

1 Although internationalization efforts in higher education have become increasingly driven by economic considerations, this is not the case for all initiatives, particularly those at the level of curriculum, where academic, social/cultural, ethical, political, and even environmental rationales feature more strongly.

Different Perspectives on Internationalization in Higher Education

Carolin Kreber

Faculty, administrators, students, policy makers and the larger community committed to internationalization must answer several difficult questions. What should the process include? Is reading a few books from different cultures enough to internationalize education?

Murphy, 2007, p. 181

“Internationalization” has become a key theme and widespread phenomenon in higher education. In this introduction, I explore different meanings and motivations underlying the notion of internationalization in higher education, thereby providing a richer conceptual basis from which to appreciate efforts directed at internationalizing the curriculum in particular. In the final section, I provide an overview of the examples featured in this volume.

Internationalization in the Context of Globalization

Given that higher education takes place within a globalizing world (Enders and Fulton, 2002), internationalization and globalization are often discussed together; however, although related, it is useful to distinguish the two

phenomena. In the first part of this chapter, I draw on some of the policy literature on internationalization in higher education, as discussions about how to internationalize the curriculum in particular are usefully enriched by placing them within this larger context.

Many analysts consider internationalization efforts to be countries' or institutions' proactive responses to the external macro socioeconomic processes and effects of globalization over which they have no control (e.g., Knight, 1997; Van der Wende, 1997, 1999). In Knight's (1997) own words:

Globalization is the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, ideas . . . across borders. Globalization affects each country in a different way due to a nation's individual history, traditions, culture and priorities. Internationalization of higher education is one of the ways a country responds to the impact of globalization yet, at the same time respects the individuality of the nation (p. 6).

According to Van der Wende (1996), internationalization refers to "any systematic, sustained effort aimed at making higher education (more) responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy and labour markets" (p. 23).

Commenting on the role of nation states under either condition (that of globalization or that of internationalization), Enders and Fulton (2002) similarly argue that globalization refers principally to increased interdependence and, eventually, convergence of markets, cultures, and societies where individual states are seen to have little power. Internationalization, on the other hand, describes greater mutual cooperation between states and activity across state borders. Globalization challenges the power of the nation state; internationalization assumes that states still play a crucial role. According to this perspective then, globalization is primarily associated with increased interdependence and convergence and an ethos of competition, while internationalization tends to be associated principally with an ethos of mutuality and practices geared at strengthening cooperation. However, how people understand the idea of internationalizing higher education varies greatly, further serving as evidence that it does not represent a uni-dimensional concept.

According to Vught and colleagues, internationalization in higher education is seen to include several activities and processes such as:

The transnational mobility of students and staff, internationalization of curricula and quality assurance, interinstitutional cooperation in education and research, and the establishment of international university consortia. Furthermore, there has been strong growth in the cross-border delivery of education, leading to a substantial market in export and import of higher education products and services (Van Vught, Van der Wende, and Westerheijden, 2002, p. 103).

The motivation for increased cross-border delivery of education can be explained in two ways. On the one hand, there is now a much greater market for higher education, particularly in countries with less well-developed higher education systems. As well, it is through cooperating with institutions in other countries, and the sharing of resources this implies, that teaching and research programs can be enriched and in some cases become affordable to the institution. This cooperation can be observed not only between developed, or developed and developing countries, but also between developing countries (Murphy, 2007, for example discusses cooperation efforts between a Mexican institution and one in Eastern Europe). On the other hand, universities in Western countries see this increased demand for higher education, particularly in so-called developing countries, as a very welcome opportunity to boost their budgets, which, coinciding with deregulation in many jurisdictions, have experienced substantial declines in public contributions over the past decade. These institutions then compete with other providers for what they perceive to be lucrative cross-border opportunities.

I should note, albeit briefly, that numerous observers predict that the pressures many countries experience with regard to international competition will expand drastically through initiatives by the World Trade Organization (WTO), particularly the highly contested General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). GATS considers higher education as a trade-related sector and legalizes the cross-border/global trade in educational services (e.g., Van Vught et al., 2002). Stromquist (2007) and Van Vught et al. (2002) report that education and training represents the fifth largest service sector in the United States, explaining the strong interest of the United States (but also, e.g., Australia, the United Kingdom, and New Zealand), in supporting the liberalization of free trade of higher education across borders.

Exploring Different Motivations for Internationalization

Following Knight (1997), Qiang (2003) provides a useful conceptual framework of four different possible rationales for internationalization in higher education: the political, the academic, the cultural/social, and the economic. The political rationale is principally related to issues of national security, stability, and peace as well as ideological influences ensuing from internationalization efforts. The academic rationale is principally linked to the goal of achieving international standards for both teaching and research. More generally, the reasoning goes that by encouraging greater internationalization across teaching, research, and service activities, the quality of higher education can be enriched. The cultural/social rationale is based on the view that the “homogenizing effects of globalization” (Knight, 1997, p. 11) need to be resisted and the culture as well as language of nations be respected. This view places particular emphasis on understanding foreign languages

and cultures, the preservation of national culture, and respect for diversity. Finally, there is the economic rationale, which, by many, is considered to be a direct response to the market forces associated with the economic dimension of globalization. On the one hand, the economic rationale underlies efforts aimed at developing the human resources/capital needed for the nation to stay internationally competitive; on the other hand, it underlies efforts geared towards increasing the institution's (or sector's) income by providing education abroad or attracting more foreign students.

Although until the 1990s internationalization in higher education was largely understood to be a cooperative effort with its rationale based primarily on political, cultural, and academic arguments, many observers today feel that internationalization has become increasingly economically motivated (e.g., Kälvermark and Van der Wende, 1997; Van der Wende, 2001; see also Grabove in this volume). While the political, cultural, and academic rationales are based on an ethos of cooperation, the economic one is based on an ethos of competition. Surely, both these overarching rationales—cooperation across state borders and competition—can be observed in contemporary efforts to internationalize higher education but it is the latter which is more and more seen to dominate the internationalization agenda.

Relatedly, it has been proposed that it might be useful to distinguish between “internationalization” and “internationalism” (Stromquist, 2007; Jones, 2000), as they are informed by different considerations. According to this framework, internationalism emphasizes notions such as “international community, international cooperation, international community of interests, and international dimensions of the common good” (Jones, 2000, p. 31). Internationalization, on the other hand, is seen to refer to “greater international presence by the dominant economic and political powers, usually guided by principles of marketing and competition” (Stromquist, 2007, p. 82). Stromquist concludes that internationalization in higher education is therefore closely associated with the “entrepreneurialism” or “academic capitalism” that Slaughter (1998) and colleagues observed among universities in the 1990s (in the United States, Australia, Canada, and the United Kingdom) as these were competing for external funds.

If one were to adopt these definitions of internationalism and internationalization, a concern over internationalism could be observed among scholars who call for the raising of intercultural awareness and development of global citizenship through schools and colleges (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 2005; Nussbaum, 1997; see also several contributors to this volume). Then again, as we saw in the earlier discussion of the cultural and political rationales underlying internationalization efforts, the term “internationalization” can be interpreted to include “internationalism” as well. Murphy (2007), for example, suggests that “Internationalization of education is seen as one way to bridge the gap between developing and developed countries and as a strategy for the formation of citizens adept at and functioning in a multi-cultural global system” (p. 198).

What can we conclude from this? Surely, the actual terms we employ to describe our “cross-border” activities and policies (“internationalism” versus “internationalization”) are perhaps less critical; what is very important, however, is to be clear about the assumptions and motivations driving our efforts.

Further Considerations Regarding these Varied Rationales

What are some of the implications of all this? I would suggest that one fundamental problem with the economic rationale (i.e., efforts aimed at developing the human resources needed for the nation to stay internationally competitive and/or efforts geared towards generating income by providing education abroad or attracting more foreign students) is that it can all too easily become the principal driver in how the purposes of higher education become defined.

To begin with, and to link this wider discussion more explicitly to the notion of “curriculum,” I should note that I see a real risk for curricula now being superficially internationalized in response to such economic imperatives so as to make them more appealing to international students, which, in turn, would mean that more international students come to study with us (and with that, more cash in our institution’s pocket). If internationalizing the curriculum is not understood to serve a more profound educational purpose, one that—while inclusive of aims to meet the needs of international students—goes well beyond this, then an important opportunity for higher education to play a pivotal role in fostering intercultural understanding, greater empathy and action towards those most in need, international cooperation on climate change, etc., is lost. More on that later.

There is a more general concern as well. In a globalized market economy, nation-states compete with one another within the same market for the same resources. In such a market, what counts is no longer so much that the provider (for example, your university or college or mine) is confident that we offer sound or “high quality” programs, but instead how the worth of the program is perceived by the “consumer” and whether the programs (in their form of delivery and curriculum content) are judged as being relevant to consumer needs or the economy. Hence, institutions are progressively more called upon to offer programs that potential clients will consider valuable, which more often than not, means “useful” for the economy and career advancement. At the same time, we observe greater obsession with quality assurance. In such a context, the very meaning of the “quality of education” and how to determine it becomes more contested than ever. Quality is intrinsically connected to purposes (indeed, we think of something that is of high quality as being fit for purpose), yet the purposes of higher education have become increasingly diverse and conflicting (Barnett, 1992; Rowland, 2006), in no small part as a result of the economic dimension of globalization. It is in this spirit that some observers (e.g., Kivinen, 2002; Newman, 2000) caution that

concern with global competitiveness could lead higher education to easily lose sight of its traditional academic values such as social criticism, preparation for civic life, and the pursuit of curiosity-driven learning and scholarship.

Now, having voiced these concerns over economically driven internationalization initiatives, some qualifying remarks are required. I think Knight (1997) is absolutely right to emphasize that the impact of globalization, and hence internationalization efforts, will be perceived differently depending on how a particular country is positioned within the global society/economy. Moreover, there are positive, even ethically defensible outcomes to partially, or even entirely, economically motivated efforts to increase internationalization. Strengthening the economy and addressing other development needs of developing countries, through their internationalization efforts (which can take on many different forms including sending students abroad and inviting foreign resources), is clearly important but has different consequences for the country that is “providing services” and the country that is “receiving” them. A real problem arises when economically motivated efforts become the overriding concerns for education, and particularly, if in a free market, countries most in need of development remain the most disadvantaged as a result of unequal opportunity. Murphy (2007) adds three further possible and interrelated risks to developing countries that see internationalization as a solution to their development needs: the imposition of foreign and inadequate models to solve domestic problems, the potential loss of human and intellectual capital, and connected to the previous two, the weakening of the domestic university system as it plays a marginal role in the development of the country.

Interest in internationalization has increased drastically since the 1990s. Many critics suggest that this is principally a result of economic considerations and perceptions of external pressure. However, although this is perhaps the case at the level of wider national and institutional policies directed at providing services abroad, recruiting foreign students, and stressing the employability of graduates, the motivation driving many individual faculty, or groups of faculty, to making changes to individual courses or programs lies elsewhere. As David Kahane argues in Chapter Five, “For many educators, . . . a key reason for internationalization is ethical: It helps students to examine their implicit and explicit beliefs about whose wellbeing matters, and to develop a more globalized sense of responsibility and citizenship.”

One might suggest that the humanitarian crises in many parts of the world have given rise to internationalization efforts through education in developed countries that have as their goal to enhance international awareness, empathy and social action among staff, students and hence, future (world) leaders, and are motivated by cultural/social, political, and ethical rationales. To address the development needs identified by certain communities some institutions (or countries) decide to offer their (educational) services. Such efforts are perhaps, or in all probability, also economically

motivated. However, the extent to which economic reasons are dominant rather than intermingled with, or in many instances secondary to, social or humanitarian considerations will vary from case to case. Then again, reasons to enhance efforts directed at internationalization might lie elsewhere altogether. One might argue, for example, that the events following September 11, 2001, or concern over sustainable development and the survival of our planet, will have spurred further national interest in international cooperation as well as in policies and activities linked to the political, cultural/social and environmental rationales of internationalization.

Scope of Meaning and Perceived Outcomes of Internationalization Efforts

The Scope of Meaning of Internationalization. As has become evident already, people understand different things by internationalization. For some, for example, internationalizing higher education has been taken to mean integrating international content or perspectives in each of the academic disciplines. The reasoning behind this view is that it is through exposure to these international perspectives, and a better understanding of the international circumstances of other people or cultures, that students are adequately prepared for the world in which they are living (Groennings and Wiley, 1990). Since the 1980s, universities had witnessed greater interest in international education programs, as indicated by curricula taking up international subjects, incorporating international comparative approaches, and increasing their offerings of international areas studies. However, it is particularly since the 1990s that internationalization is seen to be relevant across traditional programs or disciplines.

Echvin and Ray (2002) as well as Thune and Welle-Strand (2005) suggest that efforts directed at internationalization at program level can be observed by the contribution of one or more of the following four factors:

- The recruitment of international students
- The teaching process, through selection of particular course content and forms of delivery (including ICT), student mobility, language of instruction, etc.
- Resources—in the form of internationally recruited staff members, use of international course materials (e.g., literature), etc.
- Location—offering courses or setting up campuses abroad

Taking an even broader lens on internationalization, Knight (1993) argued that internationalization of higher education refers to “the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution” (p. 21). Qiang (2003), echoing the notion of integration inherent in Knight’s definition, concludes that

“internationalization must be *entrenched* (emphasis added) in the culture, policy, planning and organizational process of the institution so that it can be both successful and sustainable” (p. 258). Yet, studies show that the extent to which administrators and faculty at colleges and universities engage with calls to further their internationalization efforts is not the least a measure of how relevant they consider internationalization to be to their particular field (Schoorinan, 1999).

Does studying in internationalized contexts make a difference? Murphy (2007) discussed the extent to which internationalized campuses or programs make a difference and cited a number of studies that attest to the positive effects of internationalization efforts on students. Based on these studies, she reports that governments and universities hold the view that students who study on internationalized campuses demonstrate greater knowledge of international events, perspectives, and methods. She further observes that these students are seen to be better prepared to contribute positively to local, regional, national, and international progress because they develop skills deemed necessary for the modern workforce and global conditions, such as second-language acquisition, cultural awareness, international contacts, and adaptation skills (p. 173).

She also reports on studies that show that students themselves perceive an internationalized education to be beneficial for personal and career development. Although all these studies are very encouraging, Qiang (2003) cautions that further research is needed “to identify those competencies which help students to be successful national and international citizens and to contribute to local and global work environments” (p. 250).

Why another volume on internationalization? Internationalization is an important policy issue in higher education; yet, what precisely internationalization means with regards to teaching and learning, and what it can add to the student learning experience, is far less often talked or written about. As Van Gyn and her colleagues argue in Chapter Three, “the concept of internationalization and its contribution to higher education is inadequately understood by most” and “getting to the heart of what internationalization means in higher education is not a simple matter.”

Key questions this volume addresses are “What do we understand by integrating an international dimension in education?” “Why do we think doing so is important? And how far have we come? “What are some internationalization initiatives that can be observed on our own campuses?” Rather than asking contributors to provide comprehensive case studies of how their institution attempts to integrate an international dimension into its teaching (and research and service functions), which would have been a rather onerous task, I invited them to share their experiences of trying to work towards internationalizing education within their own personal and clearly demarcated contexts. As was suggested by Van Vught and colleagues (2002) earlier, “internationalization of the curriculum” is but one of a range

of possible activities underlying internationalization efforts. So what is meant, in this volume, by “curriculum”?

For me, the curriculum includes the rather narrow definition of the individual courses or programs offered by our colleges and universities; however, I do mean more by it. By “curriculum,” I mean all the activities, experiences, and learning opportunities (that is, the entire teaching and learning environment) that students, academics, administrators, and support staff are part of. The curriculum involves the entire institution and all the intended (and unintended) messages conveyed to students while they are studying in our programs and on our campuses. In discussing examples of internationalizing the curriculum, most contributors to this volume take the approach of a particular course or program they were responsible for. Others look at their institution more broadly.

As will become clear in the chapters that follow, none of the contributors felt that “reading a few books from different cultures (was) enough to internationalize education” (Murphy, 2007, p. 181), and all had to think carefully about “What should the process include” (Murphy, 2007, p. 181). However, none suggested that the processes and activities underlying their initiative portrayed a perfect account of an internationalized curriculum. The value of these chapters lies in the varied interpretations they offer on what internationalizing the curriculum might involve and also in the concrete illustrations they provide of what each of us could do, in our own backyards, as it were, to make the higher education experience more internationally inclusive and/or relevant. Some of the examples featured here go beyond the traditional discourse of internationalization. This is deliberate, as my intent is also to broaden this discourse and give these conceptions and practices a “voice” within it. Indeed, they enrich our understanding of internationalization in very useful ways.

My purpose with this volume is to engender reflection and dialogue within the academy about what internationalizing the curriculum could mean and how the process of internationalizing education might be enhanced. As Qiang (2003), Van der Wende (1996), and Knight (1993) have noted, attempts at internationalization will not be truly successful or sustainable unless they become fully integrated into all the activities and policies of the institution. So ultimately, discussions will need to include policy makers, administrators and those serving on central committees where not only academic regulations (as is typically the case), but also educational purposes as well as pedagogies are routinely discussed. To be clear, internationalization is not just about how and where we deliver our educational services. Reflecting on what internationalization means cannot be separated from critically engaging with the question of what the purposes and goals of higher education should be, within specific programs and across programs, and the role of teachers, students, administrators and the institution as a whole in contributing to these purposes.

In the concluding section, I provide a brief overview of the chapters that follow, drawing appropriately on some of the classification systems introduced earlier.

Internationalizing the Curriculum: Examples Featured in this Volume

In Chapter Two, Valerie L. Grabove describes how a mid-sized community college in Ontario embraces the notion of internationalization. Although her analysis concludes that most of the institutional initiatives are market-driven and aimed at increasing revenue, she also observes that these entrepreneurial efforts at college-level have had the desirable side effect of leading academic staff across the college to become more sensitized to, and educated in, the notion of internationalization. This, in turn, has resulted in gradual changes in programs and curricula. Valerie offers us an excellent example of how economic rationales, although often the trigger for new initiatives, in practice, are often intermingled with academic, social/cultural, and other motivations.

In Chapter Three, Geraldine Van Gyn and her colleagues describe a faculty development initiative at a university in western Canada designed to help academics in remodeling their courses to make them more internationally relevant and sensitive to intercultural issues. The authors make clear that it was very important at the beginning of the initiative to engage in discussion on what “internationalizing curriculum” might/should mean. Together with colleagues from their institution they concluded that internationalizing the curriculum involves “educating for world-mindedness.” Educating for world-mindedness comprises more than selecting appropriate contents and pedagogies to ensure that these address the needs of international students; it also implies awareness raising among all students and staff of issues of diversity and intercultural sensitivity and the full integration of these considerations into the curriculum. Thinking about course design through the lens of educating for world-mindedness prompts among many faculty a process of transformation of the assumptions guiding their educational purposes and pedagogies. The rationale underlying this internationalization of curricula is principally social/cultural and academic.

In Chapter Four, Bobbie Turniansky and colleagues also argue that internationalizing higher education does not just involve adding international content. If one of the roles of higher education is to prepare students to survive and thrive in an uncertain, globalized world, faculty and students have to develop a multicultural attitude, one that is sensitive to, and appreciative of, cultural diversity. The key to this, as they suggest, is to explore with students the cultural aspects of their own personal and professional identity. Specifically, they discuss the process and outcomes of a workshop they offer within their culturally diverse teacher education pro-

gram in Israel. They contend that the principles underlying the workshop hold true for any “people professions,” including scientists working in teams, accountants dealing with clients, and historians trying to understand past human events. The rationale underlying this view on internationalizing curriculum is principally social/cultural and possibly political.

David Kahane, in Chapter Five, also suggests that internationalization involves cultivating a meaningful and motivating sense of global citizenship. Drawing on his own experience of teaching undergraduate philosophy, he discusses the limits of both “pedagogies of reason” and “pedagogies of sentiment” in helping us recognize and challenge our own privilege and overcome our dissociation from others’ suffering. He highlights instead the pivotal role that “contemplative pedagogies” such as meditation and free writing can play in connecting students more deeply with their own humanity and, by overcoming alienation from their internal worlds, foster a more globalized sense of responsibility and citizenship.

The next chapter, by Martin Haigh, builds nicely on David’s ideas. Critical of approaches that treat internationalization as the addition of multicultural elements to a Western curriculum, Martin makes an even more radical proposal. Specifically, he explores the possibility of internationalizing the undergraduate curriculum by organizing it around a non-Western framework rooted in Indian philosophy, thereby lifting, or perhaps rather freeing, internationalization efforts from their Eurocentric foundations. An important aspect of the framework he advocates, which he refers to as a “Sattvic curriculum,” is that it promotes self-reflection and self-development among students, thereby having the potential to overcome present barriers to empathy, genuine commitment, and global citizenship. Martin discusses the educational benefits of, and main objections voiced against, such a proposal.

In Chapter Seven, Jean C. Florman and colleagues describe how an existing partnership between two communities, one in eastern Iowa and one in Mexico, was turned into a cross-disciplinary and international service learning course for students in the University of Iowa Colleges of Engineering, Pharmacy, and Liberal Arts and Sciences. The projects that students worked on through the service-learning component of their university courses were directly related to the development needs the Mexican community had identified. Jean and her colleagues discuss the benefits of the initiative for both communities and make suggestions for how it could be enhanced in the future. Analyzing this particular internationalization initiative in terms of its underlying motivation, one might say that the main driver was a willingness to offer voluntary services where they were needed, to use the existing partnership to offer richer learning opportunities within a broad range of disciplines, but also to learn about other cultures. Jean and her colleagues add that the initiative “offered eastern Iowa high school and university students a unique opportunity to provide service in an international setting, gain the

deep personal satisfaction that comes from performing service work, and forge permanent international friendships.”

In Chapter Eight, Ross A. Perkins reports on a partnership between an institution in Malawi and one in the United States funded by The United States Agency for International Development (USAID). As part of this partnership, lecturers from Mzuzu University in Malawi studied at Virginia Tech on a master’s program in instructional technology to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to offer a distance teacher education program back home. The partnership also included the joined redesign of a course to be offered in Malawi. Ross describes how the course was successfully redesigned as a result of an effective collaboration between educators at Mzuzu University in Malawi and Virginia Tech. Looked at through the four-dimensional lens of internationalization at the program level introduced earlier (Echvin and Ray, 2002; Thune and Welle-Strand, 2005), one might observe that the initiative included foreign student recruitment (these students did receive scholarships from Virginia Tech to pay their tuition), the teaching process was adapted by making changes to particular course content and forms of delivery, resources included collaboration with staff from Malawi, and in terms of location, the idea was to set up courses abroad. Yet, the driver for this project was a shortage of teachers in Malawi, a development need identified by the Ministry of Education in Malawi.

In Chapter Nine, Arja Vainio-Mattila reports on an academic course at the undergraduate level (“Think Global–Act Local”), offered in partnership with local NGOs, that raised student awareness of how global problems play themselves out at local levels (here, a mid-sized town in central Ontario). Arja also turns a critical eye on the assumptions that presently guide efforts directed at internationalization and argues for “anchoring the process of internationalization in the core educational mission of higher education rather than presenting it as a delivery mechanism.” Drawing on the work of bell hooks and Paulo Freire, she makes a case for embedding internationalization efforts within a critical pedagogy. In essence she proposes to create learning environments that afford students the opportunity to “not only becoming good (read compliant) global citizens but agents of change actively pursuing more equal and just relationships which may or may not be international but are always global.”

In Chapter Ten, Tarah S. A. Wright, like Arja, links the internationalization of higher education curricula to a need for universities to grapple with global issues. More specifically, Tarah explores internationalization efforts through the lens of global sustainability and examines the role of universities in educating for sustainable development through their research, their teaching (and pedagogies), and by acting as models in their own physical operations. Rather than suggesting that sustainability should be promoted through specialized courses or programs, she advocates an integrated approach where sustainability is considered across the disciplines. She concludes that “In order for higher education to truly address sustainability

problems and educate the citizenry to move toward sustainability, a fundamental re-thinking of the purpose of the university and how we teach is needed.”

Final Comment

Universities and colleges are increasingly called upon to internationalize. A comprehensive conception of internationalization can help us resist undue emphasis on economic imperatives on the one hand, and purely cosmetic efforts at internationalizing curriculum on the other, both at the expense of considerations of the common good.

References

- Barnett, R. *Improving Higher Education. Total Quality Care*. Buckingham, UK: SRHE (The Society for Research into Higher Education) and Open University Press, 1992.
- Echvin, C., and Ray, D. “Measuring Internationalization in Educational Institutions. Case Study: French Management Schools.” *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 2002, 14(1), 292–296.
- Enders, J., and Fulton, O. “Blurring Boundaries and Blistering Institutions.” In J. Enders and O. Fulton (eds.), *Higher Education in a Globalising World. International Trends and Mutual Observations. A Festschrift in Honour of Ulrich Teichler*, 1–17. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002.
- Groennings, S., and Wiley, D. Group Portrait: Internationalizing the Disciplines. The American Forum for Global Education. *International Education Series*. New York, NY: The American Forum, 1990.
- Jones, P. “Globalization and Internationalism: Democratic Prospects for World Education.” In N. Stromquist and K. Monkman (eds.), *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation across Cultures*, 27–42. Boulder: Rowmann and Littlefield, 2000.
- Kälvermark, T., and Van der Wende, M. C. (eds.) *National Policies for Internationalisation of Higher Education in Europe*. Stockholm: National Agency for Higher Education, 1997.
- Kivinen, O. “Higher Learning in an Age of Uncertainty. A Postmodern Critique to Contemporary University Practices.” In J. Enders and O. Fulton (eds.), *Higher Education in a Globalising World. International Trends and Mutual Observations. A Festschrift in Honour of Ulrich Teichler*, 191–207. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002.
- Knight, J. “Internationalization: Management Strategies and Issues.” *International Education Magazine*, 1993, 9(6), 21–22.
- Knight, J. “Internationalisation of Higher Education: A Conceptual Framework.” In J. Knight and H. de Wit (eds.), *Internationalisation of Higher Education in Asia Pacific Countries*, 5–19. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education (EAIE), 1997.
- Ladson-Billings, G. “Differing Concepts of Citizenship: Schools and Communities as Cites of Civic Development.” In N. Noddings (ed.), *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*, 69–80. New York: Teachers College Press, 2005.
- Murphy, M. “Experiences in the Internationalization of Education. Strategies to Promote Equality of Opportunity at Monterray Tech.” *Higher Education*, 2007, 53(2), 167–208.
- Newman, F. “Saving Higher Education’s Soul.” *Change Magazine of Higher Education*, September/October 2000, 2–9.
- Nussbaum, M. *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, Cahnners Publishing, 1997.

- Qiang, Z. "Internationalization of Higher Education: Towards a Conceptual Framework." *Policy Futures in Education*, 2003, 1(2), 248–270.
- Rowland, S. *The Enquiring University. Compliance and Contestation in Higher Education*. Maidenhead, Berkshire (England): The Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE) and Open University Press, 2006.
- Schoorinan, D. "The Pedagogical Implications of Diverse Conceptualizations of Internationalization: A U.S. Based Case Study." *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 1999, 3(2), 19–46.
- Slaughter, S. "National Higher Education Policies in a Global Economy." In J. Currie and J. Newson (eds.), *Universities and Globalization. Critical Perspectives*, 45–70. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1998.
- Stromquist, N. P. "Internationalization as a Response to Globalization: Radical Shifts in University Environments." *Higher Education*, 2007, 53(1), 61–105.
- Thune, T., and Welle-Strand, A. "ICT for and in Internationalization Processes. A Business School Case Study." *Higher Education*, 2005, 50(4), 593–611.
- Van der Wende, M. *Internationalising the Curriculum in Dutch Higher Education: An International Comparative Perspective*. The Hague: The Netherlands Organisation for International Cooperation in Higher Education (NUFFIC), 1996.
- Van der Wende, M. "Internationalising the Curriculum in Dutch Higher Education: An International Comparative Perspective." *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 1997, 1(2), 53–72.
- Van der Wende, M. "The Central Role of Universities in a Global World: Final Report of the 52 CRE Bi-Annual Conference." In *European Universities, World Partners. CRE Action 115*. Geneva: CRE, Conference of European Rectors, 1999.
- Van der Wende, M. "Internationalization Policies: About New Trends and Contrasting Paradigms." *Higher Education Policy*, 2001, 14(3), 249–259.
- Van Vught, F., Van der Wende, M., and Westerheijden, D. "Globalisation and Internationalisation: Policy Agendas Compared." In J. Enders and O. Fulton (eds.), *Higher Education in a Globalising World. International Trends and Mutual Observations. A Festschrift in Honour of Ulrich Teichler*, 103–121. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002.

CAROLIN KREBER is a professor of higher education at the University of Edinburgh where she is also director of the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Assessment. She is also adjunct associate professor at the University of Alberta, Canada.