

Chapter 5

The Internationalization of the University as a Response to Globalization: An East Asian Perspective

Akiyoshi Yonezawa

5.1 Introduction

The history of universities and modern higher education systems has been inevitably linked with the formation and development of the nation states. When starting the Bologna Process for forming the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), Neave (2001) mentioned a much longer process towards the “de-Europeanization” of higher education, namely, a process of gradual enclosure of universities into prospective nation states in Europe, beginning roughly during the Protestant Reformation and continuing until the end of the twentieth century. Altbach and Selvaratnam (1989) interpreted the development of Asian higher education systems after World War II as a dichotomy between dependence and autonomy, linked with the process of decolonization and formation of the nation states in this region. Nowadays, some East Asian countries, such as Korea, Singapore, and China, are becoming good models for pursuing the establishment of world-class status for their flagship universities, supported by strong governmental initiatives (Altbach and Balán 2007; Altbach and Salmi 2011).

On the other hand, the pressure of globalization on higher education is huge. Knight’s widely used definition of internationalization of higher education—the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions, or delivery of higher/post-secondary education—certainly reflects the increasing impact of globalization (Knight 2006). The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) argues that the approach to internationalization differs among countries (Santiago et al. 2008). However, Brandenburg and de Wit (2011) argue about “the end of internationalization of higher education,” reflecting on the changing nature of the internationalization

A. Yonezawa (✉)
Graduate School of International Development, Nagoya University, Furo-cho, Chikusa-ku,
Nagoya 464-8601, Japan
e-mail: yonezawa@gsid.nagoya-u.ac.jp

(1) from fringe of institutional interest to core; (2) from elite to mass; (3) from substance to form; and (4) from innovation to tradition.

In the twentieth century, we observed an expansion of higher education systems, first as a tool for colonization and then for decolonization. Global and regional collaboration in higher education has been strongly linked to the establishment of these new independent nation states, the rapid progress of internationalization, and the emergence of regional dimensions of higher education under globalization since the end of the twentieth century. At the same time, the development of a knowledge economy transformed the nature of higher education into a tradable service, as well as a platform for skill formation, which made knowledge workers mobile across borders. Internationalization, international collaboration, and the value of higher education should be reconsidered as more embedded in mutual reliance across borders among various stakeholders, such as academics, students, states, and industries.

Higher education research also faces the necessity of a paradigm change. We may take up Clark's triangle of coordination (state–university–market) (Clark 1983) and Trow's elite–mass–universal model (Burrage 2010) as two of the most influential models of higher education research in the latter half of the twentieth century. These two models were formulated when the idea of the nation state was most widely spread among both industrial countries and newly started nations as a result of decolonization. After that, many higher education researchers tried to refer to and challenge these established models. One approach is to point out the increasing impact of international dimensions in higher education. Marginson and Rhoades (2002) challenged Clark's triangle, and proposed a “glo-na-cal (global–national–local)” heuristic as a model for explaining higher education in the twenty-first century. Later, Marginson explored the behaviors of world-class or global research universities that act beyond the nation state (Marginson 2012). On the other hand, internationalization could work differently according to the national context. Referring mainly to European countries, Teichler (1999) developed a typology of internationalization of higher education as: (1) would-be internationalization; (2) internationalization for survival; (3) internationalization in two arenas; and (4) internationalization at home. Considering the actual realization of the EHEA through the Bologna Process, European countries may, to a greater or lesser extent, move towards internationalization for survival.

Higher education has now become a core knowledge industry, indispensable in the globalized economy. The functions of higher education have expanded from the union of academics, producing technocrats and professionals, contributing to society through knowledge creation and innovation, and serving education and others as a knowledge service industry. Especially among English-speaking countries, governments today are willing to protect higher education as a major export industry.

In this chapter, the author analyzes the past events, current trends, and future prospects of global and regional collaboration in higher education linked with the emergence of international dimensions. By doing so, the author argues on the future perspective of the regional and global collaboration in higher education for the sustainable development of higher education systems around the world.

5.2 Internationalization, Globalization, and Mobility

5.2.1 Emergence of International Dimensions

The most important feature of higher education in the twenty-first century has been the emergence and increasing importance of the international dimension. This can be observed in various ways. The first simple feature is a removal of barriers to cross-border mobility. In some aspects, the mobility of academics, students, and education service provisions across borders has led to concerns about quantity, and this mobility is not limited to the elite. On the other hand, the majority of students and academics do not move across borders.

The second feature is an uncontrollable expansion of and increased concern for the quality of higher education. According to the UNESCO Institute of Education, student numbers in tertiary education globally increased from 100 million in 2000 to 178 million in 2010. On the other hand, some countries such as Japan (4.0 million in 2000 and 3.9 million in 2010) and Korea (3.0 million in 2000 and 3.3 million in 2010) maintained stable trends in student numbers. When Trow's model was developed in the mid-1970s, most industrial countries tried to control the expansion of the university sector. Today, most countries, instead, compete for widening participation in higher education and seek further expansion of higher education at both undergraduate and graduate levels in order to assure the employability of their citizens in a globalized economy. On the other hand, this uncontrollable expansion leads to a concern about the quality of education services, as well as a decreased readiness for learning among students.

The third feature is the increasing mutual reliance across borders. It is becoming common for "world-class" or "global research" universities to participate in international university consortiums for academic and student exchange. Among the middle-range and more mass-oriented universities, commercial-oriented transnational education provisions are widely observed in various forms, from short-term study abroad programs to degree-oriented twinning arrangements. In countries faced with an oversupply of higher education, such as Korea and Japan, the absorption of international students compensates for the oversupply of the domestic higher education market. This, in some aspects, modifies the imbalance of learning opportunities at the global level. Various types of public and private agents or brokers collaborate on the recruitment of students internationally.

5.2.2 Constructing a New Reality Under Globalization

As Knight (2006) mentions, the internationalization of higher education is understood as a process to integrate global dimensions into higher education. Here, the standardization of higher education under globalization is frequently cautioned against. If globalization leads to the removal of barriers between different higher

education systems, a certain type of standardization is inevitable for facilitating the mobility of academics, students, and education services. The formation of regional dimensions might be utilized as a tool for protecting diversity among higher education systems against standardization under the pressure of globalization. In the globalized world, standardization tends to be processed through market forces rather than supranational-level policy actions or treaties by international organizations. The regional-level initiatives prefer the term “harmonization.” Here, the prospective higher education systems respect mutual differences and facilitate international arenas through mutual recognition.

In Europe especially, the idea and reality of higher education as public goods is strong (Marginson and van der Wende 2007). Even now, European private higher education is highly peripheral, and the marketization and privatization of higher education common to Asia-Pacific is almost not applicable, at least within Europe. However, some higher education systems in Europe recruit international students on a full-fee basis (Kim 2011). These initiatives might be mentioned as commercial provisions for higher education outside of regional systems.

Conversely, the pursuit of public value in higher education does exist, even in a highly marketized and privatized context in the Asia-Pacific region. Intensive public investment in flagship universities is an especially common feature in the majority of Asia-Pacific countries. These universities produce national leaders and senior government officials and support the science and technology of the country, and the students and alumni receive respect from the general public.

Globalization removes the national boundary of competition. This creates enormous pressure for national flagship universities in Asia-Pacific. These universities have to compete globally while being strongly supported by the government and industry at home. Fierce competition encourages collaboration and partnerships among universities, governments, and industries, both domestically and internationally. This collaboration and partnership, in many cases, promotes the universities’ public missions, especially among prestigious ones.

5.2.3 Incentives for Study Abroad

The global competition in higher education has various effects. One relates to the intention and phenomena of brain gain and brain circulation (Lee and Kim 2010). Public universities, especially flagship ones, and governments that seek competition within the knowledge economy try to gain the best talent domestically as well as globally. On the other hand, some universities try to attract full-fee-paying learners both domestically and globally, and governments also support this as a promising knowledge industry.

Universities may try to provide opportunities of study abroad and international experiences for their students and academics. Firstly, international experience itself can be an end goal for many students and academics. Opportunities of study and research abroad are still privileges for the elites in developing countries. For those

in advanced and emerging economies, the international experience itself became widely available. However, at least the initial experience of those international exchanges should be recognized as a major event to enrich the individual lives of students and academics.

Secondly, some universities promote study abroad and international experience in order for students to be aware of “the real world.” For wealthy universities and colleges, such as top private universities and liberal arts colleges in the USA, financial resources are not an obstacle to providing international opportunities. The students do not need better learning circumstances, except for a closer link with the real world that is different from their beautiful campus life.

Thirdly, some students may seek quality learning opportunities unavailable in their home institutions or countries. Considering the nature of higher education institutions as positional goods, most students tend to seek opportunities to make use of partnerships with more prestigious, centrally located institutions. This creates an imbalance in student mobility.

Fourthly, some students seek opportunities for training in international communication, multicultural understanding, and leadership. This may be a mainstream mission for student exchange at the undergraduate level, typically among industrialized countries.

Lastly, career mobilization has become a widely shared incentive for both academics and students. Many enterprises and universities operate across borders. Job opportunities are generally more numerous for those who can work in an international environment.

5.3 International Collaboration and Partnership

5.3.1 International Collaboration in Asia-Pacific Higher Education

When discussing international cooperation in Asia-Pacific higher education, the experience of colonization must be considered. The origins of higher education systems in Asia-Pacific largely lay in the expansion of higher education systems in the suzerain states. The influence of the British higher education system is seen especially in Hong Kong, Singapore, Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia, India, and others. France and the Netherlands also influenced the formation of higher education in Asia. Japan, a former colonizer in Taiwan, Korea, and elsewhere, still has a sensitive position in international collaboration in higher education, which partly began as war compensation. Some argue that the expansion of the Japanese higher education system under colonization was the indirect implantation of the German Humboldt model into Asian countries.

The USA was a colonizer of the Philippines, but more influential in many countries during their move to independence. Especially during the Cold War, the

USA supported the development of higher education in many countries through their soft-power policies. The influence of US higher education is widely seen in the Philippines, Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Indonesia, and others. The former Soviet Union also influenced the development of higher education systems, such as those in China and Vietnam. In addition, British Commonwealth countries have collaborated mutually under the Colombo Plan, of which Japan also joined in 1955.

5.3.2 Nature of International Collaboration and Partnerships in Higher Education

The international collaboration and partnerships in higher education could be understood as an action of sharing resources of higher education across borders. Through the efforts to provide basic education for all, the demand for higher learning and actual student enrolment into higher education have continuously risen. Thus, higher education systems and institutions face continuous financial stringency at the global level.

Although some emerging economies, such as Malaysia and Indonesia, have increased investment into their top universities, these investments are not sufficient to compete with established institutions in the advanced economy in North America and Europe, or even with top Asian universities in, for example, Singapore and Hong Kong. Among the top global universities, there are many initiatives for setting up partnership and consortiums with the sharing of equipment, facilities, and infrastructures, both on-site and at home. Human resources are also shared for teaching, knowledge and skill transfer, and mutual capacity development.

International cooperation for system design, planning, administration, and the operation of higher education policies and institutions is also common. For example, the World Bank and Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC) implemented sector-wide studies of higher education in Indonesia and others in the beginning of the twenty-first century. The involvement of local stakeholders in these projects was aimed to develop their capacity in the strategic planning of higher education. Through various projects, the World Bank and Asian Development Bank (ADB), as well as the OECD and UNESCO, have also supported capacity development in the quality assurance of higher education in collaboration with the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE), the worldwide network of quality assurance agencies, and the regional networks, such as the Asia-Pacific Quality Network (APQN). In the less developed countries, many argue that the governments and higher education institutions do not have enough capacity to operate on their own, and international collaboration is vital if resources are insufficient.

Student and academic exchange across borders is also a main activity of international collaboration. Through exchanging knowledge and skills, students and academics develop their capacity and increase their performance. Many joint research projects begin with the idea of resource sharing.

Medical scientists in industrialized countries collaborate with those in less developed (often tropical) countries in order to study unknown diseases. On the other hand, engineering departments in the industrial countries generally welcome hard-working students from developing countries. For example, the Japanese government and major universities have actively committed to set up and support the departments, schools, and even universities in the field of engineering and agriculture in Thailand, Kenya, Egypt, and others. Young faculty members of these countries have been accepted into Japanese partner universities and receive supervision for acquiring doctoral degrees from universities either in Japan or in their home countries.

In the fields of humanities and social sciences, provisions for international learning experiences and opportunities for mutual understanding are essential for future success. If working circumstances are globalized, one must be able to work with persons and groups with different cultural backgrounds. The Japanese government recently announced a policy vision to foster “global human resources” who can work and take leadership roles in multicultural settings. The governmentally supported project “Revitalizing Japan” was started in 2011 for supporting the launch of mutual student exchange with China and Korea, and ASEAN, adding the USA to these countries, is a new trial to send students of Japanese universities to Asian neighboring countries for fostering their international competence.

5.3.3 Funding and Rationales for International Collaboration in Higher Education

Funding and rationales for international collaboration are also a major issue, especially where there are severe financial constraints in the public and private sectors. The funding of international cooperation in higher education is provided by grants and loans. The rationale for grants or donations varies from one country or institution to another.

Firstly, from a diplomatic point of view, many countries provide public funding for international collaboration in higher education in order to strengthen soft power. Private enterprises also support international collaboration in higher education as part of their philanthropic activities. A more traditional approach might be collaboration for evangelistic purposes or enlightenment. Religious organizations have been active players throughout the history of universities and higher education institutions. The oldest universities in the Americas and, to some degree, in Asia have Christian origins, and some were established through collaboration between religious people across borders or under colonization. Other religious groups such as Muslims and Buddhists have also initiated similar efforts, particularly in emerging economies.

Secondly, diplomacy and peace-building on a larger scale have provided incentives for international collaboration in higher education. The ERASMUS

Programme (EuRoepan Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students) in Europe that has encouraged European-wide student exchange study abroad aims to establish peaceful relationships across the region. Many government scholarship programs for international students aim to foster the development of future leaders under the positive relationship with donor countries and institutions.

Thirdly, expansion of the international market for the home industry is also an important incentive for emerging and established countries. It is frequently observed that the donated equipment and facilities of higher education through international collaboration functions as a showcase of the industrial products of the donor country. At the same time, a non-English-speaking country such as Japan needs human resources which can understand the culture and working customs embedded in Japanese industrial states. Here, a collaboration program supported by public grants can be justified to the taxpayers as an opportunity to support the international operation of the industries of donor countries.

On the other hand, loan schemes rely more on the ownership and autonomous decision of the borrowing countries. Collaboration schemes in general are selected cautiously by the borrowing country from the viewpoint of a contribution towards, typically, its socioeconomic development. Especially for the countries that are about economic takeoff and high private demand for education, the options to increase their national debt through loan projects in the educational sector appear less attractive.

In many cases, finally, the cofunding of international collaboration is more widely seen, even, for example, middle-income countries with developed countries. There, cooperation is implemented in an equal partnership for mutual benefits.

5.4 Adding International Dimensions into Twentieth Century Frameworks

What can we learn from the ideas and practices of international collaboration and partnerships? Although faced with the emergence of international dimensions, the author will argue that the two frameworks of the twentieth century have not yet been challenged at their core.

5.4.1 Challenges to Trow's Elite–Mass–Universal Model

By utilizing Trow's "elite–mass–universal" model, we may be able to add an additional argument for internationalization. There are two routes for discussion. The first is the expansion of cross-border mobility among students and academics beyond the "elite" stage. In 2010, the number of students studying outside of their home countries was 4.1 million (OECD 2012), almost equal to the entire student

population of the Japanese higher and post-secondary education. International students and even academics are no longer the “elite” of both the sending society and the host society. This tendency is closely linked with the realization of mass and universal higher education in the respective countries. However, it is still too early to propose a consistent discussion regarding the emergence of “mass” or “universal” internationalization of higher education.

The second application of Trow’s idea is the breakdown of the methods of internationalization among different types of higher education. Trow points out the increase of diversity in mass and universal higher education systems. Namely, internationalization appears differently to elite-, mass-, and universal-type higher education institutions. For the academics and students of elite universities, an international dimension is accessible as an indispensable part of the learning and studying experience. For elite universities, all public and private stakeholders—such as national and local governments, international organizations, nongovernmental organizations, private enterprises, and even other universities—support their international collaboration and partnerships. As Marginson and van der Wende (2009) point out, higher education is positional goods, and people are willing to invest and support top institutions. In many cases, elite universities themselves have affluent resources that might also be utilized for their international activities. At the same time, these elite universities in the twenty-first century are engaged in a fierce competition for international recognition for their world-class excellence. In most academic fields, and in any fields of work for elite university graduates, international prestige is an indispensable possession.

On the other hand, among mass-oriented universities and higher education institutions, the necessity of internationalization is not always recognized as self-evident. Utilizing the case of Japan, Kudo and Hashimoto (2011) point out the existence of a large number of non-international universities. If those institutions and their academics and students can seize a secure domestic market, it is possible for them to survive without international contacts. Needless to say, this does not apply to some countries such as Singapore, where the whole city state and its population are required to study and work actively in order to sustain the state as a knowledge hub. Compared with elite institutions, mass higher education institutions have limited opportunities and resources available for international collaboration and partnership. Thus, the quality and quantity of the international experience in their academic and learning activities is less than those in elite institutions.

However, some mass-oriented universities and higher education institutions may find a specifically “international” niche market. Outside of elite university groups, many Asia-Pacific countries have international or transnational higher education institutions specifically targeting international values. This type of niche-oriented internationalization is also seen among existing elite comprehensive universities. For most established comprehensive universities, it is not easy to transform all institutions into international ones. As a result, the establishment of small, internationalized education and research programs is widely observed. However,

it is not unusual for those international programs and universities to have less prestigious status than the existing programs and universities.

Lastly, among the universal-oriented institutions, we may see some highly international institutions. The existence of universal higher education is still limited in industrialized economies such as South Korea, the USA, Japan, and Taiwan. Especially in Korea and Japan, the saturation and oversupply of the domestic higher education market is evident in the decrease of youth in the population. On the other hand, the international student market continues to develop through the involvement of nonelite students from neighboring countries, especially China. In the case of Japan, many international students learn at language schools outside of university.

At the same time, China is becoming one of the largest receiving countries of international students if we include students who study mainly the Chinese language and culture outside of the university system. The Philippines is also becoming a receiving country for international students in language schools and undergraduate programs. Students from Korea, for example, utilize these programs as inexpensive opportunities for learning the English language. Japanese nonelite students, in general, are not well prepared for studying in English-speaking countries. In recent years, these students have begun to enroll in US community colleges, which provide inexpensive and accessible learning opportunities, and then transfer to the undergraduate programs of less selective state universities.

5.4.2 Challenges to Clark's Coordination Model

Clark's triangle model (i.e., the analysis of the nature of academic systems as a coordination among three main actors: states, academics, and market) has been one of the key models of higher education research in the latter half of the twentieth century. This model basically explains a coordination within one country. Therefore, the emergence of international dimensions in higher education requires further reflection on this model. The "glo-na-cal agency heuristic" proposed by Marginson and Rhoades (2002) provides a breakthrough on the possible change of the relationship between a nation state, academics/universities, and students/markets. At least at the level of policy discussion or propaganda, many advocate the necessity that any stakeholders of higher education in one country should unite in order to adapt themselves to a globalized world. In many countries, higher education is now recognized as a major knowledge industry in both education and research, which should be protected by the government as it faces competition in a global market.

Yonezawa (2011) argued that Japanese responsiveness to the internationalization among the three players is different, and that the "glo-na-cal" agency has not yet been realized. After that, facing the pressure of globalization, the discussion about taking collective action among university, government, industry, and even students has become widely accepted under the theme of fostering next-generation "global human resources" which can work within the global economy.

Focusing on an argument at the system level, Marginson's (2011) recent work on the comparison of three higher education systems—United States, Westminster (the UK, Australia, and New Zealand), and Post-Confucian (Singapore and East Asia)—reveals a new pattern in the state's role in higher education as follows:

- US: Frames hierarchical market and steps back. Autonomous university leaders.
- Westminster: Supervises market competition, shapes outcomes indirectly. Managed autonomy.
- Post-Confucian: Supervises, expands, and drives the sector. More managed autonomy.

This could be understood as a new relationship among the three actors. Namely, the US higher education system continues to be a market-led system, as it was in Clark's original work in the 1970s. The Westminster model has now become an example of a university-led system, while we can observe a shift in the representatives of "universities" from "professors" represented by Italy to "university managers" represented by the UK. Finally, the Post-Confucian model is categorized as a new state-led system replacing the USSR in Clark's original work.

5.4.3 Dynamisms of International Collaboration and Partnership in the Asia-Pacific Region

The dynamism of international collaboration and partnership should be examined further. In East Asia especially, we are observing an emerging discussion of developing a regional arena in higher education. This, itself, reflects a structural change in this region, in terms of both socioeconomic power balance and academic reputation. In relation to socioeconomic robustness, we observe a rapid increase of leading economies in this region. This also reflects the increase of world-class universities in East Asia and Asia-Pacific.

Reflecting on these structural changes, the initiatives for international collaboration and partnerships nowadays are taken by wider varieties of countries as multilateral relationships in this region (Yonezawa and Meerman 2012). For example, the ASEAN University Network, a top university consortium among ASEAN countries, is now providing scholarships for international student exchange through a partnership with Japan, China, Korea, and the EU, adding to their own ASEAN scholarships. Japan, Korea, and China have also started a project to promote student exchanges in 2011 under the title of CAMPUS Asia. Australia, the USA, the UK, and other European countries are actively involved in the provision of transnational education and student exchange programs with East Asia and ASEAN countries. Malaysia initiates a strong partnership with Islamic higher education systems, while Russia is strengthening international partnerships in higher education mainly with transitional countries.

The initiators of these programs vary: sometimes it is the government, sometimes the universities, or even the market forces or students' demands. The desired

directions by these three actors are not necessarily the same. At the same time, the students and the programs offered are not only for the elite, and the quality and direction are highly diversified.

For example, CAMPUS Asia was initiated by political leaders who wished to strengthen the relationships between Korea, Japan, and China in 2010. However, the diplomatic relations between those three countries changes frequently, and Japan, for example, had already expanded such government-led partnership projects with the USA and ASEAN. Universities and students also seek and support such collaboration and partnership based on their own preference.

5.5 Conclusion

As this analysis shows, there is a highly complex context to internationalization, international collaboration, and partnerships in higher education. These concepts and practices are not always limited to the public sphere. Therefore, we should deal with these topics as a highly complex interaction among different actors, both domestically and internationally.

The frameworks of the twentieth century are still valid in principle. In other words, the nature of higher education systems in the twenty-first century should be understood in terms of their historical context. At the same time, the international dimensions of higher education challenge the nature of higher education systems across the world. Through analysis of the ideas and practices of international collaboration and partnership, we can clarify the mechanisms and directions of these changes.

An unsolved issue in this article is the encounter of different “ideas of university.” The emergence and increased importance of international dimensions leads to the overlap of higher education systems based on different ideas. For example, liberal arts education in the USA is now expanding its market to attract newly emerged middle-class families outside of the USA, especially in East Asia. However, it remains unclear as to what degree those new customers share the common ideal of “liberal arts” as a training for fostering “free thinkers.”

We need to continue our efforts to seek an effective framework for understanding the nature of higher education in the twenty-first century. A further examination of the ideas and practices of international collaboration and partnerships is, therefore, needed.

References

- Altbach, P. G., & Balán, J. (2007). *World class worldwide: Transforming research universities in Asia and Latin America*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Altbach, P. G., & Salmi, J. (Eds.). (2011). *The road to academic excellence: The making of world-class research universities*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

- Altbach, P. G., & Selvaratnam, V. (Eds.). (1989). *From dependence to autonomy: The development of Asian universities*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Brandenburg, U., & de Wit, H. (2011). The end of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 62, 15–17.
- Burrage, M. (Ed.). (2010). *Twentieth-century higher education: Elite to mass to universal*/Martin Trow. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Clark, B. R. (1983). *The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kim, T. (2011). Europe: Higher education amid financial meltdown. *University World News*, issue no. 201. <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20111209194832765&query=Higher+education+amid+financial+meltdown>. Retrieved 11 Dec 2011.
- Knight, J. (2006). Internationalization: Concepts, complexities and challenges. In J. J. F. Forest & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Kudo, K., & Hashimoto, H. (2011). Internationalization of Japanese universities: Current status and future directions. In S. Marginson, S. Kaur, & E. Sawir (Eds.), *Higher education in the Asia-Pacific*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Lee, J. J., & Kim, D. (2010). Brain gain or brain circulation? U.S. doctoral recipients returning to South Korea. *Higher Education*, 59(5), 627–643.
- Marginson, S. (2011). *Different approaches to a shared goal: How variations in state traditions and strategies are differentiating the approach to building WCUs*. The paper presented at 4th international conference on world-class universities (November, 2011, Shanghai).
- Marginson, S. (2012). Nation states, educational traditions and the WCU projects. In J. C. Shin & B. M. Kehm (Eds.), *Institutionalization of world-class university in global competition*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Marginson, S., & Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: a glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education*, 43(3), 281–309.
- Marginson, S., & van der Wende, M. (2007). *Globalisation and higher education*. OECD education working papers, no. 8. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Marginson, S., & van der Wende, M. (2009). The new global landscape of nations and institutions. In: *Higher education to 2030, volume 2, globalisation*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Neave, G. (2001). The European dimension in higher education: An excursion into the modern use of historical analogues. In J. Huisman, P. Maassen, & G. Neave (Eds.), *Higher education and the nation state: The international dimension of higher education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- OECD. (2012). *Education at a glance*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Santiago, P., Tremblay, K., Basri, E., & Arnal, E. (2008). *Tertiary education for the knowledge society*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Teichler, U. (1999). Internationalisation as a challenge for higher education in Europe. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 5, 5–22.
- Yonezawa, A. (2011). The internationalization of Japanese higher education: Policy debates and realities. In S. Marginson, S. Kaur, & E. Sawir (Eds.), *Higher education in the Asia-Pacific*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Yonezawa, A., & Meerman, A. (2012). Multilateral initiatives in the East Asian arena and the challenges for Japanese higher education. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, 1(1), 57–66.