Evolving Concepts, Trends, and Challenges in the Internationalization of Higher Education in the World

Hans de Wit

Hans de Wit
PhD, Director of the Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) and Professor of the Practice at the Lynch School of Education at Boston College. Address: 140 Commonwealth Ave, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02467. E-mail: dewitj@bc.edu

Abstract. Internationalization as a concept and strategic agenda is a relatively new but broad and varied phenomenon, driven by a dynamic combination of political, economic, socio-cultural and academic rationales and stakeholders. This article addresses the following points: What are the historical dimensions of internationalization? What are the key factors in international higher education that are impacted by and impact this phenomenon? How do we understand its evolution as a concept? What national policies are developed to enhance the international competitiveness of higher education? What are the implications for institutional strategies for internationalization? It concludes with some lessons and recommendations for Russian higher education to learn from these trends and issues concerning internationalization in higher education.

Keywords: internationalization, historical dimensions, international higher education, internationalization concepts, national policies, institutional strategies, Russian higher education

Internationalization as a concept and strategic agenda is a relatively new but broad and varied phenomenon, driven by a dynamic combination of political, economic, socio-cultural and academic rationales and stakeholders. Its impact on regions, countries and institutions varies according to their particular contexts. This implies that there is no single model for internationalization that fits all. What are the historical dimensions of internationalization? What are the key factors in international higher education that are impacted by and impact this phenomenon? How do we understand its evolution as a concept? What national policies are developed to enhance the international competitiveness of higher education? What are the implications for institutional strategies for internationalization? And what lessons can Russian higher education learn from these trends and issues concerning internationalization in higher education?

1. Historical Dimensions of Internationa-lization[1]

One can argue that higher education by its nature always has been international. Altbach [1998] refers to the university as an institution that is global by nature and history. Kerr (1994) states that universities are essentially international, but at the same time acknowledges that "they have been living, increasingly, in a world of nation-states that have designs on them." (p. 6).

As de Wit and Merkx [2012: 43] (see also [de Wit 2002: 3–18]) remark though, references to the global nature of universities ignore the fact that universities mostly originated in the 18th and 19th century and had a clearly national orientation. Neave [1997] and Scott [1998] also refer to the myth of the international university.

The international orientation of universities has changed dramatically over the centuries and takes substantially different and more complex forms and approaches today. What now is called 'internationalization of higher education' as a concept and strategy is a recent phenomenon that has emerged over the last 30 years. Its roots reach back over centuries, while it has been interrupted by more national orientations.

1.1. Medieval Roots

Many publications on the internationalization of higher education refer back to the Middle Ages and the Renaissance period, when, in addition to religious pilgrims, university students and professors were a familiar sight on the roads of Europe [de Ridder-Symoens 1992]. While limited and scattered in comparison to the European Higher Education Area we know today, we can still speak of a medieval 'European space' defined by a common religion, and a shared language (Latin) and set of academic practices [Neave 1997: 6]. The resemblance may only be superficial, but we can still see similarities to the promotion of mobility and the broadening of experience, common qualification structures and the gradual growth of English as the common academic language today [de Wit 2002: 6].

1.2. National Models

Most universities originated in the 18th and 19th centuries with a distinct national orientation and function. In many cases, there was a process of de-Europeanisation. Mobility was rarely encouraged or even prohibited, and Latin as the universal language of instruction gave way to national languages. The transition was gradual. Hamerstein [1996: 624] mentions the gradual prohibition of study abroad in many countries; the displacement of Latin by vernacular languages; and the replacement of the academic pilgrims by the 'grand tour' which focused more on the cultural than on the academic experience. As de Wit [2002: 7] observes, universities became institutions that served the professional needs and ideological demands of the new nations in Europe. Scott [1998] observes that "paradoxically perhaps, before it

---

[1] This section builds on [de Wit et al. 2015; Hunter, de Wit 2016].

became an international institution the university had first to become a national institution — just as internationalization presupposes the existence of nation states." (p. 123)

In this more national period of higher education, international projects were not completely absent. As de Wit [2002: 7] observes, three international aspects can be identified: export of higher education systems, dissemination of research, and individual mobility of students and scholars. (See [de Wit 2002: 7–10; de Wit, Merkx 2012: 44–47].)

1.3. Impact of Two World Wars

Political events in the first half of the 20th century led to a focus on stimulating peace and mutual understanding through international cooperation and exchange. The creation of the Institute of International Education (IIE) in the United states in 1919, the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD) in Germany in 1925, and the British Council in the UK in 1934 are illustrations of this development. In the aftermath of World War I, it was strongly driven by rationales as peace and mutual understanding, with the United States taking a more leading role than before, mainly as a result of an increased immigration of scholars from Europe [de Wit, Merkx 2012: 47].

This trend continued after 1945 and the end of the Second World War through the Fulbright Program, given that Europe was still recovering from the devastation of war and concentrating its efforts on reconstruction. Goodwin and Nacht [1991] refer to this shift by observing that "views of the world in U.S. higher education were transformed almost overnight by World War II. From a cultural colony the nation was changed at least in its own eyes, into the metropolis: from the periphery it moved triumphantly to the center" (p. 4–5). Cunningham [1991] describes a similar shift for Canada. Rationales as national security and foreign policy became the real forces driving the development of international education after World War II, even though sometimes still using the rationales of peace and mutual understanding from before World War II, for instance in the Fulbright program of 1946 [de Wit, Merkx 2012]. De Wit [2002] describes similar trends for the Soviet Union. The Cold War became the principal rationale for an international dimension of higher education, which moved from incidental and individual activities into organized international education programs, driven more by national governments than by universities [Hunter, de Wit 2016: 51].

While the two big superpowers became active in international education for reasons of national security and foreign policy, the rest of Europe played a more marginal role.

1.4. The European Model

The European Community strengthened as an economic and political power between 1950 and 1970, but it was not until the second half of the 1980's that European programs for education and research emerged. Its flagship program 'Erasmus' itself grew out of smaller

initiatives that had been introduced in Germany and Sweden in the 1970's and a European pilot program from the early 1980's, and was later grouped together with similar initiatives in the 90's under the umbrella program Socrates, evolving more recently into Erasmus+, an even broader program embracing education, sports and youth programs [de Wit 2002].

As Hunter and de Wit [2016] state, Erasmus and other programs were not based on any educational rationales and roles of the European Community until the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992, but rather, they had their foundation in the need for more competitiveness in relation to the United States and Japan, and in the desire to nurture a sense of European citizenship. The program activities have always been based primarily on cooperation through student and staff exchanges, joint curriculum development and joint research projects and the enthusiastic institutional response to these programs set a clear path for the European approach to internationalization.

Erasmus has had an even greater impact on the internationalization and reform of higher education than the mere exchange of students and teachers. It piloted the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) and initiated access to EU membership for countries in Central and Eastern Europe and other aspiring candidates. It paved the way for the Bologna Process and the realization of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), which in turn has generated the European Commission's first comprehensive internationalization strategy: *European Higher Education in the World* (2013) [Hunter, de Wit, 2016].

Within Europe, the United Kingdom was the exception to that rule. In 1980, the Thatcher Government introduced full-cost fees for international students, which meant that the main focus of British universities became international student recruitment for income generation, the end of humanitarianism in international education. Similar models followed in other English-speaking countries, in particular Australia. Universities may like to consider themselves essentially international institutions, but they act within national regulatory frameworks, and the shift in the English-speaking countries compared to continental Europe, that stayed for another 25 years more in a co-operative model of international education, is a manifestation of this.

The United States, in absolute numbers an active player but as percentage of overall student enrolments less, saw a rather unrelated series of international policies and activities, mainly at the institutional level, and as far as the federal level concerned more driven by national security and foreign policy: study abroad, international students, area studies.

2. Global Trends in Higher Education Affecting Internationalization Policies[2]

Besides the historical evolution of the international dimensions as described above, internationalization must also be seen in the context of the changing role and position of higher education in the world, as internationalization can only be seen in its broader context. The main misconception about internationalization is that we consider internationalization too much as a goal in itself instead of as a means to an end. Internationalization is not more and less than a way to enhance the quality of education and research and their service to society.

Higher Education has experienced dramatic expansion in the past half-century. Massification has changed the reality of postsecondary education everywhere. At the same time, the global knowledge economy has made higher education and research a key player and the international dimensions of universities more important than ever. What are the major trends in higher education worldwide: massification on the one hand, and the global knowledge economy on the other hand, and how they relate to internationalization. We also focus on autonomy and academic freedom, and the role of reputation, rankings and excellence, and the changing political climate as factors influencing the internationalization in higher education.

2.1. Massification

During the last five decades, the higher education landscape has changed dramatically. Once the privilege of an elite social class, gross enrollment ratios (GRE) in postsecondary education have mushroomed to more than 50% in many countries. There are more than 200 million students studying globally at an untold number of institutions focusing on every specialization possible. In much of the world, massification is a key phenomenon. Emerging economies, including China, India, and Latin America (with gross enrollment ratios of 37%, 22% and 35 %, respectively), are expanding their enrollment rates toward 50% or more as is common in the developed world. Even countries in Africa, still at the elite phase of less than 15% of GRE, the demand for higher education as a result of improved primary and secondary education and an emerging middle-class, is rapidly expanding. On the other side, one can observe a saturation in demand in countries which already have moved far beyond the 50% GRE characteristic of universal enrollment, such as the United States, the United Kingdom, continental Europe, Canada, Australia, South Korea and Japan. In those places, for demographic and other reasons, the supply of tertiary places in particular in STEM fields is starting to become higher than demand.

The relationship between massification and internationalization is manifest. International students and scholars are needed to fill the demand for graduates in these fields. Such students are mainly coming from the developing and emerging economies, where there is still

___

[2] This section builds on [Altbach et al. 2017; de Wit, Altbach 2018].

an ongoing demand for quality higher education, resulting in brain drain and related decrease in research and top talent capacity in these countries. In the current anti-immigration climate, tensions increase between the need for imported high skilled talents and the desire to reduce the influx of immigrants.

2.2. The Global Knowledge Economy

The other key element in higher education development and in internationalization in the past half-century has been the impact of the global knowledge economy—the increasingly technology and science based globalized set of economic relations that requires high levels of knowledge, skills, and sophisticated international relations. Research-intensive universities play a particularly important part in the global knowledge economy. Not only do they educate top talent but they are also the main producers of basic research in most countries. Research universities are among the main internationally-linked institutions. They have strong links with similar institutions around the globe, host international faculty and students, and increasingly function in the global language of science and scholarship—English.

2.3. Autonomy and Academic Freedom

The idea of university autonomy has a strong basis in the development of the university as we know it. It is strongly embedded in the rise of the research-oriented Humboldtian university in the early 19th century, in Latin American higher education after the Cordoba reform of 1918, and in the further evolution of universities around the world. Autonomy and academic freedom are at the very core of the mission of the university. It is an essential basis for quality higher education, teaching and research [Altbach 2016]. Academic freedom has a long and controversial history, including confrontations with or threats from the Catholic Church, Nazi-Germany, Cold War politics, and dictatorships in developing countries. The current political climate will lead to even more attacks on academic freedom, as is manifested in countries like Turkey, The Philippines, Thailand, China and many others. This will hinder the development of quality higher education and research, but also international cooperation and exchange. "More attention needs to be given to the mission and values of the university, for without academic freedom, universities cannot achieve their potential or fully contribute to the emerging knowledge-based society" [Altbach 2016: 239].

2.4. Reputation and Rankings

National, regional and global university rankings are driving the agendas of institutional leaders and national governments more than ever. Many governments, in particular in the North but increasingly also in the South, create excellence programs and investment schemes to become more globally competitive, have world-class universities and move higher in the rankings. While on the one hand there is a call for more access and equity, governments and institutions of higher edu-

cation are striving for more excellence in research and teaching and learning.

Salmi [2009] summarizes what separates elite research universities from the rest as a high concentration of talents; abundant resources; and favorable and autonomous governance. Excellence initiatives in for instance Germany, France, Japan, Russia, China, and other countries have strengthened national system differentiation by separating a new elite sector of world-class universities from other more nationally and regionally-oriented research universities.

Rankings—national, regional, global, institutional, by discipline and across an increasing number of other dimensions—have come to play an ever more important role in higher education. Global ranking has remade global higher education in three ways, according to Marginson [2017]. First, *competition*, the idea of higher education as a competitive market of universities and countries. Second, *hierarchy*, as a core element of the system of valuation. Third, *performance*, a performance economy driving "an often frenetic culture of continuous improvement in each institution." Yudkevich, Altbach, and Rumbley [2016] speak of the "Global Academic Rankings Game," in which only a small portion of the higher education sector competes. This minority of institutions gets all the attention and forces governments and institutions to "compete" without acknowledging the need for differentiation. As Altbach and Hazelkorn [2017] state: "Prestige and reputation have become dominant drivers rather than pursuance of quality and student achievement, intensifying social stratification and reputational differentiation." (p. 10)

The relationship between excellence initiatives, rankings and internationalization is clear. They reflect the global competitive nature of higher education of the elite research universities, they stimulate competition for international students and scholars, and they are driven by quantitative international indicators: number of international students, number of international staff, and number of international co-authors of publications. It drives national governments and institutions to invest in more global research, to use English as language of research and education, and to focus on international recruitment strategies.

2.5. Changing Economic and Political Climate

The emphasis in internationalization has traditionally been on exchange and co-operation and there continues to be a rhetoric around the need to understand different cultures and their languages. Nevertheless, a gradual but increasingly visible shift has been apparent since the second half of the 1990's towards a more competitive internationalization. Van der Wende [2001] calls this a shift in paradigm from cooperation to competition. De Wit et al. [2017: 232] speak of the globalization of internationalization, and the choice for higher education in the emerging and developing world between a more competitive direction of internationalization or a more socially responsible approach.

But a counter-reaction is emerging. The rise of nationalist-populist movements and governments, immigration bans, attacks on academic freedom, anti-globalism and in Europe anti-integration (Brexit), all might have negative implications for internationalization.

Manifestations of this trend are Brexit in the UK, the Trump Administration in the US, but also more nationalist inward looking movements in continental Europe, in Russia, China, Turkey, the Philippines, Israel, to mention some main ones [Altbach, de Wit 2016; 2017]. It is too early to tell what the exact and direct implications of this development will be, but it will most likely have a changing and accelerating effect on mobility patterns in higher education, on autonomy and academic freedom, on the privatization and commercialization in higher education, as well as other key dimensions of global higher education.

3. Implications for Internationalization

The massification of higher education and the increasing importance of higher education and research for the global knowledge economy, result in an increasing importance of its internationalization. There are now close to five million students studying abroad, double the amount of ten years ago, and predictions are a further increase to at least 8 million in the next decade. There is increasing global competition for international students taking place. The classic divide between those countries which are sending (mainly the emerging and developing countries) and those who are receiving (mainly the developed and in particular English speaking countries plus Germany and France), is shifting, and the current political climate will accelerate that process in the years to come. The international student industry has become a more global and competitive market.

There is also increasing competition for academic staff. The presence of international faculty within higher education institutions and systems around the world is an important dimension of higher education in the global knowledge economy. Yet the scope and nature of international mobility of faculty is a rather unknown and understudied phenomenon; there is a lack of consensus with respect to what defines as an 'international' academic; and there are different profiles for the institutions recruiting them: from the elite research universities recruiting the most sought-after academics on the one side of the spectrum to institutions or systems facing local shortages of faculty and recruit regional and international faculty to meet basic operational needs [Yudkevic, Altbach, Rumbley 2017].

There is growing demand and recognition for 'internationalization at home', including internationalization of the curriculum, teaching and learning, learning outcomes and global citizenship development. The reality is that only a very small percentage of scholars and students have the opportunity or even the desire to go abroad for a full degree or short term, ranging from 1-5% in most countries in the world to 20-30% in countries like Germany and The Netherlands. And this

implies that one has to internationalize at home, to be able to equip all students for the knowledge society we live in.

The internationalization of research is another dimension of this phenomenon. Like the case of international faculty, the internationalization of graduate education and research, including international co-authorship and other international research benchmarks, is receiving far less attention, other than through international rankings. Research, however, becomes a more complex enterprise and requires more international collaboration and competition than ever. Top academic talent is a scarce commodity and processes around issues such as patents and knowledge transfer require more support than in the past. Long-term planning for research infrastructure, increased research capacity, development of new research platforms and better co-ordination between research units, all require a more strategic focus on capacity development and international research policies and systems. The growth in international research funding, patents, publications and citations requires the development of research teams of a global nature. Bibliometric analysis yields evidence of increasing scientific collaboration with the international scientific community. Talented doctoral students and scholars are the international human capital on which research and development and innovation build. The dominance of English as the lingua franca in research is pervasive and has also expanded to teaching and learning. This, together with the increasing attention to international rankings and the role of research in them, explains why in recent years more attention is given to the development of national and institutional strategies for the internationalization of research.

Other elements of internationalization are international branding, reputation and rankings. The agenda of internationalization increasingly is driven by the rankings and the quantitative international indicators they rely on: number of international students, number of international faculty and number of internationally co-authored publications. These indicators ignore the relevance of internationalization at home and of teaching and learning.

According to de Wit, Hunter, Egon-Polak and Howard [2015], internationalization needs to evolve into a more comprehensive, more intentional, and less elitist (for all students and staff) process, less focused on mobility and less economically driven, with the goal to enhance the quality of education and research and make a meaningful contribution to society.

4. Internationalization, an Evolving Concept

Although, as described above higher education has always had international dimensions, internationalization as a concept and strategic factor is a rather young phenomenon, resulting from the fact that higher education at the system and institutional level needed to react to and act in a more global knowledge society and economy.

A gradual move of internationalization from margin to core has taken place from the 1980s onwards as a consequence of such developments as the increasing importance of research and education for economic development (the knowledge economy and society), the rapidly growing demand for higher education in the world, the end of the Cold War, and regional cooperation in higher education, the later particularly in Europe.

In the 1980s and 1990s, the main focus was on mobility. This came as a result of the unmet demand for higher education, which resulted in a drastic increase in international degree mobility of students, mainly from the developing world to the developed world; the growth of short term credit mobility of students, in particular in Europe as a result of Erasmus; an increase in short term faculty mobility, primarily for research; and a gradual growth in franchise operations, branch campuses and other forms of transnational education.

4.1. Abroad and at Home

This focus on what Jane Knight [2012] refers to as 'Internationalization Abroad', is still prevalent. But by the turn of the century, there also emerged a need for higher education institutions to respond to a compelling call for globally competent citizens and professionals. This imperative requires paying attention to the far larger group of non-mobile students and faculty, and to internationalization of the curriculum and teaching and learning. As such, the notions of 'Internationalization at Home' and 'Internationalization of the Curriculum' came to the fore. The first one is defined as:

> "Internationalization at Home is the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students within domestic learning environments" [Beelen, Jones, 2015].

The second one as:

> "Internationalization of the curriculum is the process of incorporating international, intercultural and global dimensions into the content of the curriculum as well as the learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods and support services of a program of study" [Leask 2015].

But more and more they are considered to be quite similar in content and focus.

Over the past decade, the relationship between these two components—internationalization at home and abroad—and the need to create a more central, integrated and systemic approach to internationalization, in order to eliminate fragmentation and marginalization, has spurred an interest in 'Comprehensive Internationalization':

"A Commitment and Action to Infuse International, Global and Comparative Content and Perspective throughout the Teaching, Research and Service Missions of Higher Education. It shapes Institutional Ethos and Values and touches the Entire Higher Education Enterprise. It not only impacts all of Campus Life, but the Institution's External Frameworks of Reference, Partnerships and Relationships" [Hudzik 2015].

4.2. Global Trends in Internationalization

In general terms one can say that internationalization over the past 30 years has seen the following key characteristics:

- More focused on internationalization abroad than on internationalization at home
- More ad hoc, fragmented and marginal than strategic, comprehensive and central in policies
- More in the interest of a small, elite subset of students and faculty than focused on global and intercultural outcomes for all
- Directed by a constantly shifting range of political, economic, social/cultural, and educational rationales, with increasing focus on economic motivations
- Increasingly driven by national, regional, and global rankings
- Little alignment between the international dimensions of the three core functions of higher education: education, research, and service to society
- Primarily a strategic choice and focus of institutions of higher education, and less a priority of national governments
- Less important in emerging and developing economies, and more of a particular strategic concern among developed economies.

In the past decade, however, one can observe a reaction to these trends. While mobility is still the most dominant factor in internationalization policies worldwide, there is increasing attention being paid to internationalization of the curriculum at home. There is also a stronger call for comprehensive internationalization, which addresses all aspects of education in an integrated way. Although economic rationales and rankings still drive the agenda of internationalization, there is more emphasis now being placed on other motivations for internationalization. For example, attention is being paid to integrating international dimensions into tertiary education quality assurance mechanisms, institutional policies related to student learning outcomes, and the work of national and discipline-specific accreditation agencies.

At the same time there is a move away from internationalization as a Western concept: "In the current global-knowledge society, the concept of internationalization of higher education has itself become globalized, demanding further consideration of its impact on policy and practice as more countries and types of insti-

tution around the world engage in the process. Internationalization should no longer be considered in terms of a westernized, largely Anglo-Saxon, and predominantly English-speaking paradigm" [Jones, De Wit 2014].

Recent publications, have given more attention to these emerging voices and perspectives [de Wit et al. 2017] and next generation insights [Proctor, Rumbley 2018].

In other words, internationalization in higher education has evolved over the past 30 years from a rather ad hoc, marginal and fragmented phenomenon to a more central and comprehensive component of higher education policy—although still more in rhetoric than in concrete action [de Wit, Rumbley 2017].

Leask, Jones and de Wit [2018] for that reason state that the implementation of "internationalization of the curriculum at home" appears to be struggling to move beyond good intentions and isolated examples of good practice. According to them we are still far away from any form of internationalization that is inclusive and accessible rather than elitist and exclusive, reason why they call for urgent attention to the following as a minimum:

1. We must, as scholars and practitioners, not only continue but also escalate our efforts at working together across disciplines, professional areas and national boundaries as well as within universities.
2. We must engage more with stakeholder groups beyond the academy, striving towards the common goal of creating a better, more equal and fairer world.
3. We must integrate internationalization with other agendas - disciplinary, professional, institutional, national, and regional – which are also focused on improving the quality of education and research for all students. Internationalisation of the curriculum, teaching, learning and service should not operate in a vacuum.
4. We must place emphasis on enhancing the quality of education and research for all students and staff in all parts of the world. This requires integrated policy and strategy as well as cooperation and partnership within and between institutions across the globe.

Working towards inclusive international and intercultural learning for all', means according to them that we become more respectful of diverse contexts, agendas and perspectives on a global scale.

4.3. Leadership and Internationalization

The evolution of internationalization, in terms of both ideas and actions, went hand in hand with a rapid growth in the number of administrators and academics dedicated fulltime or part-time to the elaboration of internationalization policy and practice, in the central administrations of institutions of higher education and in their departments and faculties, in national and international agencies, in

ministries of education, and in an emerging international education industry.

Key illustrations of the profession boom related to internationalization can be seen in the development of national and regional associations for international education—such as NAFSA: Association for International Educators, the Association for International Education Administrators (AIEA), the European Association for International Education (EAIE), and others; the rapid growth in membership and conference participation of these associations; and the expanding footprints of their conference exhibit halls. This boom was first evident in Europe, North America and Australia, but then evolved to other parts of the world, as internationalization has increasingly become a global phenomenon [de Wit et al. 2017].

It also has resulted in an increase in numbers and variation in position and responsibilities of leadership positions in internationalization of higher education, what in the United States of America are called 'Senior International Officers', as well as in the required policy focus by institutional leaders in higher education (rectors/presidents and vice-rectors/vice-presidents) concerning internationalization. This is reflected in the number of strategic internationalization plans by institutions of higher education, as well as the attention given by national, regional and international associations of universities, such as 'the 'European Association of Universities' (EUA) at the European, and the 'International Association of Universities' (IAU) at the international level.

As internationalization policies (at national and institutional levels) evolved over the years, and international offices grew in size and complexity, the need for more senior-level professionals with a broader knowledge of international education became more evident.

As internationalization has moved from the margins of higher education research, policy and practice, it has become clear that the previously disjointed approaches that characterized its earliest years have given way to an understanding that sophisticated synergies are required to realize its full potential. The same is true of the professional development needs of those tasked to advance the cause of internationalization in order to enhance the quality and relevance of higher education, locally and globally.

The following points emerge from this evolving concept of internationalization of higher education.

1. Increasing importance of internationalization in the higher education agenda
2. Policy and practice of internationalization is no longer marginal and ad hoc but core to the agenda of higher education leaders
3. Internationalization has become a broader agenda for all domains of higher education policy: research, teaching and learning, and relation to society

4. Internationalization no longer is the exclusive domain of the SIOs and their offices, but more and more of heads of other administrative and academic departments

5. Internationalization for higher education leaders has become more than oversight of the SIO and his/her office, and signing of MOUs

6. Budget implications are no longer marginal but both in expenses and in income substantial

7. Internationalization is for higher education leaders a key agenda issue at the sector and system level, nationally, regionally and globally [de Wit et al. 2018].

4.4. A Complex Phenomenon

As noted by Streitwieser and Ogden [2016] "international higher education is a complex phenomenon that involves many different activities, players, institutions and realities" (p. 13).

As internationalization and global engagement become entrenched around the world as mainstream components of quality in higher education, the need to ensure high quality professional preparation of those responsible for the internationalization agenda in their respective institutions or systems of higher education becomes more widespread and sustained. This is reflected well in the notion of "intelligent internationalization," as expressed by Rumbley [2015]:

> "Intelligent internationalization" demands the development of a thoughtful alliance between the research, practitioner, and policy communities. Those participating in the elaboration of internationalization activities and agendas [must] have access to the information, ideas, and professional skill-building opportunities that will enhance their ability to navigate the complex and volatile higher education environment of the next 20 years (p. 17).

In tandem, an updated definition of internationalization emerged, reflecting these broader understandings of the nature and purpose of internationalization:

> "The intentional process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff and to make a meaningful contribution to society" [de Wit et al. 2015].

5. National Policies and Strategies for Internationalization[3]

Over the past five years, several studies by the British Council [2016; 2017], the DAAD and the British Council [2014], Helms et al. [2015],

[3] This section builds on [de Wit et al. 2018].

de Wit et al. [2015], Crăciun [2018], and Perna et al. [2014] have looked into national policies and strategies for internationalization, and have generated a series of analyses, overviews, rankings, and recommendations on them. National tertiary education internationalization strategies and plans represent the most tangible and direct attempts by governments to play an active and decisive role in relation internationalization, but there are substantive differences in their approaches, rationales and priorities.

A worldwide census of explicit national policies carried out by Crăciun [2018] reveals that only 11% of countries have an official strategy for internationalization, most having been adopted in the last decade. Such strategies have been developed predominantly by developed countries – 3 in 4 national policies come from members of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). European countries have taken the lead in promoting strategic thinking about internationalization at the national level – 2 in 3 national policies come from this world region [Crăciun 2018], and programs such as Erasmus+ and Horizon 2020 have led to further regional harmonization of higher education systems [British Council 2017].

This is not to say that other countries have not taken measures to promote internationalization. In fact, to support internationalization processes, many countries have taken both direct measures (e. g., re-evaluating their visa policies to give preferential treatment to international students and scholars, establishing bi-lateral or multi-lateral agreements through memoranda of understanding, and promoting transnational education through free-trade deals) and indirect measures (e.g., supporting internationalization in political discourses and giving universities autonomy to pursue internationalization activities). Nevertheless, explicit national policies ensure consistency between direct and indirect policy measures and provide a clear signaling of government commitment to internationalization.

However, it would be a misconception to assume that national policies have common rationales and approaches to internationalization. Differences exist between and among high-income, low-income, and middle-income countries with respect to their policies and practices. Also, there are differences in explicit and implicit policies and practices, with some countries having well documented plans and others have no plans but well-defined activities.

6. Implications for Institutional Strategies

The main focus in internationalization strategies and plans is still at the institutional level. Indeed, institutions operate in many cases without a national plan in place. Where national plans do exist, institutions may operate in conflict or in alignment with the national agenda. A national policy may serve as catalyst or a drag on internationalization processes, but are mostly seen as a highly positive element for the advancement of internationalization. They incentivize insti-

tutions and individuals to assist in meeting national strategic goals through internationalization. But overall, institutions are still the main agents that drive internationalization. According to most recent survey results from the 5th Global survey on Internationalization by the International Association of Universities (IAU) two thirds of university leaders around the world are considering internationalization as an important agenda issue, although Marinoni and de Wit (2019) observe that there is an increasing divide between institutions that consider internationalization as of high importance and those not. They observe that

> "the reasons for such a divide between HEIs that consider internationalization extremely important and those who do not is worth a reflection and deserves to be studied more in depth, especially if one considers internationalization to be an essential part of all HEIs' mission and a sign of quality."

The challenges that institutions encounter in their internationalization strategy are divers. There is pressure of revenue generation, competition for talents, and branding and reputation (rankings). There is pressure to focus on international research and publication, on recruitment of international students and scholars, and on the use of English as language of research and instruction. These challenges and pressures conflict with a more inclusive and less elitist approach to internationalization, building on the needs and opportunities of own student and staff. In other words, there are tensions between a short term neoliberal approach to internationalization, focusing primarily on mobility and research, and a long term comprehensive quality approach, global learning for all.

7. Lessons and Recommendations for Russian Higher Education

The analysis above is of relevance for Russian higher education. Over the years, the focus in Russian higher education has been on inbound mobility of students and scholars. During the Soviet period, the main rationale was political, attracting students and scholars to come to study and become future ambassadors for the country. The People's Friendship University RUDN for instance finds its basis in that policy. After the end of the Soviet Union, there was a decline in international student and scholar presence and more of an outbound mobility of Russian students and scholars to other parts of the world, mainly North America and Europe. More recently, national policies, including the excellence program 5-100, are trying to return to a more inbound recruitment strategy of international students and scholars. Economic and political rationales as well as a strive to increase the reputation and ranking of Russian universities, are driving that agenda. Internationalization of research and publication in international peer reviewed journals are another dimension of this agenda. The use of English for

research and teaching becomes more important. Is this a realistic strategy?

The potential of Russian higher education is high. It can build on a solid foundation and reputation, certainly in the sciences and engineering. There are also challenges, such as the aging of the faculty, the lack of English proficiency among students and scholars, geographical factors, lack of innovation, strong hierarchy and bureaucracy, among others. Internationalization as a change and innovation agent requires a dynamic, young and open culture, and a long term approach. The ambitions, as in the 5-100 project, are unrealistic in their timeframe as well as in human capital capacity and bureaucracy. Internationalization needs to build on people, open culture and dynamism, and an understanding of the global, national and institutional contexts.

It is recommended to focus on a more inclusive and comprehensive approach:

- Do not let your institution's strategy be driven by rankings, but let your position in rankings be the result of your strategy
- Build your strategy on your own identity and how that is embedded in your local, national and international context
- Create a comprehensive strategy for all students and faculty, do not exclusively focus on a small elite
- Inbound Mobility is only successful if embedded in an at home strategy: language policy, international and intercultural experience of own faculty and students, an integrated international curriculum, strategic and equal partnerships.

References

Altbach P.G. (2016) *Global Perspectives on Higher Education.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University.

Altbach P.G, de Wit H. (2016) Internationalization and Global Tension: Lessons from History. *Global Perspectives on Higher Education* (ed. P.G. Altbach), Baltimore: John Hopkins University, pp. 73–78.

Altbach P.G., de Wit H. (2017a) *Nationalism: The End of Higher Education Internationalization?* Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

Altbach P.G., de Wit H. (2017b) The New Nationalism and Internationalisation of HE. *University World News*, 15 September, no 474.

Altbach P.G., Hazelkorn E. (2017) Rankings in the Age of Massification. *International Higher Education*, no 89, pp. 8–10.

Altbach P.G., Reisberg L., de Wit H. (eds) (2017) *Responding to Massification: Differentiation in Postsecondary Education Worldwide.* Dordrecht: Sense Publishers.

Beelen J., Jones E. (2015) Redefining Internationalization at Home. *The European Higher Education Area: Between Critical Reflections and Future Policies* (eds A. Curai, L. Matei, R. Pricopie, J. Salmi, P. Scott), Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 67–80.

British Coucil (2016) *The Shape of Global Higher Education: National Policies Framework for International Engagement*. Available at: www.britishcouncil.org/education/ihe (accessed 10 May 2019).

British Coucil (2017) *The Shape of Global Higher Education: International Mobility of Students, Research and Education Provision*. Available at: www.british-council.org/education/ihe (accessed 10 May 2019).

British Council, DAAD (2014) *The Rationale for Sponsoring Students to Undertake International Study. An Assessment of National Student Mobility Scholarship Programs*. Available at: https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/e002_outward_mobility_study_final_v2_web.pdf (accessed 10 May 2019).

Crăciun D. (2018) National Policies for Higher Education Internationalization: A Global Comparative Perspective. *European Higher Education Area: The Impact of Past and Future Policies* (eds A. Curaj, L. Deca, M. Pricopie), Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 95–106.

Cunningham Ch. (1991) *The Integration of International Students on Canadian Post-Secondary Campuses. CBIE Research Paper No 1.* Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.

De Ridder-Symoens H. (1992) Mobility. *A History of the University in Europe. Vol. 1: Universities in the Middle Age* (ed. H. de Ridder-Symoens), Cambridge: Cambridge University, pp. 280–304.

De Wit H. (2002) *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe. A Historical, Comparative and Conceptual Analysis*. Greenwood, Connecticut: Greenwood Studies in Higher Education.

De Wit H., Altbach P.G. (2018) Higher Education as a Global Reality. *Encyclopedia of International Higher Education Systems and Institutions* (eds J.C. Shin, P. Teixeira), Dordrecht: Springer Science+Business Media.

De Wit H., Gacel-Ávila J., Jones E., Jooste N. (eds) (2017) *The Globalization of Internationalization, Emerging Voices and Perspectives*. London and New York: Routledge.

De Wit H., Hunter F., Howard L., Egron Polak E. (eds) (2015) *Internationalization of Higher Education*. Brussels: European Parliament, Directorate-General for Internal Policies.

De Wit H., Merkx G. (2012) *The History of Internationalization of Higher Education. The SAGE Handbook on International Higher Education* (eds D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J.D. Heyl, T. Adams), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 43–60.

De Wit H., Rumbley L.E. (2017) Professional Development in International Education. The Example of the Boston College MA in International Higher Education. *Internationalization of Higher Education. A Handbook*, iss. 3, pp. 2–14.

De Wit H., Rumbley L.E., Craciun D., Mihut G.. Woldegiyorgis A. (2018) *International Mapping of National Tertiary Education Internationalization Strategies and Plans (NTEISPs). Analytical Report. Contract No 7188268.*

European Commission (2013) *European Higher Education in the World (COM 2013)*. Available at: http://www.em-a.eu/fileadmin/content/Promo/Erasmus_in_the_world_layouted.pdf (accessed 10 May 2019).

Goodwin C.D., Nacht M. (1991) *Missing the Boat: The Failure to Internationalize American Higher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Hammerstein N. (1996) The Enlightenment. *A History of the University in Europe. Vol. 2: Universities in Early Modern Europe (1500-1800)* (ed. W. Rüegg),Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Helms R., Rumbley L, Brajkovic L., Mihut G. (2015) *Internationalizing Higher Education Worldwide: National Policies and Programs*. Available at: http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/National-Policies-and-Programs-Part-1-Global.pdf (accessed 10 May 2019).

Hudzik J. (2011) *Comprehensive Internationalization: From Concept to Action*. Washington, DC: NAFSA.

Hunter F., de Wit H. (2016) The European Landscape: A Shifting Perspective. *Internationalization of Higher Education. A Handbook*, iss. 2, pp. 49–68.

Jones E., de Wit H. (2014) Globalized Internationalization: Implications for Policy and Practice. *IIEnetworker*, Spring 2014, pp. 28–29.

Kerr C. (1994) *Higher Education Cannot Escape History: Issues for the Twenty-first Century. SUNY Series Frontiers in Education*. Albany: State University of New York.

Knight J. (2012) Concepts, Rationales, and Interpretive Frameworks in the Internationalization of Higher Education. *The SAGE Handbook on International Higher Education* (eds D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. D. Heyl, T. Adams), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 27–42.

Leask B. (2015) *Internationalizing the Curriculum*. New York: Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon.

Leask B., Jones E., de Wit H. (2018) Towards Inclusive Intercultural Learning for All. *University World News*, 7 December, no 532.

Marginson S. (2017) Do Rankings Drive Better Academic Performance? *International Higher Education*, no 89, pp. 6–7.

Marinoni G., de Wit H. (2019) Internationalization and Inequality. First Results from the 5th Global Survey of IAU. *University World News*, January 2019.

Neave G. (1997) *The European Dimension in Higher Education: An Historical Analysis*. Background Document to the Conference "The Relationship between Higher Education and the State" (7–9 April 1997, Enschede).

Perna L. W., Orosz K., Gopaul B., Jumakulov Z., Ashirbekov A., Kishkentayeva M. (2014) Promoting Human Capital Development: A Typology of International Scholarship Programs in Higher Education. *Educational Researcher*, vol. 20, no 10, pp. 1–11.

Proctor D., Rumbley L. E. (2018) *The Future Agenda for Internationalization in Higher Education, Next Generation Insights into Research, Policy, and Practice*. London and New York: Routledge.

Rumbley L. E. (2015) "Intelligent Internationalization": A 21st Century Imperative. *International Higher Education*, no 80, pp. 16–17.

Salmi J. (2009) *The Challenge of Establishing World-Class Universities: Directions in Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

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

Streitwieser B., Ogden A. (eds) (2016) *International Higher Education's Scholar-Practitioners, Bridging Research and Practice*. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Van der Wende M. (2001) Internationalization Policies: About New Trends and Contrasting Paradigms. *Higher Education Policy*, vol. 14, no 3, pp. 249–259.

Yudkevich M., Altbach P. G., Rumbley L. E. (eds) (2016) *The Global Academic Rankings Game. Changing Institutional Policy, Practice, and Academic Life*. New York and London: Routledge.