3

THE HISTORY OF INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

HANS DE WIT AND GILBERT MERKX

This chapter focuses on the historical development of international education in Europe and the United States. It is important to relate the internationalization of higher education in today's world to the original roots of the university and to place the present developments in historical perspective. Only in this way is it possible to identify the specific character of the internationalization of higher education as currently encountered. At the same time it is important to recognize the development of internationalization in the emerging and developing world and the colonial and imperialist context that influenced and continues to influence internationalization of higher education in these regions. For a critical reflection on this important dimension of internationalization see box 1.

THE MIDDLE AGES and RENAISSANCE

Altbach (1998) calls the university the one institution that has always been global: "With its roots in medieval Europe, the modern university is at the center of an international knowledge system that encompasses technology, communi- cations, and culture" (p. 347). Kerr (1994) states that "universities are, by nature of their commit- ment to advancing universal knowledge, essen- tially international institutions, but they have been living, increasingly, in a world of nation- states that have designs on them" (p. 6). These references to history ignore the fact that universities mostly originated in the 18th and 19th centuries and had a clearly national orientation and function (de Wit, 2002, pp. 3-18). Neave (1997) speaks of an "inaccurate myth." Scott (1998) also criticizes the "myth of the international university" dating from the medieval period. Very few universities founded in that period were ultimately transformed by the modern world, he says, classifying this myth as "internationalist rhetoric." The university of the Middle Ages could not be "international," given that nation-states did not yet exist.

Most publications on the internationaliza- tion of higher education still refer back to the Middle Ages up to the end of the eighteenth century in Europe, making a side reference to the only known non-European university, the Al Azhar University in Egypt. Before the nineteenth century, in addition to religious pilgrims, "pilgrims or travellers *(peregrini)* of another kind were also a familiar sight on the roads of Europe. These were the university students and professors. Their pilgrimage (*peregrinatio*) was not to Christ's or a saint's tomb, but to a univer- sity city where they hoped to find learning,

friends, and leisure" (de Ridder-Symoens 1992, p. 280). Although the academic pilgrimage started long before the twelfth century, it became a common phenomenon at that time. De Ridder-Symoens describes the impact of the mobility of students and scholars on higher edu- cation and society in that period in a way that reminds us of many of the arguments used to promote mobility today:

> The use of Latin as a common language, and of a uniform programme of study and system of examinations, enabled itinerant students to continue their studies in one `studium' after another, and ensured recognition of their degrees throughout Christendom. Besides their academic knowledge they took home with them a host of new experiences, ideas, opinions, and political principles and views. (pp. 302 – 303)

Owing to the creation of more universities in the fifteenth century, recruitment of students became more regionalized, and migration of stu- dents came nearly to a halt. By the end of the Middle Ages, three quarters of all students went to a university in their region. The exceptions were those who wanted "to continue their studies in an internationally renowned university and in disci- plines not taught in their own schools" (p. 287).

Because nations as political units did not yet exist, one can speak of a medieval "European space," defined by this common religious iden- tity and uniform academic language, program of study, and system of examinations (Neave, 1997, p. 6). This medieval European space, although limited in comparison to present-day mass higher education, bears a resemblance to the recent development of a new European higher education space, particularly given the gradual emergence of English language as the common academic language of the present, resembling the medieval role of Latin.

THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES

With the emergence of the nation-state, universi- ties became de-Europeanized and nationalized. This transition did not take place in a radical way. As Kolasa (1962) notes, toward the end of the sev- enteenth century and in the eighteenth century,

> European culture continued, to a considerable degree, its universalistic spirit. National cultures became more differentiated but the most prominent savants and artists still belonged to the whole of Europe, and the French language was commonly spoken by cosmopolitan aristocracy, which managed all political and a good deal of non-political affairs. (p. 12)

According to Kolasa, the Middle Ages, the Reformation, and the Enlightenment were peri- ods of "natural, not organized or regimented, flow of culture, and of free wandering of the creators of that culture across political frontiers" (p. 12). This domain of international cultural relations was challenged in the second half of the nineteenth century, with the emergence of political and cultural nationalism.

Hammerstein (1996, p. 624) illustrates this with the following examples: prohibition of study abroad in many countries; displacement of Latin as the universal language by vernacular languages; and the disappearance of the *peregri- nationes academicae* and its gradual replacement by the *grand tour,* which differed in its emphasis on cultural experience compared to the aca- demic objectives of the former. Universities became institutions that served the professional needs and ideological demands of the new nations in Europe. "Paradoxically perhaps," observes Scott (1998), "before it became an international institution the university had first to become a national institution—just as inter- nationalization presupposes the existence of nation states" (p. 123).

Between the 18th and 19th century, three international aspects of higher education can be identified: dissemination of research, individual mobility of students and scholars, and export of higher education systems (see Box 2).

Research and publications were one interna- tional element of higher education in the eigh- teenth and nineteenth centuries. Although much of the research in that period had a national focus and interest, the international exchange of ideas and information through seminars, conferences, and publications has remained a constant feature of international scholarly

BOX 2 Export of Higher Education Systems

The most important international element of higher education in this era was probably the export of systems of higher education. This took the form of export from the colonial powers to their colonies and later to the newly independent states. Higher education in Latin America has been, and still is to a large extent, modeled on higher education in the Iberian Peninsula. Higher education in India and other Asian, African, Caribbean, and North American countries belonging to the British Empire was modeled on British higher education. In the same way, the Asian, African, Caribbean, and North American universities in the former French colonies have been built according to the structure of French higher education. After independence, these influences prevailed and only more recently have other national and international influences had their impact on higher education in these countries. As Roberts, Rodrígues Cruz, and Herbst (1996) describe, by the end of the eighteenth century, universities and other institutions of higher education could be found in North, Central, and South America, as implants from Europe. Altbach and Selvaratnam (1989) describe this phenomenon for Asia.

Countries with a noncolonial heritage, such as Japan, China, and Thailand developed also largely Western university systems. Higher education in Japan, for instance, was seen as an important part of the modernization process, which took place in the nineteenth century under pressure of Western economic, political, and military power. To this day, contemporary higher education in Japan includes elements of German origin and of current American higher education (Altbach & Selvaratnam 1989, p. 10).

Even higher education in the United States, often regarded today as the dominant model in international developments of higher education, was based on European influences and continued to reflect these for a long time. Oxford and Cambridge were the models for the first colleges established in the American colony (colonial colleges such as the New College, later Harvard, which delivered its first degree in 1642; the College of William & Mary in Dartmouth; the Collegiate School, later Yale University; the Academy of Philadelphia, later University of Pennsylvania; the College of New Jersey, later University of Princeton; and King's College, later Columbia University). Later, with the creation of Johns Hopkins University, the German model of the research university was also imported. As a side effect, many students sojourned to the universities in Europe, on which these institutions were modeled, to pursue further studies. The American system of higher education, which emerged in its modern form between the 1860s and the early 1900s, can be considered, according to Ben-David (1992), as "one of `secondary reform' and belongs to the same category of externally inspired change as the establishment of modern systems of higher education in Russia, Japan and elsewhere in Asia, and Africa" (p. 25).

Scott (1998, p. 124) calls this export of higher education models the first of two main forms of internationalization of higher education that continued well into the twentieth century. This can hardly be seen, however, as a process of integrating an international and intercultural dimension. It would be tempting to call it a primitive form of globalization of higher education or globalization of higher education avant-la-lettre, but that would ignore the role of the nation-state in the process. The best description of this stage of internationalization is "academic colonialism" or "academic imperialism."

contact. Kolasa (1962, pp. 15, 163) notes that the international academic associations and societ- ies of the nineteenth century were private in character and dedicated to individual and pro- fessional relationships. This element comes clos- est to the notion of universalism that has always been present in higher education.

Although there is very little statistical information on the mobility of students and scholars in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, mobility never completely came to an end but changed character. De Ridder-Symoens (1996) describes this change as follows: "Renaissance teachers looked upon study abroad as the culmination of the humanist education of young members of the elite. In Renaissance times wandering students were strongly attracted by the renown of teachers" (p. 417), while most of the traveling students in early modern Europe were mainly concerned with the cultural and intellectual advantages of educational travel.

If the first decades of the sixteenth century were, according to de Ridder-Symoens (1996), "the golden age of wandering scholars" (p. 418), by the mid-sixteenth century the Reformation and counter-Reformation had a strong nega- tive impact on mobility. Study abroad was prohibited in many countries, based on the argument that foreign universities were "sources of religious and political contamination" (p. 419). As in today's flow of foreign students, economic and financial arguments were impor- tant. Emigration of students was seen as a loss for the sending cities and a threat to the devel- opment of their own universities. At the same time, the reduction in the number of foreign students affected the cities that most of them had visited. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the grand tour revived student mobility, at first in order to get a degree and later, in the period of Enlightenment, mainly for pleasure. All in all, de Ridder-Symoens (p. 442) concludes that until about 1700, stu- dent mobility was an important element of university life, and even afterward, it continued to influence intellectual and political life in Europe.

Until the 20th century, in sharp contrast to the present situation, the mobility of students was greater from the United States to Europe than from Europe to the United States. For many Americans, the pursuit of study in Europe was considered the final step in their cultural integration into American society: the grand tour (see Box 3). The same can be said of Canadian and Australian higher education.

BOX 3 The Grand Tour

Higher education in the United States was based on European influences and continued to reflect these for a long time. During colonial times, the children of rich planters often went to Europe, in particular the United Kingdom, for studies such as medicine and law. But as Halpern (1969) notes, opposition developed after the American Revolution: "Jefferson and Webster opposed sending young Americans to study abroad because they shared a common distrust of European ways and because they feared that American students would become denationalized" (p. 17).

Although many American scholars and educators still went to Europe in the nineteenth century for further study and insight, these same people in their later careers became hostile to study abroad, in particular by undergraduate students. Halpern (1969) provides several examples of political and educational leaders in the United States speaking out against foreign study. An example is Harvard President Charles W. Eliot, who wrote in 1873:

> Prolonged residence abroad in youth, before the mental fibre is solidified and the mind has taken its tone, has a tendency to enfeeble the love of country, and to impair the foundations of public spirit in the individual citizen. This pernicious influence is indefinable, but none the less real. In a strong nation, the education of the young is indigenous and national. It is a sign of immaturity or decrepitude when a nation has to import its teachers, or send abroad its scholars. (p. 24)

According to Halpern (1969), this attitude can be explained by a strong desire to break with the educational and cultural dependence on Europe (p. 25). Nonetheless, American faculty and students continued to flow to Europe throughout the nineteenth century, as David McCullough (2011) describes in *The Greater Journey: Americans in Paris,* which features Americans studying in Paris in the 19th century.

Around the turn of the century one can see a shift. On the one hand, the emergence of American graduate schools presented American students the opportunity to study at home rather than abroad. On the other hand, for the first time foreign students began to come to the United States.

Note: This text was written by chapter author Hans de Wit.

International education in the United States was enhanced by that nation's engagement in the global arena. The United States has been involved in wars and national security crises since it emerged as a great power in the 1890s with the Spanish-American War. This new role stimulated both international studies and politi- cal science. During the late nineteenth century, academic mobility from and to the United States became a regular phenomenon, but without a formal and institutional structure. This began to change toward the turn of the twentieth century. In 1890, the American Association of University Women created the first fellowship to enable a college professor to pursue research abroad. In 1902, the Rhodes Scholarships were founded to promote understanding between English-speaking people. In 1905, the American Academy in Rome established research fellow- ships for study in Italy, and in 1911, the Kahn Foundation started to offer fellowships for sec- ondary school teachers to travel abroad. Another organization that dates from this period is the American-Scandinavian Foundation (1910). In 1911, the Committee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students was established with the objective of counseling foreign students and gathering statistics on foreign students in the United States. Between 1905 and 1912, Harvard and Columbia, along with the Universities of Chicago and Wisconsin, established exchange agreements with German and French univer- sities (Halpern 1969, pp. 27 – 28; see also Hoffa, 2007).

In summary, one can describe the period from the end of the Renaissance to the begin- ning of the twentieth century as being oriented toward predominantly national higher education. The main areas of international academic attention in that period were the individual mobility of a small group of well-to-do and academically qualified students to the top centers of learning in the world, the export of academic systems from the European colonial powers to the rest of the world, and cooperation and exchange in academic research, gradually involving American higher education. This confirms the suggestion of Kerr (1994), Altbach (1998), and Scott (1998) that the focus of higher educa- tion in that period became more directed to developing a national identity and serving national needs and less to amassing universal knowledge.

Before World War II

The creation of the Institute of International Education (IIE) in 1919 in the United States, the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD) in 1925, and the British Council in 1934 indicates the growing attention to interna- tional cooperation and exchange before World War II. Academic cooperation at that time was more focused on scholars than on students. And in the aftermath of World War I, it was driven by political rationales of peace and mutual under- standing. The International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, created in 1921 under the auspices of the League of Nations and the predecessor of UNESCO, was a manifestation of that new emphasis. As Kolasa (1962) observes, "The co-operation of intellectuals with politi- cians within the framework of the League of Nations is one of the most essential differences between the unofficial organizations of the

nineteenth century and the League organization for intellectual co-operation" (p. 41).

In Europe, the colonial presence continued to play an important role in foreign area and language studies. World War I produced an initial burst of enthusiasm for international and foreign area studies in the United States. Thus, in 1917, the American Association of Teachers of Spanish was founded, and in 1918, the first issue of the *Hispanic American Historical Review* appeared with a preface by President Woodrow Wilson. However, follow- ing World War I, the new interest in foreign affairs and foreign places abated rather quickly. By 1921, the *Hispanic American Historical Review* had to cease publication.

Institutions were less active than founda- tions. The first junior-year-abroad program was established in France in 1923 by the University of Delaware. Women's colleges were most fre- quently involved in setting up such programs in Europe: Marymount College in 1924 (Paris), Smith College in 1925 (Paris) and 1931 (Florence), and Rosary College in 1925 (Fribourg). Taylor (1978, p. 1518) argues that this arose because women needed more chaperoning when study- ing abroad, and while female students went abroad for cultural enrichment, the men remained in the United States to work on their careers.

As Goodwin and Nacht (1991) make clear, what happened with exchange and cooperation also applied to the curriculum:

> The demonstrated unpreparedness of the United States to comprehend the process of which it was part, both during World War I and at the Peace Conference afterward, suggested to many young Americans the need both to understand other countries better and to reflect on different ways to arrange relations among states. The study of international relations increased in the United States between the wars, with practitioners lodged both in universities and in nongovernmental research institutions like the Council on Foreign Relations, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and the Brookings Institution. (p. 3)

The first two decades of the twentieth cen- tury show a growth in mobility, in particular movement toward the United States; more atten- tion from private organizations and foundations for study abroad; and the start of institutional exchange and study abroad programs. What is striking in all this is the nearly exclusive focus on Europe.

Bilateral links and exchanges existed also between European countries such as between France and Germany. Also, student travel com- panies emerged in that period; the development of the Student Identity Card and the International Student Travel Conference occurred during that time. The International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations and the *Conféderation Internationale des Etudiants* were created in 1919, the latter in Strasbourg, with the objective to strengthen ties of respect and to cultivate solidarity. Both orga- nizations were international but European dom- inated, showing the increased importance of study abroad and exchange in Europe and the rest of the world. More concrete information on European mobility is lacking for this period.

With the advent of World War II, the United States began looking to its southern neighbors. President Franklin D. Roosevelt named Nelson Rockefeller Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. Rockefeller vigorously promoted educa- tional exchanges as a means of combating Axis propaganda and encouraging rejection of fel- lowships for study in Germany and Italy. The government asked the Institute for International Education to administer an exchange program offering scholarships to more than 1,000 Latin American students between 1941 and 1943 (IIE, 1994, pp. 7 – 9).

AFTER WORLD WAR II

After World War II, international educational exchange expanded, first and foremost in the United States. Europe was still too heavily focused on recovering from the severe wounds of two world wars and on reconstruction to be able to invest in international educational exchange and cooperation. In the field of area studies, it was barely able to maintain its histori- cal strength in the knowledge of other cultures and languages. Many of its academics had either become victims of the wars or migrated to other parts of the world, mainly the United States, Canada, and Australia. The world of academia was turned upside down, as Goodwin and Nacht (1991) describe: "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" (pp. 4-5).

Cunningham (1991) describes the same phenomenon for Canada:

> Until the Canadian higher education system was well established, Canadians often had to study in the United States and Europe to obtain their qualifications, particularly in the professions. Then, as our own infrastructure matured, students from other countries began to arrive here for advanced studies. But this phenomenon is quite recent. Students from overseas began arriving in Canada in significant numbers only after World War II. (p. 1)

While the early development of interna- tional education between the two wars was focused on Europe and strongly driven by private initiative and the rationale of peace and understanding, World War II caused a radical change. Although peace and mutual understanding continued to be a driving rationale in theory, national security and for- eign policy were the real forces behind its expansion, and with it came government funding and regulations (see Box 4).

BOX 4 National Security as a Driving Rationale in the United States

World War I, in which U.S. preparedness was conceived in strictly military terms, had relatively few lasting effects on U.S. international competence. In contrast, World War II led to institutions that initiated the rise of international education in the United States. The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941 galvanized the American public and swept away opposition to joining the Allies. The War Department realized that it would have to fight a two-front war and that it lacked the foreign area competence to do so.

The Office of Strategic Services (OSS) began to recruit university faculty for their language and area expertise and put them to work as intelligence analysts. Studies of national character were commissioned for every country on both fronts. Some were later declassified and published after the war. The most famous of these was the anthropologist Ruth Benedict's 1946 study of Japanese national character, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword,* which became both an anthropology classic and a best seller in Japan.

Also, the U.S. Army established the Army Specialized Training Program, or ASTP, which sent officers to institutions of higher education for crash courses in needed skills, including foreign languages and foreign area studies. The total number of officers trained is not known, but at its high point, the ASTP had 150,000 officers enrolled in 55 colleges and universities. In 1943, the Navy set up a similar program, the V-12 Navy College Training Program, which enrolled more than 125,000 officers before it was terminated in 1946. The success of these ventures led the U.S. Army in 1945 to establish an American-style university in Biarritz, France, complete with faculty, college credit courses, and several thousand GI students (Lambert, Barber, Jordan, Merrill, & Twarog, 1984). Unfortunately, this experiment was soon the victim of budget cuts. The ASTP and V-12 programs were highly effective, and they established a model of university-government collaboration that was to be the inspiration for Title VI of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958. Other spin-offs of World War II include the Fulbright Act of 1946, Marshall Plan of 1947, the Point Four Program of 1949, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and the Title XII overseas agriculture assistance program of BIFAD, passed in 1975.

(Continued)

(Continued)

World War II veterans, who become internationalists because of their overseas service, were the promoters of these federal programs. The late Frederick Wakeman, a China specialist who served as president of the Social Science Research Council, called attention to this generational effect in a talk to National Research Council directors in 1996. Wakeman argued that an elite network of World War II veterans emerged, committed to enabling the United States as a world power. Members of this elite moved back and forth among the major foundations, universities, and government agencies, using their contacts to promote America's international competence. McGeorge Bundy, for example, worked in Army intelligence during World War II, served as an assistant to Secretary of War Henry Stimson, went to the Council on Foreign Relations, became a professor at Harvard and then dean of Harvard College, returned to government as chairman of John F. Kennedy's National Security Council, and finally became president of the Ford Foundation. Wakeman also observed that the retirement of the World War II generation meant the loss of elite support for international competence.

The United States

The Fulbright Act of 1946 (replaced by the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961) was conceived as a way of spending down lend-lease loans owed to the United States by World War II allies, whose weak currencies could not be converted into dollars. By sending faculty and graduate stu- dents to foreign countries and receiving faculty and students from those same countries, the Fulbright program established personal net- works and stimulated interest in overseas research. It also familiarized Americans with foreign universities and foreigners with American universities.

Soon foreign faculty began to use their U.S. connections to place their students in American universities. Foreign student enrollments in the United States had been virtually nonexistent before World War II. After the passage of the Fulbright Act of 1946, enrollments of foreign students began to grow, at first slowly and then exponentially. In 1959, there were 48,000 foreign students in American colleges and universities. By 2009, there were 690,000 such students.

A second spin-off of the Fulbright program was that American faculty began to use their foreign connections to establish study abroad programs for their own students. Before 1950, only six U.S. academic year study abroad pro- grams existed, a number that grew to 103 in 1962 and 208 in 1965. Summer study abroad

programs grew from 63 in 1962 to 97 in 1965 (Freeman, 1966). The Institute for International Education reported 18,000 Americans studying abroad in 1965, 49,000 in 1985, and 224,000 in 2005.

Technical assistance was another dominant factor in North-South relations in higher education. Cooperation for the development of agriculture, based on the agricultural extension programs of the Roosevelt Administration, was one of the components of the Point Four Program of 1949, expanded by later legislation, most notably the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Administered since 1961 by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), technical assistance programs, as Holzner and Greenwood

(1995) remark, also came to be seen "almost exclusively in the light of Cold War conceptions of the national interest" (p. 39). In 1975, these agricultural assistance programs were consoli- dated in U.S. Title XII of the legislation author- izing the establishment of the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD). Long-term contracts were established with major land-grant universities in the United States to enable them to participate in overseas AID agricultural projects. Such universities often had dozens, or even hundreds, of faculty, staff, and students working overseas.
The Cold War also played a central role in the development of foreign language and area stud- ies programs in the United States (see Box 5).

The Soviet Union

At the same time, the Soviet Union expanded its political, economic, social, and academic control over Central and Eastern Europe in a quite different and clearly repressive way, bringing academic freedom and autonomous cooperation and exchange almost to an end. Kallen (1991) describes the situation of higher education in Central and Eastern Europe during the Communist period:

> Higher education, as well as the educational system in general, had been made subservient to the political and economic interests of the State and in fact the Party. The universities were among the chosen and most prestigious instruments for transforming human minds and for providing the State economy with the right numbers and the right kind of highly qualified manpower. (p. 17)

For academic cooperation, the Western world was not a priority:

> Much higher importance was attached to co-operation with other socialist countries, whether in Central/Eastern Europe itself or elsewhere in the world. Large numbers of

> students with scholarships attended higher education in the USSR and in other socialist countries, and considerable numbers of staff were invited to teach or learn, particularly in the USSR. The Third World at large represented the second priority. Apart from receiving large numbers of students on state scholarships and inviting considerable numbers of staff, the Central/Eastern European countries carried out a vast programme of development assistance in Third World countries." (pp. 27 – 28)

Another feature of this period was the rise of competition between the Soviet Union and the United States with respect to North-South academic exchanges. "More than a few develop- ment projects in the Third World became some- thing of a chess game between the superpowers," as Holzner and Greenwood (1995, p. 39) observe. The USSR saw developing countries as an important region in which to expand their political and economic power, and they invested in development aid programs for universities. Likewise, the United States and soon after Western Europe, Canada, and Australia provided development funds for higher education in Asia, Latin America, and Africa. Academic personnel were sent to these regions for teaching, training, and curriculum development; junior faculty received grants for postgraduate training in the donor countries; and equipment and books were sent to improve the infrastructure of the universities in the developing world. A massive movement of students from South to North, in particular to the five most important receiving nations—the Soviet Union, Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States—characterized the second half of the twentieth century, the only changes being that Australia moved in as a serious competitor in the Asian market and the Soviet Union lost its position.

For an overview and analysis of internationalization of higher education in the Soviet Union/Russia see box 6.

Europe

In Europe, higher education in the first dec- ade after the Second World War was not very international. Countries were focused on reconstruction after the great Depression and the Second World War, with their impact on society and the economy. What little international dimension existed was primarily the movement of elite degree-seeking students in developing countries to the colonial and imperialist powers with which they were linked: the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and, to a lesser extent, countries like Belgium and the Netherlands. In addition, governments signed cultural and scientific agreements to exchange small numbers of students and staff. In general, the period 1950 to 1970 was characterized by a foreign policy among receiving countries of "benevolent laissez – faire" (Baron 1993, p. 50): open doors to foreign students.

That policy, "humanitarianism and internationalism" (Chandler 1989, p. viii), and its one – way dimension were the main characteristics of the process of internationalization of higher edu- cation at a global level and in Europe in particular. The universities themselves played a mainly passive role as receivers of foreign students. The effects on higher education cooperation within Europe were marginal. International activity was mainly ori- ented toward the cooperation of European higher education with the United States (outward mobil- ity) and with the Third World (inward mobility). A European policy for internationalization did not exist, and the same applies to the institutional level. At the national level, international cooperation and exchange were included in bilateral agreements between nations and in development cooperation programs, driven by political ration- ales. Institutions were passive partners in these programs.

Neave (1992) characterizes academic mobility in Europe in the period 1950 to 1970 as

follows: "overwhelmingly voluntarist, unorganized and individual" (p. 15).

> The relatively small numbers of students involved and though organized under the aegis of national agencies, whether public or private, continued in the main along a North-North axis, between North America and the United States in particular and Western Europe, or, from the standpoint of the Eastern bloc, between the Soviet Union and its satellites. (p. 18)

Overall, in the post-World War II period, the Cold War drove the U.S. government, for rea- sons of defense, public diplomacy, and security, to stimulate international exchange and coop- eration. Even after the end of the Cold War, continued international instability gave new relevance to these rationales for federal support. In Europe, however, the development of international education took a different shift, as Box 6 makes clear.

In the 1980s, the global context changed. The strengthening of the European Community and the rise of Japan as an economic world power chal- lenged U.S. dominance, not only in the political and economic arenas but also in research and teaching. Both Japan and the European Community invested in research and development (R&D) programs to compete with the United States. The European Community invested in programs of cooperation for R&D between the member states, with specific reference to the technological race with Japan and the United States. Following the example of countries such as Germany and Sweden, the European Commission decided to expand its role to the promotion of international cooperation in curriculum development, mobility

BOX 5 The Cold War and International Education in the United States

The Soviet Union's 1957 success in launching the first orbiting satellite, Sputnik, led to a wave of public hysteria in the United States, comparable to the reactions to Pearl Harbor and the destruction of the World Trade Towers on 9/11/2001. The Eisenhower administration was suddenly on the political defensive, accused of letting the Soviets get ahead of the United States. In response, the Eisenhower Administration proposed a new federal program to support science, engineering, language, and area studies in higher education, called the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958. The NDEA, according to Vestal (1994), was a direct reaction to the launch the year before of Sputnik I by the Soviet Union and an effort by the United States to regain international leadership. The point man for this legislation was World War II veteran Eliot Richardson, the assistant secretary for education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The NDEA included Title VI, which was a new version of the Army Specialized Training Program. Title VI authorized partnerships between government and higher education to train foreign language and area experts. NDEA was passed in 1958 and signed by President Eisenhower. Over the next decades, new Title VI missions were added, such as outreach, citizen education, internationalization of the undergraduate curriculum, international business education, minority recruitment, language research, and support for overseas research centers (Scarfo, 1998).

All these initiatives indicate that higher education was considered an instrument in the Cold War. At the same time, they stimulated the internationalization of higher education in the United States.

Note: This text was written by chapter author Gil Merkx.

BOX 6 International Education in Europe in the 1980s

The 1980s produced some radical changes in Europe. With respect to the individual mobility of students, European nations and universities began changing their benevolent laissez–faire policy to a more controlled acceptance and in some cases the active recruitment of fee-paying foreign students. At first, this applied nearly exclusively to the United Kingdom, where the British decided in 1979 to introduce full-cost fees for foreign students. Higher education as an export commodity quickly became dominant in the United Kingdom, as it also did in Australia. For most people on the European continent, considering the education of foreign students as an export commodity was still anathema at that time.

On the European continent, the hosting of foreign students was and in most cases still is based more on foreign policy arguments than on considerations of export policy. At the end of the twentieth century, the international movement of students as an export commodity had spread over the European continent and became a more important element of higher education policy than it had been in the past, both at the national and institutional level.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the notion of studying abroad, in the sense of sending students to foreign institutions of higher education as part of their home degree program, became an issue on the continent that overshadowed the developments in individual mobility of students. Since the 1980s, student mobility as a one-way, individual process stimulated by political or economic considerations has (with the exception of the United Kingdom) lost prominence as a policy issue. It has been marginalized by the greater attention given to student mobility in the framework of exchange programs, which have been among the top priorities in higher education policies of the 1980s and 1990s. Before this period, organized programs for the exchange of stu- dents and staff existed, but these programs were limited in both funding and scope, stimulating mainly unrelated exchanges at the graduate level.

The 1976 Joint Study Programmes scheme of the European Community (EC) was aimed at the promotion of joint programs of study and research between institutions in several member states. The focus of this experimental program was primarily the stimulation of academic mobility within the EC. This scheme was replaced in 1987 by the European Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (Erasmus). The action program of 1976 was the basis for future activities in academic cooperation and exchange within the European Community. Since the implementation of the Erasmus program in 1987, significant results have been achieved in cooperation and exchange within higher education in the European Union. Thanks to Erasmus, in the period 1987–2011, more than 2 million students have been exchanged, and the program expanded to other European countries outside the European Union.

Note: This text was written by chapter author Hans de Wit.

of students, and faculty and university-industry networks. In terms of internationalization during this period, the international dimension of higher education moved from the incidental and indi- vidual into organized activities, projects, and pro- grams, based mainly on political rationales and driven more by national governments than by higher education itself. Kerr (1994) notes that "it has been to the advantage of nation-states to sup- port the expansion of higher education and its internationalization within and beyond their borders" (p. 20).

After the cold War: A Shift From Political to Economic Rationales

The collapse of communism at the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s changed the map even further. The countervailing politi- cal and military superpower, the USSR, fell apart at a time when the United States was being increasingly threatened as the economic super- power by the European Union.

The end of the Cold War, according to Shaw (1994), created an atmosphere of global anar- chy: on the one hand, a contradictory context of growing nationalism was based on the exclusivity of ethnic groups, in itself the result of "disinte- gration of nation-states and national societies," and the other a global culture and society, a "global complex of social relations," was devel- oping at the level of both systems and values. This global society can be best understood as a diverse social universe in which the unifying forces of modern production, markets, commu- nications, and cultural and political moderniza- tion interact with many global, regional, national, and local segmentations and differentiations. Global society should be understood not as a social system but as a field of social rela- tions in which many specific systems have formed, some of them genuinely global, others incipiently so, and others still restricted to national and local contexts. (p. 19)

No longer dominated by the superpowers, the global environment is characterized by Friedman (1994) as "ethnicization and cultural pluralization of a dehegemonizing, dehomoge- nizing world incapable of a formerly enforced politics of assimilation or cultural hierarchy" (p. 100). This is a development that is expressed in the stronger emphasis on globalization of economics, social and political relations, and knowledge but at the same time by tendencies toward ethnic conflicts and nationalism and isolation, tendencies that increasingly manifested themselves in the next decade.

In the post-Cold War period, economic arguments were emphasized in promoting inter- national cooperation and exchange in higher education. Lyman (1995) describes this for the United States: "For too long, international education, especially exchange and study abroad programs, were justified by a vague sense that such studies were the path to mutual understanding and world peace, [but] today, internationalizing education in the US is pro- posed as a way to help restore our economic competitiveness in the world" (p. 4). Harari (1992, p. 57) also stresses the growing importance of the argument of economic competitiveness. Callan and de Wit (1995) have stated that the same applies for the arguments used by the European Commission for their programs to promote cooperation and exchange within the European Union and with the rest of the world. Neave (1992, p. 21) uses terms such as the ***market ethic*** and the ***cash nexus*** for this period. Van der Wende (2001) speaks of a change in paradigms from cooperation to competition, although she also states correctly: "Not surprisingly most continental European countries pursue a cooperative approach to internation- alization, which in terms of international learn- ing and experience is more compatible with the traditional value of academia" (p. 255).

Competitiveness as a popular rationale for international education was added to the older rationales of foreign policy and national security. In the United States, the creation of Centers for International Business Education and Research at universities under Part B of Title VI of the U.S. Higher Education Act is an illustration that "national interest came to be supplemented (but certainly not replaced) by the competitiveness paradigm" (Holzner & Greenwood 1995, p. 40). Mestenhauser (2000, p. 34) also refers to the change of rationale from international under- standing and avoiding wars and conflicts to global competitiveness in U.S. international education.

President Bill Clinton circulated a memorandum on "international education policy" for the heads of executive departments and agencies, dated April 19, 2000 (White House, 2000), which underlines the competitiveness rationale:

> To continue to compete successfully in the global economy and to maintain our role as a world leader, the United States needs to ensure that its citizens develop a broad understanding of the world, proficiency in other languages, and knowledge of other cultures. America's leadership also depends on building ties with those who will guide the political, cultural, and economic development of their countries in the future. A coherent and coordinated international education strategy will help us meet the twin challenges of

> preparing our citizens for a global environment while continuing to attract and educate future leaders from abroad.

In Europe in the 1990s, the creative and informal period of educational policy of the European Community came to an end. The Maastricht Treaty, signed in 1992 and ratified on November 1, 1993, included education for the first time. The importance of strengthening the European dimension in education was placed high on the agenda. The role of the European Commission in higher education has not been limited to educational mobility and exchange within the European Union. It has impacted, in the first place, the opening up of Central and Eastern Europe. Through its so-called PHARE program, the commission in 1989 initiated sev- eral forms of cooperation, both in R&D and in education. Thanks to the program for support to higher education in these countries, TEMPUS, and other programs supported by national gov- ernments and other international private and public organizations, a rapid improvement in the educational infrastructure and the quality of education in Central and Eastern Europe has been achieved. Now most of these countries have become members of the European Union (EU) or at least are accepted as participants in the EU programs. Also, all the countries, includ- ing Russia since 2003, have signed the Bologna Declaration and take part in its development process.

The cooperation programs of the EU go beyond Europe. The early fear on the part of some governments and academics outside Europe of the emergence of a "Fortress Europe" in inter- national education has proved to be unfounded by a booming number of exchange agreements and programs of cooperation linking institutions of higher education in Europe with counterpart institutions all over the world. This is reflected in the creation of the new Erasmus Mundus pro- gram, started in 2004 and intended to create high-level joint degree programs between EU institutions and those elsewhere in the world.

The first two decades OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

The end of the Cold War, the deepening of Euro- pean integration, and the globalization of our societies started a process of strategic develop- ment of the international dimension of higher education. Although one could disagree with Callan's (2000) emphasis on the role of analysts in this process, her description of the change between the 1980s and 1990s is correct:

> A dominant concern through the 1990s has been with internationalization as a process of strategic transformation of institutions. This concern makes a clear departure from earlier, piecemeal and limited, concerns with the management of student mobility "Striving for strategy" has become a recurrent motif in the construction of internationalization, both descriptively and prescriptively. (p. 17)

Teichler (1999) argues that this period is one of substantial qualitative changes, referred to as the three quantum leaps in the internationaliza- tion of higher education. The first one is the leap from "a predominantly 'vertical' pattern of co- operation and mobility, towards the dominance of international relationships on equal terms." That leap coincides with the "piecemeal and limited" focus on internationalization Callan (2000) describes. The second leap is "from casu- istic action towards systematic policies of internationalisation." That leap refers to the emergence of a strategic perspective on interna- tionalization, as Callan mentions. The third one is "from a disconnection of specific interna- tional activities on the one hand, and (on the other) internationalisation of the core activities, towards an integrated internationalisation of higher education" (pp. 9 – 10). This analysis is the more appropriate view of the developments in this period, where the third leap can be seen as the millennium leap, the leap at the beginning of the 21st century: the leap in which internation- alization as a strategic issue becomes an inte- grated part of the overall strategy of institutions of higher education.

The landscape of international higher educa- tion has been changing over the decade (de Wit, 2002, 2008; Knight, 2008). The interna- tional dimension and the position of higher education in the global arena are more promi- nent than ever in international, national, and institutional documents and mission statements. Increasingly influenced by globalization, higher education is also becoming a more dynamic actor in the global knowledge economy. Teichler

(2004), Scott (1998, 2005), Altbach (2006), Knight (2008), de Wit (2008, 2011), Foskett and Maringe (2010), and others address the complex relationship between globalization and internationalization of higher education. Van der Wende (2001) speaks of a shifting paradigm from cooperation to competition.

The most striking trend over the past 50 years is the increase in the number of globally circu- lating students, from about 250,000 in 1965 to 2.5 million in 2005 and 3.7 million in 2011 to over 5 million in 2020. The cross-border delivery of higher education, with programs, projects, and providers moving across borders instead of students, is an important growth market for Australia, the United States, and the United Kingdom . For the United Kingdom and Australia, the number of students in offshore activities is increasing more rapidly than those onshore. For countries like Germany, France and Russia, soft power and knowledge diplomacy are driving forces for the development of branch campuses. Global competition for highly skilled manpower is becoming a strong pull factor in international student circulation. The graying societies of Europe, North America, Australia, and Japan are competing for top talent around the world, all of which need to fill the gaps in their knowledge economies. At the same time, they have to com- pete with the emerging economies in Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and Africa, where such talents may be needed even more. Until about 2015, the challenge for international education was perceived by many observers as the problem of coping with success, trying to develop a strategic vision that could integrate these different expanding activities with one another and with other aspects of the university. The focus was primarily on mobility and research, on competition for students, talents, funding, access to top publications and on top positions on rankings.

- But in the second half of the decade new views on internationalization, less focused on the abroad component (mobility) and more on the at home component (internationalization at home and of the curriculum, global citizenship development, virtual exchange), already starting to emerge around the turn of the century, became more manifest. The shifting paradigm from cooperation towards competition encountered an opposite reaction. At the same time nationalist/populist trends around the globe, manifested in particular through Brexit and the election of Donald Trump as president of the United States of America in 2016, challenge and seriously threaten the internationalist movement of the past decades, also in higher education. A threat that is even more stronger as a result of recent developments around 2020, the Covid-19 pandemic, the related economic crisis, and geopolitical tensions, for instance between the United States and China. It is also the time in which 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 institution 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." (De Wit and Jones, 2014)

CONCLUDING REMARKS

From this description of the historical development of the international dimension of higher education, it becomes obvious that changes in the external and internal environments of higher education over the centuries have been extremely influential in this process. Macro- historical changes affecting the international dimension of Europe's higher education over the past decades were: the emergence of nation- states in the nineteenth century and earlier; Europe's historical role in the world, in particular its role in colonization and in the process of decolonization; the impact of higher education in countries such as France, Germany, and the United Kingdom on higher education in the rest of the world; recent trends in European integration; the collapse of the former Soviet Union and associated East-West rapprochement; recession and financial constraint; "massification" of higher education; the dissolution

of some structures and blocs and the emergence of others.

One can say that until the twentieth century this dimension was rather incidental and individual: the wandering scholar and student, the grand tour, the student flows from South to North. The export of higher education models in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, seen by some as an important manifestation of the internationalization of higher education, is difficult to understand as such and is better seen as academic colonialism.

After World War II, international educational efforts became structured into activities, projects, and programs, mainly in the United States and to a lesser extent in the Soviet Union, Germany, France, the United Kingdom. National scholarship programs for students and staff (Fulbright); institutional study abroad programs (the American junior-year abroad); the development of area studies, international studies, and foreign language training in the United States (NDEA, the Higher Education Act, Title VI); scientific and cultural agreements between countries; and the creation of national agencies (IIE, DAAD, and British Council) were manifestations of more organized activity-based approaches to internationalization. Referred to in the literature collectively as "international education," they were driven in particular by the Cold War.

A second manifestation appearing in the 1960s was technical assistance and development cooperation, an area that in some countries, such as Australia, Canada, and The Netherlands, was the most dominant international program until the 1980s and is also strongly present else- where (see also Chapter 20, this volume). In addition, although less organized, the international flow of students, mainly from South to North, continued and even expanded.

Major changes in internationalization took place in the 1980s. The move from aid to trade in Australia and the United Kingdom; the development of the European programs for research and development (the Framework programs and their predecessors) and for education (SOCRATES, LEONARDO, and their predecessors); the development of transnational education; the presence of internationalization in mission statements, policy documents, and strategic plans of institutions of higher education, in particular in Europe, Northern America, and

Australia; and the emergence of senior policy advisers for internationalization and their membership organizations (Association of International Education Administrators, IEA, NAFSA, European Association for International Education, International Education Association of Australia) were clear manifestations of these changes.

Globalization and the related knowledge society based on technological developments, as well as the end of the Cold War and the creation of regional structures (in particular the EU), influenced these changes. The need for higher education to make an organized response to these external developments resulted in interna- tionalization strategies that were based on more explicit choices (rationales) and a more inte- grated strategy (process approach). It was only in the 1980s that the internationalization of higher education became a strategic process, resulting, for instance, in the establishment in 1982 of the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) in the United States. Competitiveness in the international market became a key rationale. Incidents, iso- lated activities, projects, and programs were still present, both at the national and institutional level, but internationalization as a strategic pro- cess became more central in higher education institutions.

However, the period 1990-present is one of transition, the beginning of a great transforma- tion, according to Kerr (1994, p. 9). The global- ization of our societies and markets and its impact on higher education, along with the new knowledge society based on information tech- nology, will change higher education profoundly and will also change the nature of international- ization of higher education. Will that change be, as Kerr argues, "in the direction of the supremacy of the pure model of academic life consistent with reasonable guidance by the nation-state [and] a universal reconvergence where universities best serve their nations by serving the world of learning" ? That would be too simplistic and naive a conclusion. Internationalization will take place in the context of globalization processes, processes that, as Scott (1998) states, "cannot simply be seen as reiteration of the old internationalism, still dysfunctionally dominated by the West (or, at any rate, the developed world) but are now intensified by the new information (and knowledge) technologies" (p. 124).

The changing global environment, the changes in global higher education itself and the way its international dimension is evolving, call for a debate on the future of internationaliza- tion. The historical roots and changes of the internationalization of higher education should not be ignored in that debate. Although so far Europe and North America, in particular the United States, as well as to a certain extent Australia, have played a key role in the development of internationalization, there is an increasing concern, correct or not, that internationalization is a synonym to Westernization or neocolonialism. At the same time, the other continents, in particular Asia but also Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East, will undoubtedly influence the debate on internationalization by their practice and by their position in the global knowledge society and economy in the coming decades.

In this transformation process, there is the threat to the liberal, internationalist mainstream in higher education as a result of nationalism and geopolitical tensions, and of a global economic crisis resulting from the Covid-19 pandemic that challenges international collaboration, mobility and inclusiveness. At the same time there are opportunities for a break of the Western paradigm, the use of digital innovations, more attention on the internationalization of the third mission of higher education and the Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations, internationalization for society, and a shift in paradigm from an exclusive focus on mobility towards a global learning for all approach.

Author's Note: This chapter owes to previous work by the authors, in particular Chapters 1 and 2 in de Wit, 2002, and Merkx, 2003.

REFERENCES

Altbach, P. G. (1998). Comparative perspectives in higher education for the twenty-first century. *Higher Education Policy, 11*, 347 – 356.

Altbach, P. G. (2006). Globalization and the university: Realities in an unequal world. In P. G. Altbach & J. J. F. Forest (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Altbach, P. G., & Selvaratnam, V. (1989). *From dependence to autonomy: The development of Asian universities*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Baron, B., (1993). The politics of academic mobility in Western Europe. *Higher Education Policy, 6*(3), 50 – 54.

Ben-David, J. (1992). *Centers of learning: Britain, France, Germany, United States*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Callan, H. (2000). The international vision in practice: A decade of evolution. *Higher Education in Europe, 25*(1), 15 – 23.

Callan, H., & de Wit, H. (1995). Internationalization

of higher education in Europe. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Strategies for internationalisation of higher education: A comparative study of Australia,*

Canada, Europe and the United States of America. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

Chandler, A. (1989). *Obligation or opportunity: Foreign student policy in six major receiving countries* (IIE Research Report No. 18). New York: Institute for International Education.

Cunningham, C. G. (1991). *The integration of international students on Canadian post-secondary campuses*. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.

De Ridder Symoens, H. (1992). Mobility. In H. de Ridder-Symoens (Ed.) *A history of the university in Europe: Vol. I. Universities in the Middle Age*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

De Ridder-Symoens, H. (1996). Mobility. In W. Rüegg (Ed.), *A history of the university in Europe: Vol. 2. Universities in early modern Europe*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

de Wit, H. (2008). The internationalization of higher education in a global context. In P. Agarwal, M. E. Said, M. Sehoole, M. Sirozi, & H. de Wit (Eds.), *The dynamics of international student circulation in a global context*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

de Wit, H. (2011). *Trends, issues, and challenges in internationalisation of higher education*. Amsterdam: Center for Applied Research on Economics and Management, School of Economics and Management HvA.

Foskett, N., & Maringe, F. (2010). *Globalization and internationalization in higher education: Theoretical, strategic and management perspectives*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Freeman, S. A. (1966). Undergraduate study abroad. In *International education: Past, present, problems, and prospects: Selected reading to Supplement H.R. 14643* (pp. 387-392). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Friedman, J. (1994). *Cultural identity & global process*. London: Sage.

Goodwin, C. D., & Nacht, M. (1991). *Missing the boat: The failure to internationalize American higher education*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Halpern, S. (1969). *The Institute of International Education: A history*. Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York.

Hammerstein, N. (1996). The Enlightenment. In W. Rüegg (Ed.), *A history of the university in Europe: Vol. II. Universities in early modern Europe*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Harari, M. (1992). Internationalization of higher education. In A. S. Knowles (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hoffa, W. A. (2007). *A History of US study abroad: Beginnings to 1965*. Carlisle, PA: Forum on Education Abroad.

Holzner, B., & Greenwood, D. (1995). The institutional policy contexts for international higher education in the United States of America. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Strategies for internationalisation of higher education, A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe, and the United States of America*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

Institute of International Education (IIE). (1994). Investing in People Linking Nations. 1919 – 1995: The First 74 Years of the Institute of International Education. New York: IIE.

Kallen, D. (1991). Academic exchange in Europe: Towards a new era of cooperation. In *The open door: Pan-European academic co-operation, an analysis and a proposal*. Bucharest: CEPES/ UNESCO.

Kerr, C. (1994). Higher education cannot escape history: Issues for the twenty-first century. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Knight, J. (2008). Higher education in turmoil. The changing world of internationalization. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Kolasa, J. (1962). *International intellectual co-operation (the League experience and the beginnings of UNESCO)* (Series A. no. 81). Wroclaw, Poland: Prace Wroclawskiego Towarzystwa Naukowego.

Lambert, R. D., Barber, E. G., Jordan, E., Merrill, M. B., & Twarog, L. I. (1984). *Beyond growth: The next stage in language and area studies*. Washington, DC: Association of American Universities.

Lyman, R. (1995). Overview. In K. H. Hanson & J. W. Meyerson (Eds.). *International challenges to American colleges and universities: Looking ahead*. Phoenix, AZ: Orix Press.

Merkx, G. W., (2000) "Foreign Language and Area Studies through Title VI: Assessing Supply and Demand, *International Educator*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (pp. 23-32).

Merkx, G. W., (2003), "Waves of Change: Internationalization in U.S. Higher Education," *International Educator*, Volume XII, No. 1, pp. 6-12.

Merkx, G. W., (2015)" International Education in the United States," in G. W. Merkx and R. Nolan, *Internationalizing the Academy: Lessons of Leadership in Higher Education*, ed., (Harvard Education Press), pp. 9-22.

McCullough, D. (2011). *The greater journey: Americans in Paris*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Mestenhauser, J. A. (2000). Missing in action: Leadership for international and global education for the 21st century. In *Internationalization of higher*

education: An institutional perspective (Papers on Higher Education). Bucharest: UNESCO/CEPES.

Neave, G. (1992). *Institutional management of higher education: Trends, needs and strategies for*

co-operation. Unpublished document, International Association of Universities. Paris: UNESCO.

Neave, G. (1997). The European dimension in higher education. An historical analysis. Background document for the conference on *The Relationship between Higher Education and the Nation-State,* Enschede, the Netherlands.

Roberts, J., Rodrígues Cruz, A. M., & Herbst, J. (1996). Exporting models. In W. Rüegg. (Ed.), *A history of the university in Europe: Vol. 2. Universities in early modern Europe.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Scarfo, R. D. (1998). The history of Title VI and Fulbright Hays. In J. N. Hawkins, C. M. Haro, M. A. Kazanjian, G. W. Merkx, & D. Wiley (Eds.), *International education in the new global era.* Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles.

Scott, P. (1998). Globalisation and the university. In P. Scott (Ed.), *The globalization of higher education.* Buckingham, UK: SRHE and Open University Press.

Scott, P. (2005). The global dimension: Internationalising higher education. In B. Khem & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Internationalization in higher education: European responses to the global perspective.* Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

Shaw, M. (1994). *Global society and international relations.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Taylor, M. L. (1978). Study abroad. In A. S. Knowles (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Teichler, U. (1999). Internationalisation as a challenge of higher education in Europe. *Tertiary Education and Management, 5*, 5 – 23.

Teichler, U. (2004). The changing debate on internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education, 48,* 5 – 26.

Van der Wende, M. 2001. Internationalisation policies: About new trends and contrasting paradigms. *Higher Education Policy, 14,* 249 – 259.

Vestal, T. M. (1994). The international student experience: A U.S. industry perspective. *Journal of Studies in International Education 3*(2), 57 – 72.

White House. (2000). International education policy: Memorandum for the heads of executive departments and agencies by President Clinton. Oklahoma City: Office of the Press Secretary.