

„Internationalisation“ or „globalisation“ of higher education? Conceptual changes in recent discussions and documents

Hanna Lauterbach

First, the article gives a critical overview of the development and some recent scholarly differentiation of the concept of „internationalisation of higher education“. Second, it applies this differentiation to reconstruct the different meanings of the term „internationalisation in higher education“ in the recent debate among political, scientific and economic leaders and leading institutions in Germany. Third, it argues that there is not only a hidden agenda of internationalisation - namely globalisation - but another sub-text aiming at ignoring the aspect of „Bildung“ of higher education (education-for-life, human growth) in favour of an almost exclusive focus on „Ausbildung“ (professional training).

In recent years the concept of „internationalisation“ has become the favourite slogan for focussing the public debate about the necessary reforms in German higher education. Policy makers, economic leaders and sections of the academic establishment are concerned to see that Germany has lost its former attractiveness as a host country for foreign students, especially for the best students from the most dynamic economies in the Asian-Pacific area. It is obvious that a highly industrialised, export-oriented country like Germany is interested in exerting cultural and technological influence upon the future leaders of their potential trade partners (*Hochschulrektorenkonferenz 1996*)

Moreover, Germany is in danger of finding itself excluded from the emerging globalised market for higher education. German universities and *Fachhochschulen* do not seem to be fit for competing with higher education institutions of the U.S., the U.K., Japan, Australia and the Netherlands in regard to the best and most affluent students world-wide (*Hochschulrektorenkonferenz 1996*). The traditional form of the German system of higher education makes it difficult for German institutions to enter this competition with any prospect of success (*Fritzsch 1998*). In Germany, higher education is legally structured as a sovereign task of the state acting according to long-term political and administrative rationales. It is not organised like a highly specialised industry improving and adapting itself quickly according to the changing demands of a global educational marketplace, as are some U.S. American and Australian universities. (*Chipman 1999*).

The commercialisation of higher education is inseparable from the breakthrough of the new information and communication technologies, „which enable institutions to deliver their programmes and services internationally and on a large scale to a virtual and borderless world“ (*Van der Wende/Beerkens/Teichler 1999, S. 67*). Some experts even believe that the new media will establish themselves world-wide just because they provide the possibility to produce educational commodities in a way that can be commercially exploited (*Expertenkreis „Hochschulentwicklung“ 1999*).

From the background of this brief situation analysis, I shall consider the most important changes the meaning of „internationalisation of higher education“ has undergone in the last fifteen years (1). In the meantime, higher education research has developed some distinctions among the various policies and strategies covered by the term, which are helpful, but not without any problems (2). With those conceptual instruments at hand, we shall explore the various implicit definitions of „internationalisation of higher education“ at work in the actual debate about this issue among political, scientific and economic leaders or institutions

in Germany. The method will be typological and analytical: one or more typical examples for each sphere of political influence are analysed in order to reconstruct an attitude towards internationalisation, which can be considered not as representative, but at least as typical among members of the respective sphere of influence (3). After summing up the main trends of how „internationalisation“ is actually understood by German political and economic top executives or „think tanks“, we finally point to other vital issues of higher education policy more indirectly entailed in or addressed by these non-academic descriptions and visions of internationalisation: the relation of Bildung (human growth, education-for-life) to Ausbildung (professional training) and the question whether science develops within or outside democratic control (4)

1 „Internationalisation of higher education“: from development aid politics towards catalysing far-reaching institutional change

In the OECD/CERI seminar on „Internationalisation of Higher Education“ (1995), Mr. Deetman, President of the Executive Board, NUFFIC (The Netherlands Organisation for International Co-Operation in Higher Education summarised the most important changes of focal meaning emerging in the debate upon internationalisation in higher education among OECD Member states in the last fifteen years (*Deetman 1996*).

Up to the mid-eighties, the OECD Member states were mainly interested in a one-way form of internationalisation, i.e. in the flow of foreign students from the developing to the industrialised countries. They focussed on the political or socio-economic impact of incoming student mobility as an instrument of international relations. Foreign students were paid attention either in the context of development aid politics or as customers providing financial income for domestic higher education institutions.

In 1988, a new perspective unfolded: the discovery of foreign students as „agents for change“ within higher education institutions of their native country. The former, more quantitative perception turned into a „concept of internationalisation as a means to improve the quality of higher education“ (*Deetman 1996, S. 32*). With the ERASMUS programme starting in 1990, the emphasis shifted to student flows between the industrialised countries and to joint study programmes and inter-institutional co-operation. Higher education research started to work out methodologies for evaluating the measures higher education institutions had launched in order to cope with the demands of a much more diverse, internationalised student population.

From 1995 on, the concept of „internationalisation“ becomes clearly much more comprehensive and „student mobility“ is no longer considered as its focal meaning. „Increasingly we are aware of the fact, that curriculum development, staff mobility and institutional strategies, too, represent essential elements of the process of internationalisation“ (*Deetman 1996, S. 32*). Deetman points to the interrelatedness of all those elements. Internationalisation becomes more and more integrated into the core functions of higher education planning, management and quality assurance.

With regard to the future, Deetman identifies the following challenges:

- institutions will have to deal with the international dimension in a less supportive environment; external support from the state is generally decreasing;
- the notion of „higher education as an international market“ gains importance, given the fact that several regions, especially the newly industrialising countries, are generating huge demands for higher education;
- the former main host countries for foreign students emerge as the main „players“ on this new market;
- the positive effects of competition have to be balanced with the needs of the developing countries;
- keeping the quality perspective through effective planning and programming, the OECD countries can earn an optimal spin-off from the presence of foreign students in their higher education systems.

In a more elaborated way, Ulrich Teichler draws a similar picture in view of the changes of „internationalisation“ concepts within European higher education policies:

„Starting off from a heterogeneous set of phenomena, internationalisation does not merely mean varying border-crossing activities on the rise anymore, but rather substantial changes: first, from a predominantly ‚vertical‘ pattern of co-operation and mobility towards the dominance of international relationships on equal terms; second, from casuistic action towards systematic policies of internationalisation; third, from disconnection of specific international activities on the one hand and on the other internationalisation of the core activities towards an integrated internationalisation of higher education.“ (*Teichler 1999a, S. 5*).

Teichler points out that, although higher education policies in Europe are still primarily shaped by national state authorities, they are wandering more and more into the hands of higher education institutions themselves. The latter are increasingly permitted and even forced by the state to become autonomous entrepreneurial agents developing distinct profiles in order to succeed within the

framework of a de-nationalised higher education market. This de-nationalisation is encouraged by the policy of the European Commission.

2 Different meanings of „internationalisation“ as worked out by recent higher education research

The following differentiation is drawn from two articles of Van der Wende (1997) and Van der Wende/Beerkens/Teichler (1999). They observe three major changes internationalisation in higher education has undergone (1999, S. 65f.):

- the notable increase of the international student mobility, which has become more independent of the students' financial position or social status;
- the broadening of the concept of „internationalisation“, similar to the description of Deetman;
- the fact that supra-national decision-making more and more influences higher education („*Sorbonne Declaration 1998*“, „*Bologna Declaration 1999*“).

Therefore, they suggest distinguishing among the various policies and strategies which are covered by the term „internationalisation“, first with a horizontal perspective (2.1 – 2.3) – geographically and respective to the relevant agents – and second on a vertical plane using innovation theory for distinguishing different steps and depths of institutionally change catalysed by an internationalisation process (2.4).

2.1 „Internationalisation“ as the intended outcome of specific governmental supra-national higher education policies

This is the traditional meaning of „internationalisation of higher education“: two or more national or supra-national governments act as agents of higher education reforms „aimed at making the higher education system more international“ (Van der Wende/Beerkens/Teichler 1999, S. 67). To implement an international dimension, several measures on the level of teaching, research and service are introduced – more or less in a top-down manner, which means that higher education institutions are more in a receptive and reacting role guided by fund-related criteria and programmes. The sovereignty of the participating nations concerning higher education policy is sustained, either by bilateral treaties or (in the authors' view) by the subsidiarity principle of the Maastricht Treaty.

2.2 „Internationalisation“ as market-driven globalisation and denationalisation of higher education

In 1997 Marijk van der Wende (NUFFIC, University of Amsterdam) gives a review of the concept of „internationalisation“ as used and discussed by higher education planning and research. Like Deetman, Van der Wende states that „internationalisation“ refers to more than just the exchange of students and scholars. The issue has shifted to the economic and institutional impact of internationalisation and to its relationships with quality improvement and assurance. Internationalisation is not an aim in itself. It's orientated towards a comprehensive restructuring and upgrading of higher education systems within a framework of global competition. Therefore, van der Wende suggests a wider definition of internationalisation, „including any systematic, sustained effort aimed at making higher education (more) responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the **globalisation** [my emphasis, H.L.] of societies, economy and labour markets.“ (*Van der Wende 1997, S. 19*)

Van der Wende's definition does not further explain in detail what he has in mind, when he speaks of „globalisation“. Therefore we might propose a short description of the common understanding of (neo-liberal) globalisation as it is reflected in the public discussion (*Martin/Schumann 1996, Uchatius 2000*). Speaking of „globalisation“ mirrors the changed meaning of „internationalisation“ in an era in which economic transactions are incredibly accelerated by means of ICT and at the same time even OECD member states are more and more giving up their former national sovereignty in economic, social-political and ecological matters. Elected democratic governments relinquish their own power by signing international economic treaties promoting a global free trade system. They enhance deregulation, privatisation and marketisation with respect to basic facilities and social tasks (water, energy, food security, health care, public safety, education etc.) traditionally provided and controlled by the state. The neo-liberal conviction behind these activities maintains that promoting a global free market for all sorts of commodities and services will at the same time yield a maximal benefit for all participants and for the common good.

This ideology is contested by global social movements, which point to the fact that even according to the statistics of the World Bank (*Uchatius 2000, S. 18, 20, 23; O'Brien/ Goetz/ Scholte/ Williams 2000*) the gaps in property, income and access to technology between the poor and the wealthy nations as well as the social classes within industrialised nations did not become smaller, but opened up tremendously in the course of global economic liberalisation. In addition, neo-liberal globalisation is accused of threatening democracy and ecology

world-wide. Principally and in the long run, multilateral economic treaties like the unsuccessful M.A.I. (Multilateral Agreement of Investment) or the planned F.T.A.A. (Free Trade Area of the Americas) treaty aim at forbidding or restricting any national legislation of more stringent laws or „special treatment“ launched to protect the common good (for instance the ecological balance of the environment) and the rights and interests of the economically weaker (children, poor people, employees, smaller national farmers or industries, animals) standing opposed to the profit interests of national, foreign or transnational investors.

At the same time, not only biological, but also cultural diversity is decreasing by the unifying influence of Western science and life-style promoted by transnational media companies. Education and working conditions of the people as well as the national élite are becoming more and more homogeneous. „Human capital“ or „brain gain“ of national and international students and highly skilled scientists and engineers has emerged as the key resource for the future economic welfare of all leading OECD Member states. Therefore, Van der Wende's definition probably suggests that relating the phenomenon of „internationalisation“ exclusively to the differences and relationships between one national higher education system and another has turned out to be an old-fashioned sort of perspective in the era of globalisation.

A consequence – not drawn by Van der Wende himself – might be that it is more convenient and in tune with his perspective to develop research methods exploring directly the responsiveness or the competitive standing of each national system and their leading institutions within the emerging global market of higher education.

Astonishingly enough, a recent article of Van der Wende (*with Beerkens and Teichler 1999*) does no longer define or differentiate the meaning of „internationalisation of higher education“ by the concept of „globalisation“. Instead it replaces the latter by the term **„de-nationalisation of higher education“** (*Van der Wende/ Beerkens /Teichler 1999, S. 67*). Actually, this concept serves as the new title under which a couple of features of the globalisation process causing or facilitating the expansion of higher education systems across borders are summarised:

- Within the triangle of co-ordination regulating a nation's higher education policy (academic oligarchy, state authority and market demand) deregulation measures have shifted the balance in favour of more institutional autonomy and stronger market influences. That means they are at the same time

enabled and forced to develop a marketable profile and act in an entrepreneurial manner.

- Decreased state funding forces higher education to activate new sources of financial income by expanding their study programmes beyond the borders of the nation state.
- ICT provides the technological basis to offer overseas or branch campuses, distance learning and franchised programmes globally „to a virtual and borderless world“ (*Van der Wende/ Beerkens/ Teichler 1999, S. 67*).

„De-nationalisation“ is the term favoured by Teichler (*1999a*) too, who claims that the European Commission fosters a de-nationalisation and Europeanisation policy in higher education by promoting curricular co-operation to ease mobility and thereby restricting the scope of national political and academic agents.

2.3 „Internationalisation“ as cross-border regionalisation of higher education

Following the analysis of Race (*1997*) „regionalisation of higher education“ means a variety of co-operative settings, like for example the co-operation between the Nordic countries or alongside the French-German border. This type of internationalisation is focussing on the socio-economic and political development of a region belonging to two or more different nations. Co-operation is focussing on the compatibility, accessibility and responsiveness of the respective higher education systems and study courses for each other and for the regional labour market. These measures might be launched either by governmental policies or be a result of de-nationalisation processes - with higher education institutions either putting governmental orders into practise or acting autonomously as educational entrepreneurs.

2.4 The vertical dimension of „internationalisation“ in terms of its innovative impact on institutional change

Besides the horizontal dimensions of internationalisation in terms of agents and geography, Van der Wende, Beerkens and Teichler (*1999*) outline a set of vertical parameters. Following the innovation theory as set up by Levine (*1980*), they are able to differentiate the depth of the internationalisation process by conceptualising it as an innovation process of a certain type, in a certain phase or stage of implementation leading eventually to the institutionalisation or to the termination of the innovation. „Innovation“ is defined from the perspective of the adopter as „an idea, practise or object that is perceived as new by an individual

or an unit of adoption.“ (Rogers 1983, S. 11 cit. Van der Wende/ Beerkens/ Teichler 1999, S. 70)

Types of innovation (Van der Wende/ Beerkens / Teichler 1999, S. 70-76):

- **Establishment of new organisations**, for instance schools and colleges that are established as separate institutional structures in order to accommodate international (and also often interdisciplinary) programmes;
- **innovative enclaves within existing organisations**, for instance international programmes or units in order to accommodate international courses for international groups of students;
- **holistic changes within existing institutions**, „which involve the adoption of a major institutional innovation with a unified and coherent purpose“ - a very rare phenomenon in higher education in spite of the abundance of respective mission statements (Van der Wende/Beerkens/ Teichler 1999, S. 72);
- **piecemeal changes within existing organisations**, which do not affect the institutional mission, function or organisational principles, for instance exchange arrangements, international courses, excursions and intensive programmes, generally done on a ‘grassroots level’ depending on personally committed individuals (very frequent);
- **peripheral changes outside existing organisations** challenging traditional higher education institutions, like virtual universities operating transnationally due to ICT delivery.

The main factors determinating whether an innovation leads to institutionalisation or not are its compatibility in respect to the values and goals of the host institution and its profitability in respect to the adopters’ needs.

2.5 Comment

It is obviously useful and clarifying to differentiate the concept of „internationalisation of higher education“ geographically (cross-border-regional, international and global dimensions) and respective to the questions: Who is allowed to act, who is the main initiator, decision maker or steering centre in the field of internationalisation processes? National governments and super-national alliances, i.e. elected politicians and for instance EU administrators - or higher education institutions acting fairly autonomously as entrepreneurs on a globalised higher education market?

Nevertheless there are some problems. The first part of the definition (2.1) is almost circular: „Internationalisation“ is defined as two or more national or super-national governments launching political measures „aimed at making the higher education system **more international** [my emphasis, H.L.]“ (*Van der Wende/Beerkens/ Teichler 1999, S. 67*). What does „more international“ mean? It is not explained. As we will see later, there is a predominant tendency among politicians and the corporate world in Germany to understand „more international“ as „more adapted to the observed or anticipated challenges and chances of the neoliberal model of globalisation“, i.e. to an emerging global market for higher education.

The same is valid as regards to the „Europeanisation“ and the „cross-border regionalisation of higher education“. Both can be seen as phenomena of globalisation as well; „Europeanisation“ is focussing on the global competitiveness of a harmonised European system of higher education („*Sorbonne Declaration*“ 1998, „*Bologna Declaration*“ 1999), especially in competition to the North American ones; the term „regionalisation“ is reflecting the fact that the divisions between the economically flourishing and the declining areas become more and more independent from the national borders within which they are situated.

Given the world-wide uneasiness with neoliberal economic globalisation (*Uchatius 2000*) „de-nationalisation“ seems to recommend itself for scholarly purposes, because it's less loaded with politically controversial associations and emotions than „globalisation“. On the other hand, as a negative concept it is ambiguous, less meaningful and drawing a veil: while „globalisation“ points at least implicitly to the „invisible hand“ of the market replacing political steering, „de-nationalisation of higher education“ is lacking any hints concerning the moving forces of this process.

The vertical distinctions within the concept of „internationalisation“ in terms of different depths of institutional change initiated by internationalisation policies and strategies are useful formal instruments, especially for comparative case studies and evaluations of higher education institutions aiming at exploring and ranking their degree of institutional innovation with regard to internationalisation. On the other hand they are able to assess to what degree the goal of reforming higher education is succeeding in the diverse spheres of political power or influence. Let us try to categorise the present discussion in Germany by means of Van der Wende's, Beerkens' and Teichler's conceptual tools.

3 Recent conceptualisations of „internationalisation of higher education“ among political, academic and economic leaders or institutions in Germany

3.1 Political leaders and institutions of higher education

The concept of „internationalisation“ is part of almost every publication or public speech of the leading politicians and institutions for educational and scientific affairs, as well as of their articles in newspapers and higher education periodicals. Let's have a brief look at three key words eligible to represent the typical „spirit of internationalisation“ in Germany at the turn of the millennium:

„Efficiency“:

- In a report of the Kultusministerkonferenz (Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Laender in the Federal Republic of Germany, KMK) about the implementation of a couple of measures the Conference of the Prime Ministers of the Laender had agreed upon to strengthen Germany as a supplier for higher education, internationalisation is obviously oriented towards making German higher education more attractive for incoming foreign students and scholars (*KMK 1997*). This feature, together with the employability of the graduates, are seen as standards or decisive criteria for the quality of a higher education institution. Quality is understood as „efficiency“ (*Leistungsfähigkeit*) in the context of a new, more entrepreneurial and globalised framework of higher education policy. The Laender ministers of educational and cultural affairs make it perfectly clear that they mean to launch a respective structural reform of the German higher education system. It's going much further than the fostering of student mobility: „the organisation of studies at German higher education institutions has to be framed in a clearly tighter structure and has to be much more transparent.“ (*KMK 1997*)

„Knowledge society“:

- In a final report on the technological capability of Germany published by the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (Federal Ministry of Education and Research, BMBF) in 1998, the six responsible research institutes (for economic, social, innovation and science research) wrote in their conclusion that it is necessary to understand and practise education policy, research policy and innovation policy as a cross-section task and a

cross-section policy (*BMBF 1998*). Otherwise, Germany would fail to meet the challenges of globalisation. Cross-section politics, oriented towards being on the top of technological innovation, has to realise the transformation of Germany into a „knowledge-society“ able to maintain and enforce its standing in regard to the best, quickest and most marketable technological innovations. The report provides insights into the primarily economic imperatives determining the policy of the government regards to higher education. In our interview for the ADMIT-Project (see E. Berning in this volume) in the BMBF (May 1999), we were told that Germany is interested in attracting as large a number of foreign students as possible from the global stock of excellent students. If those international students end up performing better than home students they may get the respective jobs and have the opportunity to stay here, if that fits the German interests.

„High-Tech-Offensive“:

- In a number of speeches concerning the science policy of Bavaria given by the Bavarian Minister for Science, Research and Art, Mr Zehetmair, in 1999, the minister put the issue of internationalisation of higher education straightforwardly into the context of the accelerated globalisation. As an answer to this challenge, the Bavarian State would spend hundreds of millions of DM in the next years for an „High-Tech-Offensive“ to strengthen Bavaria's standing as a highly attractive region for research and investments in a globalised economy. The internationalisation of Bavarian higher education is supposed to be part of this „Offensive“ with a budget of 30 million DM (15 million Euro), not only for student exchange, but for structural reforms of higher education as well. The minister emphasised different measures to reduce study periods and claimed that the foreign students expect a clearer, tighter and more calculable structure and duration of the study programmes, an improved tutoring and helpful service offers.

As we see here, the „spirit of internationalisation“ turns out to be primarily a „spirit of globalisation“ enforced by political advisors, top executives and political institutions of higher education themselves. It becomes concrete in the measures the new framework resolutions of the KMK agreed upon, as well as in the resolutions of the German Rector's Conference (Hochschulrektorenkonferenz, HRK), the representative body of German higher education institutions. The same applies to several legislative initiatives of the Laender aimed at reforming higher education in Germany on a structural level.

In most of these documents one does not find any explicit definition of the term „internationalisation“, but rather a listing of concrete practical measures summarised under this slogan. Typical elements of these lists are proposals and recommendations concerning reforms and improvements (*HRK 1996, 1997, 2000, KMK 1997, 1999*), which relate to fostering mobility, curricular innovations, an ICT-offensive, higher education marketing and enhancing strategic integration.

Apart from detailed questions relating to these issues, the HRK's checklist for internationalisation strategies (HRK 2000) asks higher education and department leadership, whether internationalisation (still understood as the admission and accommodation of foreign staff and students) is an integral and defined element of the higher education institution's overall strategy and whether respective objectives will be evaluated and included into the performance-related funding of the departments.

Categorising the dimensions of „internationalisation“ among leading politicians and political institutions in German higher education by means of Van der Wende's, Beerken's and Teichler's distinctions, we find that the political class still understands „internationalisation“ primarily as an intended outcome of governmental or (with a view to the EU programmes) supra-national policies (see 2.1). Higher education institutions are not yet treated like entrepreneurial units, but nevertheless the motivational and strategic background of this policy is evidently rooted within an agenda of globalisation or de-nationalisation (2.2). There is a necessity felt to keep pace with a global competition for „brain gain“ among the technologically leading nations and supra-national alliances.

Thinking of the recently founded „Virtual University of Bavaria“ in the context of vertical dimensions of internationalisation (2.4), we find the category of „peripheral changes outside existing institutions“ challenging traditional higher education structures. Apart from that, the proposed measures mainly stay within the limits of piecemeal changes and innovative enclaves within existing organisations. The HRK's checklist for the strategic integration of internationalisation seems to point towards initiating holistic institutional changes. But restricting „internationalisation“ in terms of staff and student exchange means that its scope remains too small in relation to that endeavour.

3.2 The Science Council, a representative of the academic establishment

The „Science Council“ (Wissenschaftsrat, WR) advises the Federal and the Laender governments regards to the structural development of higher education, science and research according to the demands of society, culture and economy.

Already in 1992, in its „Recommendations for the Internationalisation of relationships in Science“ (*WR 1992*), the WR was dealing with internationalisation and Europeanisation of higher education clearly within the acknowledgement of economic globalisation (2.2). It underlines that the German higher education system is not attractive for international students particularly from the Asian-Pacific area, and points to the competition between the three economic giants, the EU, the U.S. and Japan. The universal values inherent in science, the international scientific co-operation and the co-operation between science and economy are recommended as a remedy against the developing countries becoming uncoupled from technological progress and estranged from Western civilisation. The highly industrialised countries are challenged to rebuild intercultural understanding and besides global ecological threats do require international research efforts.

Enhancing intercultural understanding is seen as a task for the humanities and the social sciences, together with the so-called „particularisation“ meaning the growing historical, geographical, cultural, social and economic research addressing regional issues, problems and relationships. This is very similar to what Van der Wende, Beerkens and Teichler had in mind with „internationalisation in terms of cross-border regionalisation of higher education“ (see section 2.3 and E. Berning in this edition on the higher education region of Saarbruecken). Thinking in „regions“ rather than in „nations“ is a typical feature of globalisation too. The WR demanded the fostering of a „European education“ including the understanding of national peculiarities. It recommended intensified language instruction and foresaw profound curricular changes in some disciplines, mainly due to the internationalised labour market. The measures the WR proposed to improve student mobility (incoming and outgoing) are not discussed here, because many of them have become commonplaces and in the meantime some of them have been realised, especially on the plane of reforming legal hindrances for mobility.

Recently, the WR published a chapter on „Deepening Internationalisation“ within its „Thesis on the Future Development of the German Science System“ (*WR 2000, S. 29-36*). These recommendations go much further in equating internationalisation implicitly with a globalisation (2.2) of German higher education

institutions, envisioning them as autonomous agents on a world-wide higher education market:

- It complies with the German interests to become a country of immigration for outstanding students and scientists, particularly from the Middle and East European Countries.
- A decisive criterion of the autonomy of German higher education institutions will be, whether they will be enabled to promote their international marketing and offer courses of study and affiliations internationally with the aid of ICT.
- Participating in the global education markets will open up sources of income for German higher education institutions.
- The corresponding direct competition with national and foreign higher education institutions will fuel their internal reform process.
- A sufficient command of English has to be recognised as a basic skill.
- Imparting foreign language competence is only a prerequisite for a deeper understanding of their own culture and foreign cultures, which graduates need in order to cope with more and more internationalised and multicultural settings in their professional life.

The humanities and the social sciences are called upon to develop either innovative, internationally and professionally oriented study programmes beyond the occupational scope of the civil service or to launch study modules, which can be integrated into professional courses of study like business administration or engineering. Their research capacities should respond to internationalisation processes by focussing on international, intercultural and innovative interdisciplinary dimensions and by taking into account the rise of new traditions and identities as well as the renaissance of old ones, which are incongruent with the framework of modern national states. They are requested to explore the intellectual dimension of an open-mindedness for the cultures of countries on the threshold of economic take-off. The WR considers this open-mindedness (together with its social dimension) to be a key factor for the attractiveness of American higher education institutions.

At least concerning humanities and social sciences, the WR seems to recommend the most far-reaching type of institutional innovation as a response to the pressure of internationalisation, namely „holistic changes within existing institutions, which involve the adoption of a major institutional innovation with a unified and coherent purpose“ (see 2.5). The holistic change consists in the proposed re-definition and restructuring of the humanities and the social sciences.

They find themselves united under a new name - „Kulturwissenschaften“ (cultural studies) instead of „Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften“ - and put into service for clearly circumscribed professional objectives and for enhancing the international attractiveness of German higher education altogether.

3.3 „Internationalisation“ as seen by representatives of the corporate world

3.3.1 The new private or private-public higher education institutions

Although quantitatively unimportant compared to the state universities, the new (non-ecclesiastical) private universities in Germany are often praised as models for the internationalisation of higher education. Therefore it is worthwhile to enrich our record of current meanings of „internationalisation“ by looking at the typical features realised or planned in some innovative higher education institutions (as to state universities see E. Berning in this volume about the Technical University of Munich).

The new private universities are run either as independent, limited liability companies or as private-public-partnerships or as „corporate universities“, like the „Lufthansa School of Business“ or the „DaimlerChrysler Corporate University“ (Deiser 2000, Geimer 1999). The latter are not universities in the proper sense, at least not in the sense prevailing in Germany. There's no free access, no research, no self-administration, the staff is not necessarily academically qualified and the range and orientation of the courses of study are lacking a commitment towards universality and academic freedom. Actually, „corporate universities“ themselves don't pretend to be more than highly qualified, corporate further education institutions and strategic steering instruments of the company's board (Deiser 2000). Using the term „university“ is part of their marketing strategy. Therefore we shall not consider corporate universities in this context.

Hildegard and Reinhold Geimer (1999) portrayed some new private universities, all of them directed towards business and/or technology subjects, for example:

„The International Department– University of Karlsruhe“ (technical university), a limited liability company, offers Bachelor and Master study programmes in civil, electrical and electronic engineering addressed towards particularly qualified and motivated students from Asian countries and from the U.S.

„The International University in Germany“ in Bruchsal, sponsored by different transnational corporations (SAP, IBM, Siemens, Alcatel, Microsoft, SEW-

Eurodrive, DaimlerChrysler), offers the following degree programmes: Master of Information and Communication, MBA and Bachelor of Science. They are preparing their students for management positions in transnational corporations specialised in ICT.

„The International University Bremen“, founded in 1999 by the City of Bremen together with Rice University (Texas), tries to combine the German unity of teaching and research on the one hand and the British-American, more general orientation of the undergraduate study period on the other hand. Courses of study are planned mainly in the area of natural sciences and engineering but also, to a smaller extent, in the humanities and social sciences. The institution aims at educating the future leaders in economy, politics, research, education and society and at furthering world citizenship. Internationality is to be guaranteed by the presence of professors and students from all over the world, by a broad range of intercultural courses of study and by English being the language of instruction.

The new German private (or private-public) universities have a couple of typical features in common designed to make them fit for higher education's internationalisation in the sense of globalisation:

- Focussing almost exclusively towards courses of study without expensive technical equipment, which impart directly marketable skills and qualifications requested particularly by transnational corporations;
- addressing foreign students as a matter of priority and selecting their students by themselves;
- excellent teacher-student-ratios and international teaching staff;
- tuition fees between Euro 5,000 and 20,000 annually;
- English as the main language of instruction, compulsory study periods abroad, training in the associated companies and cultural study courses aimed at providing insight into many different cultures;
- modularised study programmes with credit point systems, part of them organised as ICT-based distance or virtual instruction.

The existence and the profiles of the new private higher education institutions in Germany are also representatives of the vertical dimension of internationalisation in terms of „establishment of new organisations“ aimed at opening up a national and taking part successfully in a global higher education market.

3.3.2 A voice from a corporate ‚think tank‘: the „Centrum für Hochschulentwicklung“

The most radical position concerning equating the internationalisation of higher education horizontally with its globalisation and vertically with holistic changes within existing institutions is held by the „Centrum für Hochschulentwicklung“ (Centre for Higher Education Development, CHE), a foundation funded by the German TNC Bertelsmann.

The director, Detlef Müller-Böling, published a book, in which he envisions a new paradigm of higher education policy and planning, called „the unleashed higher education institution“ (*Müller-Böling 2000*). The „unleashing“ relates to the fetters, the state – according to Müller-Böling – is putting upon higher education. The key concepts for the new model are „autonomy“, „scientific excellence“, „economic viability“, „profile building“, „competition“, „internationalisation“ and „virtualisation“ (*Müller-Böling 2000, S. 31f.*). This vision evidently interprets the internationalisation of higher education in terms of its globalisation, except for the feature of privatisation, which Müller-Böling rejects in favour of state-funded, but self-controlled higher education institutions.

In Müller-Böling’s opinion, German higher education is lacking international attractiveness, because the state regulates internationalisation of higher education institutions too strictly through the „well-ordered cultural federalism“ of the German Laender. The Laender aim at providing the greatest possible homogeneity of the higher education system in favour of the regional and national, instead of the international education markets. Thereby, they work against profile building, institutional autonomy and flexible reactions by higher education institutions themselves. The latter need a transition towards a completely new steering system, as selective reforms, piecemeal changes or the establishment of a „dual system“ with different study conditions for national and international students (see 2.5) fall short of achieving the goal of internationalisation. Instead, Müller-Böling foresees and proposes deep changes in the general framework of higher education teaching and learning (*Müller-Böling 2000, 217-228*):

- Life-long learning demands a higher permeability of study structures and a greater mobility of teaching locations and duration, including the virtual classroom.
- New private and/or foreign higher education providers will break the „education monopoly“ of the national states and promote the smoothest possible interfaces between professional training and professional occupation; univer-

sities and *Fachhochschulen* are supposed to use profile building as a competitive playing field.

- The modularisation of study courses will more and more replace the idea of studying as a joint and completed phase of training and education.
- Quality assurance shall be taken away from state control via framework examination orders etc. and put into the hands of higher education institutions by leaving it to themselves, whether they do or do not develop new courses of study and let them undergo an accreditation process.

According to Müller-Böling, „accreditation“ means to carry out regular peer reviews by members of the respective scientific community including representatives of the labour market and possibly some state representatives. These committees examine, whether the respective courses of study fulfil some general and minimal quality standards and provide a temporally limited legitimisation. Criteria might be the credibility and utility of the study programmes in view of students, labour market and potential employers; the sustainability and transferability of the imparted qualifications in the context of life-long learning; their compatibility with the predominant structures of higher education. To implement accreditation thoroughly and sustainably into the German higher education system, it necessarily has to be integrated into the preconditions of the state's higher education funding. For Müller-Böling, accreditation as a „buffer institution“ is the crucial and central element of a new steering system for German higher education replacing state control by the institutional autonomy of higher education.

It's obvious that this vision is candidly drafting the „internationalisation of higher education“ as its „globalisation“. The individual institution and market's „invisible hand“ are the main ‚agents‘ on a global playing field. On the vertical plane, Müller-Böling's CHE-vision of internationalisation clearly aims at „holistic changes within existing organisations“, rejecting almost contemptuously the predominant practise of piecemeal changes and innovative enclaves.

In Müller-Böling's opinion, the problem of lacking international attractiveness on a deeper level reflect the principle tension of German higher education policy oscillating between „Bildung“, i.e. fostering human growth and education-for-life by giving the students more freedom and more choice to organise their studies by themselves, vs. „Ausbildung“, i.e. providing practically relevant professional training, which is easier to translate into school-like, structured courses of study. Pointing to the fact that the European Union's higher education policy is explicitly founded on a concept of Ausbildung in the sense of preparing for a profession, Müller-Böling suggests re-examining whether the German concept of Bildung is still suitable at all. For him, the process of Bildung, which clearly

includes an ethic dimension, primarily belongs to the responsibility of the individual himself or herself. That sounds as if he considers Bildung to be a private matter, while Ausbildung remains a public, state-funded, but no longer state-regulated matter.

4 Comment: Internationalisation, globalisation and the future of the Bildungs-aspect of higher education

Looking back at this brief analysis of the various types of policies and strategies included in the recent public and political discourse on „internationalisation of higher education“ among some representative political, academic and economic leaders and institutions in Germany, I would like to give the following summary and conclusions:

On the one hand, there are still notable differences between political authorities, academic establishment and the corporate world respective to the horizontal and vertical dimensions of internationalisation. The requested depth of institutional change (2.4) ranges from piecemeal changes and innovative enclaves favoured by political authorities (KMK, HRK) to holistic changes within existing institutions - particularly within the humanities and the social sciences (WR) - up to demanding a complete new steering system for higher education unleashing it totally from state control by means of accreditation as the new buffer institution (CHE). According to the horizontal distinctions of Van der Wende (1997), Beerkens and Teichler (1999) focussing upon the question where the centre of activity and steering is situated, there is a parallel spectrum of differences: understanding „internationalisation“ as the intended outcome of specific governmental higher education policies (2.1) as held by political authorities on the one side vs. its understanding as market-driven de-nationalisation and globalisation, with higher education institutions as autonomous agents competing on a worldwide education market, on the other side. The latter position is held by the new private or private-public universities and backed up by the CHE, whereas the WR occupies a middle position.

On the other hand, (neo-liberal, economic) globalisation is the hidden agenda of internationalisation everywhere. Policy makers and political advisors strive for a higher education system eligible primarily to improve Germany's standing within a global competition concerning „brain gain“ and technological innovation. The WR states that international marketing and direct competition with national and foreign higher education institutions will fuel the internal reform process of German higher education institutions and open up new sources of

funding. The CHE's vision of the „unleashed“ higher education in Germany devoted to autonomy (self-control via accreditation), economic viability, profile building and competition sets up a globalisation-oriented framework for internationalisation from the very beginning. In contrast to „internationalisation“, which is traditionally associated with student and staff mobility, cultural diversity and understanding, multiple language performance and world citizenship, a „globalisation of higher education“ fosters its deregulation, privatisation, marketisation, acceleration and standardisation (via modularisation and the harmonisation of curricula) and its exposure to global competition.

So far, Van der Wende's, Beerkens' and Teichler's differentiation of the concept of „internationalisation“ (2.1-2.4) is helpful for analysing the differences and similarities in the understanding of „internationalisation of higher education“ in the present public debate in Germany. Nevertheless, there is another important dimension or agenda of the „internationalisation talk“, which they overlook completely. We can identify its tracks easily, at least in the German discussion on internationalisation: the tacit abolition of the aspect of „Bildung“ of higher education.

It is astonishing, that the book of CHE-director Müller-Böling is the only one among all the contributions presented and analysed above which names and discusses the issue openly - the others do not even mention it. Müller-Böling suggests to re-examine, whether the concept of Bildung is still suitable for the European and international compatibility of the German higher education system and argues that Bildung, including its ethical dimension, is to be considered as a private matter of the individual, not an objective of higher education (*Müller-Böling 2000, S. 217*). This is obviously a highly problematic thesis reflecting the typical neo-liberal conviction that the free market will convert private vices into public benefits. It ignores the fact that the social power and privileges the future leaders in economy, politics, science and society gained through higher education have to be balanced by their developing social and ecological sensibility and responsibility as well as democratic attitudes, skills and manners - otherwise we will end up with the dictatorship of multilateral economic institutions, transnational investors and the reductionism of technocratic experts (*see O'Brien/Goetz/Schulte/Williams 2000, Uchatius 2000, Simon 2000*).

Of course, economic rationality might have a very positive impact upon the hierarchical and authoritarian structures of traditional higher education institutions. More managerial leadership, global budgets, flat hierarchies, teamwork, service-orientation and improved interfaces between study programmes and the labour market may enhance efficiency, creativity and personal satisfaction

among staff, students and administration. Tuition fees, profile-building and the option to introduce admission examinations for certain courses of study by each higher education institution itself may enhance the quality of German higher education. But those market-oriented measures have to be balanced by another pole that represents the non-economic objectives of higher education.

In this context it is notable that the WR (2000, S. 29-36) points to the task of the humanities and the social sciences to provide social cohesion and stability by re-interpreting the cultural heritage, but keeps complete silence on its complementary task to contribute to social dynamism, cultural creativity and political innovation. Higher education has always been a period in life in which young people had an opportunity to develop personal and political visions, social competence and attitudes of responsibility, not only for their private success but for the common good as well. It is a distinguishing feature of German higher education that for the overwhelming majority of students this happens - if it happens - primarily outside higher education and by chance, in their leisure time or as a by-product of the necessity to earn their living.

Normally, there are only few extra-curricular activities, little informal contact and certainly no common form of life between students and staff on a campus comparable to the tradition of the old British universities or the American universities. Corresponding to the Humboldtian maxim of „Bildung durch Wissenschaft“ („Education through Science“), experiences of community have been restricted to the more advanced students participating in their professors' research projects. According to British criticism (Gellert 1988, S. 24-29), German higher education neglects the personal development of the student, including ethical behaviour and manners. It suffers from a one-sided emphasis on research in technically usable knowledge, from the absence of undergraduate „liberal education“ and a common life of students and staff on the campus, where - according to the „English collegiate ideal“ - „teachers and taught are co-operating with leisurely confidence in the task of preserving and transmitting a cultured way of life“ (Halsey 1961, S. 55, cit. Gellert 1988, S. 24). It fosters a tendency towards pedantry, intellectual arrogance and dogmatism accompanied by a withdrawal into a realm of unpolitical, pure science (Ashby 1966, S. 7, Gellert 1988, S. 29).

Unlike the traditional German understanding of Bildung, not only „the transmission of a common culture“, but also of „common standards of citizenship“ were considered central objectives of traditional British higher education (Committee on higher education 1963 cit. Gellert 1988, S. 30). Practising democratic skills and attitudes - for instance through the numerous student's debating clubs - is

explicitly part of this educational environment, which seems to lead to an open-mindedness and to good manners estimated last not least by international students.

It seems as if the WR (2000) ignores the few opportunities of education-for-life and human growth the German system of higher education offers to its students, if it (the WR) confines itself in this context to recommend that tertiary education become more international has to be changed into flexible and permeable modules of purely professionally oriented training programmes. The ideal to remodel courses of study into modularised, highly combinable and flexible study units might sound attractive in respect to the quickly changing demands of the labour market, the necessities of life-long learning and the international compatibility of the German higher education system. But given the pressure of reducing the duration of study periods and harmonising curricula internationally, the process of rationalisation and standardisation of higher education threatens students with losing simultaneously the academic freedom and spare time left by the traditional higher education system (particularly in the humanities and social sciences). It might as well abolish the only opportunity for a longer and more intensive co-operation and tutoring between staff and students, when the latter become included into research projects in order to write their Magister or Diplom thesis.

Coming back to the concept of „internationalisation“ and to the discussion about the reasons, why German higher education is lacking international attractiveness I will end with four theses:

- 1) If the challenges of economic globalisation, particularly the competition for „brain gain“ and the development of new sources of income for German higher education institutions is the open or hidden agenda of the discussion about „internationalisation“, this debate is at the same time implicitly or explicitly dealing with the issue of what is happening or should happen with the aspect of Bildung of higher education.
- 2) Historically, there have been only few opportunities for developing the non-intellectual dimensions of Bildung - human growth, social competence, democratic skills and attitudes etc. - **within** German higher education. At present, most of the measures suggested in order to foster professional training and make German higher education fit for global competition, at the same time reduce the students' possibilities to acquire an education-for-life **outside** higher education.

- 3) Therefore: the danger of reducing the academic freedom of students and staff and the absence of tuition fees without replacing it by the advantages of the „collegiate“ model - the intimate tutorials, the campus life and the respect for liberal education typical for the Anglo-American system - is not likely to make German higher education more attractive for international students.
- 4) Introducing the latter requires a lot of money - for better teacher-student-ratios and personal tutoring, for campus facilities and residence halls, for the fostering of extra-curricular activities, etc. Germany has to undergo an honest and passionate public debate about where this money shall come from and no longer underestimate the attractiveness of the security, cultural diversity, social integration and emotional bonding provided by British and U.S. American higher education institutions. They act much more as entrepreneurial units, but at the same time they do not consider their students' education-for-life to be a private matter of the individual.

Literature

- Ashby, E. (1966): Universities: British, Indian, African, London
- „Bologna Declaration“ (1999): The European Higher Education Area. Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education Convened in bologna on the 19th of June 1999
- Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (1998): Zur Technologischen Leistungsfähigkeit Deutschlands. Zusammenfassender Endbericht
- Chipman, L. (1999): The Disintegration of an Industry, in: Higher Education in Europe 24, 177-186
- Deetman, W.J. (1996): Opening address, in: Internationalisation of Higher Education, Paris: OECD Documents, 31-33
- Deiser, R. (2000): Das Modell der Corporate University, in: Politische Studien 51, H.2, 48-53
- Expertenkreis „Hochschulentwicklung durch neue Medien“ der Bertelsmann-Stiftung (1999): Die Universität im Jahr 2005, in: Forschung und Lehre, H. 8, S. 408-411
- Fritzsch, H. (1998): Deutschland investiert in seine Vergangenheit. Was Deutschland von Japan unterscheidet, in: Forschung und Lehre, H.3, S. 139-141
- Geimer, H. und R. (1999): Neue Privathochschulen als Alternative zu den Staatlichen Universitäten, in: Bildung und Wissenschaft H.2/3 (1999): Das Hochschulwesen in Deutschland – Wohin führt der Weg?. Reforminitiativen für das 21. Jahrhundert, S. 29-33
- Gellert, C. (1988): Vergleich des Studiums an englischen und deutschen Universitäten, Frankfurt a. M. - Bern - N.Y. - Paris: Lang
- Halsey, A.H. (1961): University Expansion and the Collegiate ideal, in: Universities Quarterly 16, I
- Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (1996): 179. Plenum: Attraktivität durch internationale Kompatibilität

- Kultusministerkonferenz (1997):* Stärkung der internationalen Wettbewerbsfähigkeit des Studienstandortes Deutschland. Bericht der Kultusministerkonferenz an die Ministerpräsidentenkonferenz zu den Umsetzungsmaßnahmen, Bonn
- Levine, A. (1980):* Why Innovation Fails: the institutionalisation and termination of innovations in higher education, New York: Albany State University of New York Press
- Martin, H.-P.; Schumann, H. (1996):* Die Globalisierungsfalle, Reinbek b. Hamburg: Rowohlt
- Ministerium für Wissenschaft, Forschung und Kunst Baden-Württemberg (ed.) (1999):* Prisma. Zeitschrift für Studierende 9 (1999), H. 1
- Müller-Böling, D. (2000):* Die entfesselte Hochschule, Gütersloh: Bertelsmann-Stiftung
- O'Brien, R.; Goetz, A. M.; Scholte, J. A.; Williams, M. (2000):* Contesting Global Governance. Multilateral Economic Institutions and Global Social Movements, Cambridge University Press
- Race, J. (1997):* Regional Cooperation in Higher Education: a background and overview. Strasbourg: Council of Europe
- Rogers, E.M. (1983):* Diffusion of Innovations, 3rd edn, New York: Free Press (1st edn. 1962)
- Simon, D. (2000):* Demokratisiert die Wissenschaft!, in: Die Zeit Nr. 38, 14.9.2000, 41f
- „Sorbonne Declaration“ (1998):* Joint declaration on the harmonisation of the architecture of the European higher education systems, Ministers in charge of France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom, Paris, The Sorbonne, May 25th, 1998
- Teichler, U. (1999a):* Internationalisation as a challenge for higher education in Europe, in: Tertiary Education and Management 5, 5-23
- Uchatius, W. (2000):* Der Krieg der Pazifisten, in: Die Zeit Nr. 39 vom 21.9.2000, S. 17-23
- Van der Wende, M. (1997):* Missing Links. The Relationship between National Policies for Internationalisation and those for Higher Education in General, in: National Policies for Internationalisation of Higher Education in Europe, hrsg.v. Torsten Källemark, National Agency for Higher Education / Marijk van der Wende, Netherlands Organisation for International Cooperation in Higher Education (Nuffic), Stockholm, 10-41
- Van der Wende, M.; Beerkens, E.; Teichler, U. (1999):* Internationalisation as a cause for innovation in higher education. A comparison between European cooperation and the Dutch cross-border cooperative programme, in: From the eye of the storm. Higher education's changing institution, hrsg. v. B. Jongbloed; P. Maassen; G. Naeve Dordrecht-Boston-London
- Wissenschaftsrat (1992):* Empfehlungen zur Internationalisierung der Wissenschaftsbeziehungen, Köln
- Wissenschaftsrat (2000):* Thesen zur zukünftigen Entwicklung des Wissenschaftssystems in Deutschland, Köln

Anschrift der Verfasserin:

Hanna Lauterbach M.A.
Bayerisches Staatsinstitut
für Hochschulforschung und Hochschulplanung
Prinzregentenstr. 24
80538 München

Lauterbach@zv.tum.de