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Abstract

Internationalization has become one of the key concepts in higher education. On the one hand, internationalization is a driving motive for change in higher education. On the other, it is still a phenomenon with a lot of questions regarding its rationales, meaning, organizational models, relationship to developments in higher education, and status as an area of research and study. This paper examines internationalization in the context of the current changes and challenges in higher education; namely, the rationales for internationalization, the evolution of this concept, and its organizational models. Conclusions will assist student affairs practitioners and faculty, higher education administrators and policy makers in identifying key policy issues and posing questions for the future directions of internationalization.
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Statement of the Problem

Higher education is in the throes of a major transformation because the world in which higher education plays a significant role is changing. Accordingly, basic traditional viewpoints are being reconceptualized in order to see new potential inherent in changes occurring in higher education. The international dimension of higher education is becoming increasingly important, complex, and confusing (Knight, 2004; Yang, 2002). It is therefore timely to critically review and analyze a body of literature related to the concept of internationalization in light of current changes and challenges. This paper will address the issues involved in integrating the international dimension into HED.

Etymologically internationalization is derived from Latin; ‘inter’ means ‘between’ and ‘nationalization’ refers to ‘nation’. Hence, the concept of internationalization applies to, on the one hand, a process of “making something international” (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 2000). It is a process of exchange and mutual influence, where the actors involved are presumably ‘nations’. On the other hand, internationalization is commonly conceptualized as an ideology or policy of some sort (Knight, 2004).

Internationalization is integral to the strategic planning of universities worldwide. Consequently, decisions regarding how we internationalize education will affect our students and international partners both in the short and long term. It is therefore necessary that we as educators understand the current issues involved in internationalization and globalization, how internationalization relates to globalization,
and the potential effects of decisions relating to how internationalization occurs within our educational institutions and our educational programs.

Although linked, internationalization and globalization are different phenomena rather than interchangeable terms (Scott, 2000). Globalization is defined as “the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, ideas ... across borders. ... affects each country in a different way due to a nation’s individual history, traditions, culture and priorities” (Knight & de Wit, 1997, p.6). Internationalization of higher education can be one of the ways a nation responds to the impact of globalization while at the same time respecting the individuality of the nation (Knight, 1997 as cited in de Wit, 2002). I view internationalization of higher education as one of the “instruments” of globalization.

Many higher education institutions around the world are internationalizing their campuses (refer to www.msnbc.msn.com for further information about the world’s most global universities) as a response to globalization.

The globalization of societies, economies and labor markets increasingly influence academic and professional requirements including multilingualism, social and intercultural skills for graduates. Hence, higher education must provide an adequate preparation for that. In addition, the level of specialization in research and the size of the investments that are indispensable to certain fields of research and development require collaborative efforts and intensive international cooperation. In addition, the following two developments are increasingly influencing the international dimension of higher education. First, the recruitment of foreign students has become a significant factor for institutional income and of national economic interest. Second, the use of new information and communication technologies in the delivery of education and the
involvement of the private sector cause national borders and the role of national
governments in education to become blurred (Knight, 2004).

Knight (1999) observes that as the rationales shift, the types of activities diversify,
as outcomes take on increasing importance, and the nature of the interactions among the
participants changes, the terminology for internationalization of higher education also
changes. This calls for a rethinking of internationalization and a need for a broader
concept which contains the entire functioning of higher education through its various
dimensions and the actions of some individuals as part of it. This paper will reexamine
the rationales for internationalization of higher education (the ‘why’), review the
evolution of the meaning of ‘internationalization of higher education’ (the ‘what’), and
critically analyze the organizational models of integrating the international dimension
into higher education (the ‘how’).

Three main questions will be addressed in this paper:

- Why do we internationalize higher education?
- What does it mean to internationalize higher education?
- How should higher education be internationalized?

In this paper three terms will frequently be used: ‘international dimension’,
‘internationalization of higher education’, and ‘international education’. International
dimension is used in this paper as a generic term to contain all aspects of higher
education that have international specifics, regardless of whether they are
programmatically or strategically organized. The term international education refers to a
more developed form of the international dimension such as a program and/or

---

1 This terminology (the why, the what, the how) is also used in de Wit’s (2002) work. I am continuing to use this terminology.
organization. Internationalization is accepted as an extension of international education and refers to a more strategic process approach (de Wit, 2002).

Throughout the Educational Leadership and Policy program, I have affirmed and deepened my professional goals (acquiring knowledge and improving my skills in higher education administration, educational leadership and policy). In addition, I have strengthened my experience in higher education budgeting and planning, student affairs administration, leadership, assessment, and program development. Additionally, I have tried to unite international education and my current status as an international student into my own studies. I have accumulated international experience, in particular, forming a global vision of a problem, developing programs on international standards, teaching international students, making direct contacts with American scholars, and participating in international symposia and conferences. I have also incorporated an international component through my internships at the International Center at the University of Utah (summer 2007) and at the Office of International Programs (spring 2008). Overall, this experience has been the impetus of this paper.

I draw chiefly from three courses for the purposes of this assignment: Educational Policy, International Student Affairs, Higher Education Budget and Planning, and a mix of focused readings about the fundamental tenets of internationalization in higher education. The following courses will also be incorporated in this text: Leadership in Student Affairs, Assessment in Student Affairs, and Program Development in Higher Education.

Review of Related Literature
Literature regarding internationalization in the field of higher education encompasses a variety of different publications that appeared over time and across disciplines. In addition, one of the fundamental issues dealing with the internationalization of higher education is the diversity of related terms. In this part I will cover literature related to three main areas connected with the subject of this study, namely, integrating the international dimension into higher education. In the first section I will cover literature dealing with the rationales for internationalization, that is, with the 'why'. I will include a discussion on the shift in rationales and relate the rationales to the different stakeholders in higher education. Second, I will attempt to review the evolution of the concept of internationalization, the 'what'. I will include transformative education as a tool for the development of international competence. In the third section I will analyze organizational models for the internationalization of higher education, the 'how'.

*Rationales for Internationalization*

This section is aimed to reexamine why we internationalize higher education. The fundamental question 'why' received explicit and structured attention in the 1990s. de Wit (1999) defines rationales as motivations for integrating international dimensions into higher education. The rationales explain 'the why' of internationalization. For more than 15 years now, scholars (Aigner et al, 1992; Davies, 1992; Johnston & Edelstein, 1993; Knight, 2004; Knight & de Wit, 1995; de Wit, 2002) have attempted to suggest major reasons for the internationalization of higher education. These include international security, economic competitiveness, environmental interdependence, the increase of ethnic and religious diversity, financial reduction, and the rise of academic entrepreneurialism.
Knight & de Wit (1995) classify the political and economic rationales including arguments related to economic growth and investment in the future economy, the labor market, foreign policy, financial incentives and national educational demand. Educational and cultural rationales include development of the individual, integration of the international dimension to research and teaching, institution building, and quality improvement. Also, Blumenthal et al. (1996) discern that internationalization policy can have political, economic, educational, cultural or academic, scientific and technological dimensions. In a later study, Knight (1997) clusters rationales for internationalization into four groups: political, economic, academic and cultural/social. A better understanding of the rationales for the internationalization of higher education will contribute to a better understanding of what exactly it means to internationalize, and how to integrate the international dimension into higher education.

The political rationale relates to issues concerning the country’s position and role as a nation in the world. Examples include security, stability and peace, ideological influence, etc. Knight (1997) wrote that “education, especially higher education, is often considered as a form of diplomatic investment for future political and economic relations” (p. 9). As for the economic rationale, Knight (1997) refers to objectives related to either the long-term economic effects, where internationalization of higher education is seen as a contribution to the skilled human resources needed for international competitiveness of the nation, and where foreign graduates are seen as keys to the country’s trade relations, or to the direct economic benefits, for instance, institutional income and net economic effect of foreign students, etc.
The academic rationale includes objectives related to the aims and functions of higher education. It is often assumed that by enhancing the international dimension of teaching, research and service, there is value added to the quality of higher education. Linked to the notion of enhancing the quality of education is the idea that internationalization is often a positive change agent for institution building. Knight (1997) considers that international activities may serve as “catalysts for major institutional planning/review exercises, or help with institution building through the enhancement of the human, technical or management infrastructure systems” (p. 10).

The cultural/social rationale concentrates on the role and place of the country’s own culture and language, and on the importance of understanding foreign languages and culture. Knight (1997) says that “the preservation and promotion of national culture …, the acknowledgement of cultural and ethnic diversity within and between countries are considered as a strong rationale for the internationalization of a nation’s education system” (p. 11). Related to this point is the need for improved intercultural understanding and communication. The preparation of graduates with a strong knowledge and skill base in intercultural relations and communication is becoming the barest necessity of higher education.

In the past decade, scholars have observed a shifting emphasis in rationales (Knight, 2004; van Vught, van der Wende & Westerheijden, 2002; de Wit, 2000, 2002). Knight (2004) emphasizes the significant changes in nature and priorities within each generic category presenting the four categories of existing rationales (see Table 1 for the rationales driving internationalization). The table highlights “some of the new emerging rationales at the national level that cannot be neatly placed” (p. 22) in one of the four
existing groups. These cross-cutting rationales involve human resources development: brain power, strategic alliances, commercial trade, nation building, and social/cultural development. When analyzing rationales, it is also necessary to take into account the diverse stakeholder groups within higher education: the government, the educational sector, and the private sector (Knight, 2004; de Wit, 2002).

The government sector includes different levels of government ranging from supranational to national, regional and local bodies. de Wit (2002) sees a trend away from national governments towards regional bodies, for example, the European Union, and other international entities like the United Nations. Different stakeholder groups have a vested interest in the international dimension of higher education. The educational sector includes the different types of institutions (colleges, institutes, polytechnics, universities) which make up an educational system; the scholarly research and discipline groups; the professional and membership associations; the students, teachers and researchers, and administrators; and other advocacy or issue groups (de Wit, 2002). The private sector is a heterogeneous group, owing to the varied interests of the manufacturing, service or trade companies, the nature of their products and services as well as their geographical interests. Another influencing factor is the size of the company and whether it is local, national or transnational in ownership (de Wit, 2002).

Beside the shifts in rationales, it is necessary to keep in mind (de Wit, 1999), first, that there is a strong overlap in rationales within and between different stakeholder groups. The main difference is the hierarchy of priorities. Different stakeholders attribute different levels of importance to the four major rationales. Second, stakeholders, in general, have a combination of rationales for internationalization. Third, it is important to
recognize the differences and similarities in motivations for internationalization within a single sector and between the groups. For example, the rationale of personal development for a student may be different from the rationale of national security for a government or the labor market argument for a private company. However, it is worth noting whether the difference in the level of importance is a reason for conflict or collaboration among the stakeholder groups, and, hence, whether it weakens or strengthens the position for the international dimension. Since rationales are crucial and fundamental for the internationalization of higher education, the ‘why’ question needs to be explicitly formulated. Therefore, it is important for an individual, institution or national body belonging to any of the sector groups to analyze the diversity and/or homogeneity of the rationales and assess the potential for the conflicts or complementation of the goals.

**Internationalization: Evolution of the Concept**

The purpose of this section is to present an overview of the evolution of the concept of ‘internationalization’ in perspective to approaches and other terms used, and to suggest a tool for the development of international competence. Knight (2004) notes that the popularity of internationalization in higher education “has really soared since the early 80s. Prior to this time, international education was a favored term” (p. 9). de Wit (2002) made a comprehensive overview of the development and the use of the terms internationalization, international education, comparative education, and other related terms mainly used in the last decade.

In the late 1980s, internationalization was ordinarily defined at the institutional level and in terms of an activity approach. For example, it refers to “the multiple activities, programs, and services that fall within international studies, international
educational exchange and technical cooperation” (Arum & van de Water, 1992, p. 202). Knight (1994) introduces a process and organizational approach. Internationalization is interpreted as “the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution” (Knight, 1994, p. 7). However, van der Wende (1997) argues that an institutional-based definition is a limited understanding of the concept and therefore suggests a broader definition where internationalization is “any systematic, sustained efforts aimed at making higher education responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy and labor markets” (p. 19). This definition, in contrast, positions only an external environment, specifically globalization. Because of the number of different interpretations, de Wit (2002) underlined that:

as the international dimension of higher education gains more attention and recognition, people tend to use it in the way that best suits their purpose. ... Even if there is no agreement on a precise definition, internationalization needs to have parameters if it is to be assessed and to advance higher education. This is why the use of a working definition in a combination with a conceptual framework for internationalization of higher education is relevant. (p.114)

Knight (2003) proposes a new working definition that acknowledges national/sector and institutional levels and the integral relationship between them. Internationalization is understood as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education (Knight, 2003, p. 2). The new definition addresses the changing environment where the national/sector level is very important and has a great influence
on the international dimension of higher education through policy, funding, programs, and regulatory frameworks. In her opinion, there is no conflict with the previous definition (Knight, 1994); they are both very complementary.

Knight (2004) notes that there are a small number of academics who seriously study the nuances and evolution of the term itself given the changes and challenges that are before us. However, it is very important to have a common understanding of the term so that when the phenomenon is discussed and analyzed there is an understanding and common reference to it when advocating for increased attention and support from policy makers and academic leaders (Knight, 2004).

de Wit (2002) concludes that internationalization of higher education has not yet been recognized as a research field because of the lack of a strong research traditions and the fact that internationalization is an interdisciplinary field of study. In spite of the lack of internationalization theory one has to take into account that “students affairs divisions and academic departments exist for one primary reason – so that student can learn. ... learning remains at the core.” (Schroeder, 2003, quoted in Komives, Woodward & Associates, 2003, p. 633). One could make a statement, that as a process, the internationalization of student affairs is characterized by specific trends, such as multiculturalism and the appreciation of differences and similarities, issues such as the need for more international student affairs graduate preparation programs, and the lack of resources.

The American Council on Education (ACE) states that “without international competence, the nation’s standard of living is threatened and its competitive difficulties will increase. Unless today’s students develop the competence to function effectively in a
global environment, they are unlikely to succeed in the twenty-first century” (Hayward, 1995, p. 1). ACE further notes that the level of competence should be integral to the educational experience and stressed that the United States needs to be producing more knowledgeable undergraduates and graduates who also understand global systems through exposure to different languages, cultures and peoples. It is critical that the international dimension relates to all aspects of higher education and the role it plays in society. For this reason, it is crucial to connect the global with national and local vision. There are special ‘tools’ available to assist faculty in creating curriculum so that students can become internationally competent.

I argue that one such ‘tool’ is transformative education. Keeling (2004) states that, “transformative education transcends earlier ideas about learning and development with a unified theory of learning that questions the structure of most institutions of higher education. In the transformative paradigm, the purpose of educational involvement is the evolution of multidimensional identity, including but not limited to cognitive, affective, behavioral and spiritual development” (p. 12). Thus, each institution should be designed as an integrated system, the purpose of which should be to encourage learning in various contexts throughout and beyond the campus. Transformative education is in unison with the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (Bennett, 1993), that allows “educators … to sequence activities in ways that facilitate development toward more sensitive stages” (p. 24). This model describes the stages of an individual’s transitions from an ethnocentric perspective towards ethnorelativism, and emphasizes the phenomenology of difference, construing of difference, and ethical choices. It is well presented in Erica Thompson’s integrative paper (Thompson, 2007). Now that we have
examined why to internationalize and what it means to internationalize higher education, the analysis moves on to a discussion of how to internationalize a university campus, and focuses on the organizational models for internationalization of higher education institutions.

Organizational Models for the Internationalization of Higher Education

Different rationales and approaches lead to different international programs, organizational strategies and models. The purpose of this section is to critically analyze five different organizational models for the internationalization of higher education. The first three from this list are mentioned as the basis for further attempts to give structure to the organizational aspects for integrating the international dimension into HED. The last two are presented in more detail because they correlate with our interpretation of the internationalization of higher education as a process based on the cited readings and author’s personal and professional observation.

First, Rudzki (1995) develops a more programmatic approach to strategies of internationalization and tries to provide a framework for assessing levels of international activity within institutions. Second, Davies’s (1992) focuses on the organizational strategies as a starting point in response to changes in the external environment. It is very useful for a first rough assessment of the present organizational strategy for the internationalization of an institution, and where it wants to go. Third, van Dijk and Meijer (1997) introduce three dimensions of internationalization: policy (the importance attached to internationalization aims), support (the type of support for internationalization activities), and implementation (method of implementation). According to their study a policy can be marginal or a priority, the support can be one-sided or interactive, and the
implementation can be ad hoc or systematic. The fourth model is by van der Wende (1996) and is based on the process approach to internationalization. The fifth model by Knight’s (1994) stresses the internationalization process as a continuous circle.

de Wit (2002) considers the first three approaches (Rudzki, Davies, and van Dijk and Meijer) to the theoretical modeling of internationalization by institutions as complements of one another in their prescriptive and descriptive aspects. He ascertains that they offer a means of measuring the formal, paper commitments of institutions against the practice to be found in concrete operating structures. Further, they offer a way to include in the theoretical frame the important fact that institutional strategies may be implicit as well as explicit.

The following two models by van der Wende (1996) and Knight (1994) focus on the process of internationalization as a whole. In van der Wende’s (1996) model, the scholar identifies three important factors. First, she starts with goals and strategies as defined by the institution itself and by (inter)national policies. Second, she emphasizes the implementation of these goals and strategies, for which she identifies three categories including student mobility, staff mobility, and curriculum development. Finally, she specifies the effects of the implementation on the short term for students, staff, and education, and the long term for the quality of education, output, and position of the institution. In her view, an evaluation of the effects should have consequences for redefining goals and strategies (see Appendix A for this model).

t van der Wende (1996), who originally developed the model for the Netherlands Foundation for International Cooperation in Higher Education, notes that the model concentrates on educational aspects of internationalization, excluding other aspects such
as research and technical assistance. She also comments on her own model stating that it is too narrow in its description of motives, using only definitions from formal policy documents and that it suggests that institutional policies are mainly inspired by (supra)national governmental policies, ignoring other factors.

Knight (1993) suggests an alternative approach to the development of organizational models and considers the internationalization process as a continuous cycle, not a linear or static process. In her internationalization cycle, she identifies six phases in the process of integrating the international dimensions into the university-college culture and administrative systems (Knight 1993). Six cycle phases include awareness, commitment, planning, operations, review, and reinforcement.

Continuing the research into internationalization of higher education, Jane Knight (1994) has combined the six phase elements of Knight (1993) with van der Wende (1996) three elements of the analysis of context, implementation, and long-term effects. It has resulted in a modified version of the internationalization circle (see Appendix B for the phases of the circle). This model incorporates context analysis, the implementation phase, and the effect of internationalization on the overall functions of the institution. Moreover, the institutional and the specific departmental aspects, as well as the link between the two are addressed in all phases. In addition, the specific circumstances of disciplines and departments get enough attention and are not forced into the general structure.

Analyzing Knight’s (1994) modified version of the internationalization circle, de Wit (2002) stresses the integration effect. In his opinion, in those cases where the main emphasis is on the integrative factor of internationalization, that is, internationalization as a strategy becomes a key factor in the overall strategy of an institution and/or department;
the internationalization circle becomes part of an overall planning circle of the institution, with the integration phase as the central link. In this way, internationalization is no longer a part of an external relations policy, but is an integral element of educational development and innovation.

The question of theory versus practice is always of crucial importance because one of the primary goals of higher education is to form theory-to-practice connections. Theory is simply a theory and can only be corroborated by best practices. Regardless of the fact that universities are culturally specific, especially in terms of decision-making processes, one can observe the models of internationalization at work at some leading American universities as noted in Appendix F of the Report of the Presidential Task Force on Internationalization of the University of Utah (Adams, et al., 2006) and critically apply their good practices. These models include the University of Minnesota, the University of California-Los Angeles, the University of Washington – Seattle, the University of Washington, the University of North Carolina, and the University of California – San Diego.

Considering the analysis and information presented in this part regarding the shifting rationales for internationalization of higher education, evolution of the internationalization concept and developing organizational models, one could argue that HEIs need to be well aware of these current evolutionary processes. Internationalization, being primarily a vehicle for change in higher education, is changing its concept. I argue that, if developed and implemented correctly, taking into account its evolutionary aspect, auspicious outcomes will occur. Internationalization is a many-sided, inclusive phenomenon and the integration of the international dimension into higher education
needs to be planned, explicitly and implicitly motivated, understandable and well modeled.

Implications of the Literature

Based on the literature review, a number of assumptions and conclusions can be made to inform higher education institutions of the potential impact the integration of the international dimension can have on a campus as a whole and, in particular, on students, faculty, and staff. Rationales, the meaning and the organizational models of internationalization in light of new realities were reexamined. Key notions utilized to study and analyze the international dimension are complex, multifaceted, diverse, controversial, changing, and challenging. These attributes represent a mosaic of internationalization as a phenomenon that is evolving on many fronts both as a leader and a follower in the new realities higher education is facing.

The purpose of the implications section is to answer the ‘so what’ question and identify some of the issues that arise from the new conceptual frameworks that will need to be addressed as we deal with the next developmental phase of internationalization and the next decade of changes and challenges. The following concerns and assumptions are presented according to the structure of this paper: the rationales (the why), meaning (the what), and organizational models (the how) of integrating the international dimension into higher education. Although the list is not meant to be comprehensive, it attempts to illustrate the complexities and implications of the important phenomenon of internationalization and point the way to further study.

*Higher education institutions must adequately react to constantly changing realities and changes in rationales, and, hence, clearly articulate their own rationales for*
Internationalization. Knight & de Wit (1999); van Vught, van der Wende & Westerheijden (2002); de Wit (1995), (2002) all state that the rationales are changing both within and between four generic categories: political, economic, academic, and social/cultural. The increasing emphasis on competition at the international level requires that higher education institutions develop a strong international reputation and brand themselves as such. Higher education institutions have always been competitive trying to achieve high academic standards and international profile. However, one can observe a real shift towards higher education institutions developing an international reputation to successfully compete in a more competitive environment. This results in higher education institutions competing for market shares in the recruitment of international, fee-paying students, in the offering of for-profit educational and training programs, and in the selling educational programs like language testing or accreditation. To achieve a more desirable position for competitive advantage across disciplines, higher education institutions must undertake serious efforts to create an international reputation.

In addition, differing and competing rationales contribute to both the complexity of the international dimension of education and the substantial contributions that internationalization makes. In spite of the complexity of individual rationales, and because policies, programs, strategies, and outcomes are all linked and guided by explicit and even implicit rationales, it is of fundamental importance for higher education institutions to be very clear in articulating their motivations for internationalization. Referring to the ‘internationalization circle’ (Knight, 1994), higher education institutions must start by analyzing the external and internal context in policy documents and
statements to be aware of the need, purpose and benefits of internationalization for students, staff, and faculty.

Higher education institutions must clearly identify and comprehensively define ‘their’ internationalization in order to clarify the confusion and misunderstanding that currently exist. Different interpretations of the internationalization concept in higher education lead to the confusion and misunderstanding of the term. They make obstacles and hurdles in discussions and debates of the phenomenon of internationalization at national, regional and institutional levels. Consequently, higher education institutions’ administrations must realize the myriad of factors both internal and external affecting internationalization, and the accelerated pace of changes. It is crucially important to be aware of the fact that the realities of today’s context must be involved in our understanding of the internationalization of higher education. Because of the growing number and diversity of education providers that have different interests and approaches to international, intercultural, and global dimensions, higher education institutions must clearly specify their understanding of more generic terms of purpose, function, and delivery of higher education instead of or in addition to the specific functional terms of teaching, service, and research.

Clearly articulated rationales and a well-defined meaning of internationalization in higher education lead higher education institutions to an appropriate organizational model to support their institutional efforts. In view of the organizational models of integrating the international dimension into higher education previously cited, higher education institutions are well advised to follow a number of the ‘how’ principles to make their institutional networks successfully operate. As van Ginkel (1998) pointed out,
the “coordinating capacity” of the institution to “link the outside network with the inside matrix, the environment with the invironment” (p. 40) is a determining factor for the success of integrating the international dimension into a university relationship. It is worth emphasizing that one of the effective theoretical ways of integrating the international dimension into higher education is through the ‘internationalization circle’ offered by Knight (1994). This organizational model allows higher education institutions to incorporate the efficacy of internationalization on the overall functions of the institution.

To resolve the internationalization challenges, student affairs practitioners and academic affairs should also use some guiding documents, such as The Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs (ACPA & NASPA, 1997), Powerful Partnerships: A Shared Responsibility for Learning (NASPA, 1998), and a central tenant, The Student Learning Imperative (ACPA, 1994). These directive documents demonstrate collaborative partnerships as strategies for bridging the great divide comprehending common purpose, joint planning, assessment and implementation, new perspectives, and reasonable risks, senior administrators’ commitment to developing, nurturing, and sustaining partnerships and perseverance, and tenacity in pursuit of goals.

Integration of the international dimension into higher education is a very complicated and time-consuming process; hence, leadership is called upon to play a crucial and vital role from reconceptualization to implementation of internationalization through remodeling the institutional framework. “Leadership is the answer to everything” (Collins, 2001, p. 21). Leaders are a key to large-scale, sustainable education change. Senior leaders must commit by way of a mission statement in terms of rationale, goals,
and objectives as well as a strategic plan to appropriately plan, evaluate, and ensure quality. Internationalization of a campus also needs the active involvement of faculty, staff and students. In fact, true long-term integration changes call for well thought-out leadership strategies that could design the internationalization of a campus. Fullan (2002) suggests “five essential components that characterize leaders in the knowledge society: moral purpose, an understanding of the change process, the ability to improve relationships, knowledge creation and sharing, and coherence making” (p.17). I would compare leadership with the “human mind” – a metaphor used by Anna Neumann for viewing individual members’ roles on the team. On the way to internationalizing a campus, higher education institutions should “learn in the team and by the team” (Neuman, 1991, p. 506).

Leaders as designers must identify needs and resources, develop a purpose and objectives, and create priorities and strategies. The traditional SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis (Bryson, 2004) can start with big questions, such as: What would it mean to have every resource and structure of our university integrate into the international dimension? What characteristics of our administrative structure make it harder for us to emphasize the international dimension? What obstacles impede our ability to make the whole campus an international community? Leaders also have the responsibility of designing incentives, recognition, and rewards for faculty, staff and student participation.

*Educational excellence must be taken into account. Assessment must be used to guarantee appropriate and preferable outcomes linked to internationalization.* All that we do in higher education must be for the sake of students’ good learning. Consequently,
a student centered system can only be achieved if the opinion of students is a central element in all debates and discussions. Before starting to internationalize a campus, higher education institutions need to analyze the context of the campus and listen to the stakeholders and especially, the students, faculty and staff. They may perceive and interpret the institutional in- and environment differently from the senior administrators. This could be done by developing some quantitative and qualitative surveys, and focus group analyses. A commitment and engagement to internationalize successfully needs to go in both the top-down and bottom-up directions. “In response to assessed student needs, Multicultural Student Programs and Services must play a principal role in creating and implementing institutional policies and programs” (CAS, 2008, p.262). Student affairs practitioners and academic affairs should also refer to student learning outcomes as in Keeling (2004) and a series of surveys conducted by ACE (Siaya & Hayward, 2003) to examine the status of internationalization in U.S. postsecondary education. The findings will surely assist educators in creating and implementing assessments and evaluations.

Higher education institutions having decided to internationalize must emphasize the integrative factor of internationalization. In view of the best practices of integrating the international dimension into a campus, it is worthwhile to appoint a deputy vice chancellor or pro vice chancellor with specific responsibilities for policy development and priority setting for all international activities. These activities must broadly include research collaboration, institutional links and exchanges, curriculum development, student recruitment, offshore activities, and international projects. To commit the academic and administrative resources of an higher education institution it is very
reasonable to establish an international committee to create a horizontal slice across a university’s traditionally vertical organizational structure.

Research on internationalization is lacking and it needs to be expanded.

Comparative studies on the internationalization of specific academic fields and in the field of student affairs are underrepresented in research on internationalization. Kerr (1994) makes some interesting observations on this topic. He identifies three types of areas: areas of worldwide uniformity in the content of knowledge, areas of intercultural similarity of knowledge, and areas of intranational particularity. Taking into account that current studies assume too much homogeneity among the disciplines, while in reality there are big differences in rationales, meanings and models, de Wit (2002) considers further comparative studies on this issue very necessary and useful. Higher education institutions need to learn from one another about potential insufficiencies and benefits connected with integrating the international dimension into a campus. Hence, educators and student affairs practitioners should conduct studies and assessments of higher education institution practices related to internationalization.

NAFSA, The Association for International Educators, and NASPA, Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, provide their platforms for sharing best practices. For example, NAFSA provides access to best practices in internationalization “Internationalizing the Campus: Profiles of Success at Colleges and Universities”. NASPA also supports the International Education Knowledge Community, which holds an international symposium as a part of the association’s annual meeting. Conferences, workshops and seminars are available for administrators, educators, and student affairs practitioners (refer to www.nafsa.org and www.naspa.org for further information).
Administrators, faculty and student affairs practitioners should be aware of the literature examined in this paper since it can assist their efforts in integrating the international dimension into higher education.

The purpose of this paper has been to reexamine the rationales for internationalization of higher education, the evolution of the concept of internationalization, and the organizational models of integrating the international dimension into higher education in the light of new realities. I hope that the literature presented in this paper will equip higher education institutions starting to internationalize their campuses with special knowledge about internationalization as an evolving phenomenon. As internationalization is a key to preparing the next generation (see Appendix C for NAFSA 2005 poll findings), the evolution of the rationales for internationalization, its concept and organizational models must be acknowledged and taken into account. In fact, much can be learned from a thorough analysis of the why, what and how as we examine the dynamic internal and external relationship of internationalization of higher education.

The complexity involved in the field of internationalization requires an additional set of knowledge, attitudes, skills, and understanding about the international, intercultural and global dimension of higher education. How these competencies are developed and recognized for and by policy makers, administrators, academics and student affairs practitioners engaged in the field of internationalization of higher education in many respects will determine the success of integrating the international dimension into higher education.
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Table 1: Rationales Driving Internationalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationales</th>
<th>Existing – National and Institutional Levels Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Social/cultural | National cultural identity  
|                | Intercultural understanding  
|                | Citizenship development  
|                | Social and community development |
| Political      | Foreign policy  
|                | National security  
|                | Technical assistance  
|                | Peace and mutual understanding  
|                | National identity  
|                | Regional identity |
| Economic       | Economic growth and competitiveness  
|                | Labor market  
|                | Financial incentives |
| Academic       | International dimension to research and teaching  
|                | Extension of academic horizon  
|                | Institutional building  
|                | Profile and status  
|                | Enhancement of quality  
|                | International academic standards |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Of Emerging Importance – National and Institutional Levels Separated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| National                  | Human resources development  
|                            | Strategic alliances  
|                            | Commercial trade  
|                            | Nation building  
|                            | Social/cultural development |
| Institutional             | International branding and profile  
|                            | Income generation  
|                            | Student and staff development  
|                            | Strategic alliances  
|                            | Knowledge production |

APPENDIX A: NUFFIC\(^2\) MODEL FOR INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION


\(^2\)NUFFIC: Netherlands Foundation for International Cooperation in Higher Education
APPENDIX B: INTERNATIONALIZATION CIRCLE

8. Reinforcement
Develop incentives, recognition, and rewards for faculty, staff, and student participation

1. Analysis of context
Analyze the external and internal context in policy documents and statements

2. Awareness of need, purpose, and benefits of internationalization for students, staff, faculty, society

3. Commitment by senior administration, board of governors, faculty and staff, students

4. Planning
Identify needs and resources, purpose and objectives, priorities, strategies

5. Operationalize
- academic activities and services
- organizational factors
- use guiding principles

6. Implementation
Implementation of program and organizational strategies

7. Review
Assess and enhance quality and impact of initiatives and progress of strategy

9. Integration effect
Impact on teaching, research and service function

Internationalization Circle

Note: All phases address both the institution- and department-specific aspects and the relation between the two.

Source: Jane Knight, Internationalization: Elements and Checkpoints, CBIE Research paper no. 7 (Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education, 1994), 12.
APPENDIX C: NAFSA: ASSOCIATION OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATORS

2005 POLL

American Public: International Education is Key to Preparing Next Generation.

WASHINGTON, January 11, 2006 Americans in overwhelming numbers believe that international education is a key to preparing their children for success in the global age. They believe that foreign language skills will make their children more competitive in the job market, and they feel it is important for the next generation to have the opportunity to study abroad and to interact with students from other countries while in college.

These are the findings of a new national survey commissioned by NAFSA: Association of International Educators, which polled more than 1,000 adults representing a broad cross-section of the American public during the first week of December 2005.

Among the highlights of Americans' attitudes toward international education:

- 90% believe it is “important” or “very important” to prepare future generations of Americans for a global society;
- 92% agree that knowledge of other languages will give future generations a competitive advantage in career opportunities;
- 77% feel it is important for future generations to participate in study abroad programs in college;
- 86% believe it is important for their children and grandchildren to attend a college where they can interact with and get to know students from other countries;
- 94% feel it is important for future generations to have knowledge of other countries and cultures.
Past surveys have confirmed that Americans value international education. This latest survey reveals a dramatic public consensus about its perceived importance. The consistency of responses across demographic lines is especially striking. Irrespective of age, gender, race, geographic region, household income, or level of education, Americans are remarkably strong in their conviction that international education programs and preparedness for a global society are important.

Action on these two critical fronts will go a long way toward responding to the American public’s call to ensure that the country is well-prepared for the global challenges of an increasingly competitive and interconnected world. To review the full survey report, access http://www.nafsa.org/nationalsurvey