to see how the former scepticism against some kind of learning from foreign experiences has been overcome by a surprising optimism as regards the transferability of specific elements of other higher education systems. The outcome of this development are, however, less clear, and one might look forward to the impact of a sometimes astonishing, and hopefully fruitful misunderstanding of the structures and dynamics of higher education systems abroad and their implementation at home.

Institutional Policies: the open agenda of internationalisation

The question whether or not internationalisation should be an integrated part of an higher education institution's mission and to what extent institutional policies and strategies for internationalisation could or should be developed - apart from the usual rhetoric on the relevance of internationalisation - certainly (still) belongs to the open agenda in this field.

Most universities tend to consider that internationalisation or globalisation is best put in the hands of the basic units of teaching and research, while the central institutional units should foster respective infra- and support-structures. The findings of a research project on the 'European Policy Statements', which European Union higher education institutions submitted to the EU in 1996 as part of their application to the ERASMUS programme (Barblan *et al.* 2000), tend to support this view. The study concluded that there was a weak 'vertical consistency' between the European goals and strategies and the activities foreseen by the institutions to implement them. Similar deficits were found as regards the 'horizontal consistency': by and large, institutions had little idea how to create a link between their general institutional objectives and the particular aims of international or European cooperation. Interestingly, few differences in policy statements were found between institutions in the United Kingdom where strategic management in higher education has a firmly established role and Germany where the concept is only beginning to become important.

Against that, the trend towards competition by cooperation is underlined at the institutional level by the formation of international inter-institutional partnerships in higher education. Partnerships come in all shapes and sizes and probably with all their inherent tensions and inequalities. A well-known 'global' example is Universitas 21. In Europe, similar strategic consortia have been created, e.g. the European Consortium of Innovative Universities (ECIU), the league of the technical universities of Delft, Aachen, Zürich and Imperial College London (IDEA) and the Consortium of European Management Schools (CEMS). Many more examples could be given. It is also interesting to observe that various institutions have chosen to link with institutions from the U.S. Examples include the recently announced cooperation of Oxford with Princeton, Stanford and Yale to jointly provide on-line courses and the consortium of the London School of Economics, the HEC graduate business school Paris with New York University to develop a joint MBA programme. As van der Wende (2001b) has recently argued, the establishment of numerous networks and consortia of this kind make inter-institutional interaction more complex: in some markets they may be partners, while in others they may be competitors.

Globalisation and Higher Education: don't trust the hype

Globalisation is a topic that gives rise to considerable controversy as to whether it is a social process or political rhetoric, or most probably a composite mix of both. It sometimes seems a catch-all-phrase or a non-concept: a catalogue of more or less everything that seems different since the 1970s,

whether advances in information technology, greater capital flow across borders, international mobility of labour or students, new public management and the weakening power of nation-states, credit transfer in higher education and international recognition of degrees. This paper has tried to identify some of the major forces of internationalisation, globalisation, and regionalisation in European and German higher education.

They seem to lead to higher education systems in which the national and the transnational coexist. As Sassen has reminded us, the role of the nation-state has changed but has not been eliminated: It is not simply that the national state is losing significance, because "the state itself has been a key agent in the implementation of global processes, and it has emerged quite altered by this participation" (Sassen 1996: 29). In this light, the controversy between the 'state and the market' as imperfect alternatives may not be as sharp as it may seem at first sight. It remains to be seen what happens when the state tends to imitate the market in service sectors of society, such as in higher education, that operate as "dynamic systems of contradictory functions" (Castells 2001 : 206) previously under state control. The question, that has recently been brought up by Kwiek as to whether "the current passage to late modernity and to the information age, the decline of the role of the nation-state and the increasing power of processes of globalisation mean the inevitability of the radical reformulation of the social mission and the tasks of the institution of the university?" (Kwiek 2000: 74), is still an open one.

Though higher education policy remains predominantly shaped at a national level and tends to

underscore specific traditions and contexts of individual countries, the responsibility of the individual higher education institutions in Europe clearly grows in the process of internationalisation, which is accompanied by growing pressure for diversity and an increasing popularity of managerialism, as well as by a policy which seems to favour de-nationalisation of higher education. There is no doubt that the university as we know it - the modern university as a project of the nation-state and its cultural identity - is in a delicate and complicated position at the moment. Internationalisation is obviously contributing to a process of rethinking the social, cultural and economic role of higher education and its configuration in national systems of higher education.

Internationalisation of higher education can be viewed as a trend: irresistible, as those who resist fall behind. Or it can be viewed as a challenge, which may or may not be taken up, or could be taken up differently. Most experts and actors in the field believe that internationalisation of higher education is bound to grow, but that the aims and modes of internationalisation leave ample scope for a strategic option.

References

Barblan, Andris, Sybille Reichert, Martina Schotte-Kmoch, and Ulrich Teichler. 2000. *Implementing European Policies in Higher Education Institutions*. Kassel: Centre for Research on Higher Education and Work (Werkstattberichte; 57).

Castells, Manuel. 2001. Universities as dynamic systems of contradictory functions. In Muller et al.: pp. 206-223.

Convention of European Higher Education Institutions. 2001. *Shaping our Own Future in the European Higher Education Area*. Salamanca, 29-30 March 2001 (Notes for Discussion Groups).

Enders, Jürgen. 1996. *Die wissenschaftlichen Mitarbeiter. Ausbildung, Beschäftigung und Karriere der Nachwuchswissenschaftler und Mittelbauangehörigen an den Universitäten*. Frankfurt a.M./New York: Campus.

Enders, Jürgen. 1998. "Academic Staff Mobility in the European Community: The ERASMUS Experience". In *Comparative Education Review* 42 (1): pp. 30-45.

Enders, Jürgen. 1999. "Crisis? What crisis? The academic profession in the 'knowledge' society". In *Higher Education*, 38 (1): pp. 71-81.

Enders, Jürgen and Ulrich Teichler. 1995. *Der Hochschullehrerberuf im internationalen Vergleich*. Bonn: Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft, Forschung und Technologie.

Haug, Guy. 1999. Visions of a European Future: Bologna and Beyond. Keynote address presented at the 11th EAIE Annual conference, Maastricht, December 1999.

Kälvermark, Torsten and Marijk C. van der Wende (eds.). 1997. National Policies for Internationalisation of Higher Education in Europe. Stockholm: National Agency for Higher Education.

Kwiek, Marek. 2000. "The Nation-State, Globalisation and the Modern Institution of the University." *Theoria*. 96: December, pp. 74-98.

Moja, Teboho and Nico Cloete. 2001. Vanishing borders and new boundaries. In Muller et al.: pp. 244-270.

Muller, Johan, Nico Cloete and Shireen Badat. 2001. Challenges of Globalisation. South African debates with Manuel Castells. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.

Neave, Guy. 1999. Apocalypse now: the changing role of the university in the emerging information society. In Tuijnman and Schulle: pp. 189-196.

Neave, Guy. 2000. Introduction. Universities' Responsibility to Society: An Historical Exploration of an Enduring Issue. In Neave, Guy (ed.) *The Universities' Responsibilities to Society. International Perspectives*. Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 1-28.

Rothblatt, Sheldon and Björn Wittrock (eds.). 1993. *The European and American University since 1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sassen, Saskia. 1996. *Losing Control? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization*. Columbia University Press.

Scott, Peter (ed.). 1998. *The Globalization of Higher Education*. Buckingham: The Society for Research in Higher Education & Open University Press.

Teichler, Ulrich. 1998. *The Role of the European Union in the Internationalisation of Higher Education*. In Scott: pp. 88-99.

Teichler, Ulrich. 1999. "Internationalisation as a Challenge for Higher Education in Europe." *Tertiary Education and Management*. 5 (1): pp. 5-23.

Trow, Martin. 1999. *Lifelong learning through the new information technologies*. In Tuijnman and Schuller: pp. 197-212.

Tuijnman, Albert and Tom Schuller (eds.). 1999. *Lifelong Learning Policy and Research*. London: Portland Press.

Wächter, Bernd (ed.). 1999. *Internationalisation in Higher Education. A Paper and Seven Essays on International Cooperation in the Tertiary Sector*. Bonn: Lemmens (ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education).

van der Wende, Marijk C. 2001a. "Internationalisation Policies: About New Trends and Contrasting Paradigms." *Higher Education Policies*. Forthcoming.

van der Wende, Marijk C. 2001b. "The International Dimension in National Higher Education"

Policies: What has Changed in Europe over the Last Five Years?" *European Journal of Education*. Forthcoming.

Wittrock, Björn. 1993. The Modern University: the Three Transformations. In Rothblatt and Wittrock: pp. 298-314.
