DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ‘GLOBALISATION’ AND ‘INTERNATIONALISATION’

IMPLICATIONS FOR SCIENCE AND WCU BUILDING

Simon Marginson, University of Oxford, UK
WCU-9: 18 November 2022
IMPLICATIONS OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ‘GLOBALISATION’ AND ‘INTERNATIONALISATION’

- Introduction
- Space and scales in higher education and science
- Cross-border developments
- Continuing role of nations
- Definitions of globalisation and internationalisation
- Problems of orthodox definition of internationalisation
- Conclusions
SINCE THE INTERNET BEGAN AND PARTICIPATION STARTED TO GROW RAPIDLY IN THE 1990S, GLOBAL, REGIONAL, NATIONAL AND LOCAL HIGHER EDUCATION HAVE ALL FLOURISHED WORLDWIDE.
MOBILE STUDENTS INCREASED BY 5.5% PER ANNUM 1998-2019

INTERNATIONAL OR FOREIGN STUDENTS, TERTIARY EDUCATION, WORLD (MILLIONS) – UNESCO DATA
Since the Internet began in 1989 there has been great growth in all networked information-based systems. A global science system has expanded rapidly, grounded in global publishing in English and networked collaboration, but excluding knowledge in other languages and all indigenous knowledge.

Global work dominates intellectually in the science disciplines, though research and scholarship in social sciences, humanities and some professional fields is often more local-national than global.

Global science is resourced by but not controlled by national governments. It is shaped primarily by grassroots cross-border interactions between researchers.

Global science underpins global comparisons/rankings.
## World-Class Universities are Globally Collaborative

(Leiden ranking, universities with most top 5% papers by citation rate, 2017-2020, original data Web of Science)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Top 5% Papers</th>
<th>All Papers</th>
<th>% of Papers in Top 5%</th>
<th>Cross-Border Papers</th>
<th>% of Papers Cross-Border</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvard U</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>4276</td>
<td>35,050</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>44,930</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford U</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>17,187</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>20,174</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Toronto</td>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>24,260</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>29,586</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsinghua U</td>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>22,311</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>16,668</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Oxford</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>16,499</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>30,755</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhejiang U</td>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>29,091</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>15,727</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Michigan</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>19,609</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>17,999</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>10,503</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>17,621</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U College London</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>15,560</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>29,131</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Cambridge</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>14,268</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>26,130</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai Jiao Tong U</td>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>28,703</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>16,014</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins U</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>17,708</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>21,048</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huazhong U S&amp;T</td>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>21,654</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>9,823</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Pennsylvania</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>13,628</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Washington, Seattle</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>14,847</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>17,542</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia U</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>12,891</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>17,092</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RISE OF REGIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENCE IN SOME PARTS OF THE WORLD

• In Europe the coordinated Bologna reforms, European Higher Area and European Research Area

• Horizon Europe: EU’s ninth multiannual Framework Programme for research and innovation, world’s largest research programme, budget €95 billion

• Growing coordination and cooperation in higher education in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

• Some region-level activity in higher education in Latin America, Sub-Saharan Africa, Middle East and North Africa

European Parliament, Strasbourg
• Some pushback against inward student mobility
• In 2020 US and Chinese researchers shared 62,904 papers in Scopus, much the largest collaboration in global science. The US government has now moved from engagement to decoupling (China Initiative 2018), citing technological competition and security risks
• US allies have also problematised China links
• China is moving towards greater self-sufficiency
• Russia’s invasion of Ukraine has fragmented cooperation in the post-Soviet zone and triggered international isolation of Russian universities
How do we explain the simultaneous operation of global, regional, national and local factors in higher education?

Are higher education and science becoming more global or becoming less global?

Is internationalisation ‘dead’ amid aggressive nationalism?

Are global higher education and international higher education the same thing? What's the implication of the different terms?

Is the Anglophone definition of ‘internationalisation’ helpful, or is it misleading and Western-centric?
HIGHER EDUCATION IS A MULTI-SCALAR SECTOR

• Higher education is not always ‘national’ or ‘global’. It is always both of these, and more
• Global, regional, national and local activities are not zero-sum: any and all can grow/decline
• Individual and institutional agents have open possibilities, and causation can flow from any of the intersecting scales of activity
• Geographical space is brought into being by agents (persons, groups, institutions, nations)

Roy and Diana Vagelos Education Center, Columbia University, USA
SPACE = SOCIAL SPACES WITH MATERIAL COORDINATES
SPACES ARE CONSTELLATIONS OF SOCIAL RELATIONS THAT ARE CREATED BY HUMAN AGENTS
HOW AGENTS MAKE SPACE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

A. space as material
   (e.g. resources, policies, networks, pre-given hierarchies etc)

B. space as imagined
   (e.g. perspectives, interpretations, ideas, ideologies etc)

C. space as social practices
   (e.g. actions, programmes, connections, systems etc)
MULTIPLE SCALES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

the world as a whole (tianxia, contains all the scales and their activities)

- global (connects to local disciplines)
- pan-national region
- national
- sub-national region (province, city)
- local (institution, discipline)

agency and activity in any one scale can intersect with any of the other scales
IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND KNOWLEDGE ALL THE SCALES ARE HIGHLY ACTIVE
Higher education and knowledge are nationally, culturally, linguistically and educationally diverse! We cannot unite or ‘manage’ the field using normative or ideological language that privileges one kind of space, one way of life or one set of values.

But we can agree on the neutral scientific concepts used to describe the different spaces and scales of activity in higher education, which are tools for research and policy analysis.

Terminology should be consistent with sound practices in other social sciences, and explain cross-border higher education on an inclusive basis, enabling the free identification of similarities and differences so as to better inform research and practice.
# Neutral Geographical Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>Phenomena or relations between nations (<em>inter-national</em>) or between higher education organisations or persons in nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalisation*</td>
<td>Creation or growth of relations between nations, or between higher education organisations or persons in nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Phenomena or relations in higher education pertaining to the world as a whole or a large part of the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalisation</td>
<td>Extension or intensification of relations in higher education on the world or planetary scale, tending towards convergence and/or integration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NOT ‘the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education’ (Knight 2004)
SOME DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INTERNATIONALISATION AND GLOBALISATION

• *International* activities are directly regulated and supported by national government
• *Global* activities (e.g. collaboration in science, university partnerships) can be practised outside government, using global travel and communications
• Resources and governance in higher education are mostly determined inside the country
• Information and scientific knowledge flow globally
• Global problems in science can be tackled on a multilateral basis (internationalisation) but much is pursued in direct cooperation between universities and between scientists (globalisation)
Higher education has long had two kinds of cross-border connections

• **International relations** – conducted through the nation-state framework, for example collaborative research programmes, negotiations between national accreditation agencies, cross-border student mobility which is mediated by national governments through visa policies, scholarships and national marketing.

• **Global relations** – flows of knowledge and ideas, scholar to scholar links, that date back to medieval Europe and the monasteries of India, university to university agreements, the global science system (almost 25 per cent of articles are now written by scientists from more than one country).
Methodological nationalism: ‘the belief that the nation/state/society is the natural social and political form of the modern world’ (Wimmer & Schiller 2003). It rests on the ‘internalist’ fallacy that the trajectory of nations is entirely determined by their own efforts (Conrad 2016)

‘Methodological nationalism operates both about and for the nation-state, to the point where the only reality we are able to comprehensively describe statistically is a national, or at best an international one’ (Dale 2005)

This ‘precludes a planetary consciousness, as we are stuck in global discourses underpinned by nation-state categories and identities’ (Shahjahan & Grimm 2022)
Methodological nationalism sees one totally dominant scale in higher education - the national. scale. Local institutions are wholly contained in the national. The global scale does not exist, there is only international activity, an outgrowth of the nation-state.

The critique of methodological nationalism is not a rejection of national identity, or the use of the nation-state as a unit of analysis. The nation-state is central to higher education. Nation-based data are needed. However, in recognising this we don’t have to exclude other scales from view.
‘Internationalisation at the national, sector and institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education’ (Knight 2004)

• Attempts to manage a field of practice that is irreducibly diverse and cannot be unified with abstract terminology
• The definition is methodologically nationalist: focusing the main attention on the national framework and inter-national relations
• Uses a highly ideological geography (internationalisation good, globalisation bad), that blocks global activities from view
• In the context of its use in a Western-dominated higher education world the definition is self-centred and non relational, leaving untouched the historical legacy of Euro-American centrisim
A MISLEADING GLOBAL GEOGRAPHY

‘globalisation is changing the world of internationalisation’, while ‘internationalisation is changing the world of education’ (Knight 2003)

External economic globalisation [BAD] pressuring nation and higher education from outside

- National container seen as protecting higher education against globalisation
- Seems to position internationalisation advocates in a key role in institutions

Mediated by internationalisation activities [GOOD] of nation / institutions

- Higher education nurtured in national container, changed by internationalisation

But higher education institutions are themselves global agents, globalisation is more than economic, e.g. flows of science and knowledge

- But rather than protecting institutions nation-state may impose policy of competition and commercialisation
CRITIQUE OF THE DEFINITION FROM THE GLOBAL EAST

‘To non-Western societies, modern universities are an imported concept. They originated from ‘Europe, spreading worldwide from the mid-19th century to the present time mainly due to colonialism. Even the countries that escaped colonial domination adopted Western models as well. The European-North American university model has never been tolerant toward other alternatives, leading to the inefficacy of universities in non-Western societies, on whom a so-called “international” perspective has been imposed from the outset. What is lacking is an appropriate combination of the ‘international’ and the local. Within the contemporary context of Western dominance, internationalisation of higher education in non-Western societies necessarily touches on longstanding knotty issues and tensions between Westernisation and indigenisation. This is particularly true in China, a country with a continuous history of fostering unique cultural heritages for thousands of years’ (Rui Yang 2014)
CRITIQUE OF THE DEFINITION FROM THE GLOBAL SOUTH

• ‘Although internationalisation of higher education is touted as a solution to the problems facing higher education provision in Africa, the reality is different. What internationalisation may well do is to deepen the relation of dependency of local higher education institutions on higher education institutions in industrialised countries’ (Ogachi 2009)

• ‘Internationalisation as regards the global South, particularly Africa, is far from being an intentional process’. Universities in the global South engage in ‘massive consumption’ of ideas, knowledge and textbooks from the global North ‘while staunchly, but helplessly, adhering to international academic and scholastic norms and values’. Former colonies maintain the academic language of the coloniser. Global rankings ‘have pushed the internationalisation pendulum from intention to coercion’, pressuring institutions ‘to do things not necessarily within the realm of burning institutional needs’ (Teferra 2019)
### Global scale

**Cooperation in science/knowledge**
- Which knowledge is included in the global pool and which excluded (nations, languages, disciplines etc.)?
- Who has access to what knowledge on what basis (openness, cost)? Who decides validation, inclusion?

**Partnerships between universities**
- In a bilateral partnership between institutions, who initiates? Net resource flows? Who sets the terms?

**Mobility of institutions**
- What operating basis? Home or host country rules, language? Hybrid? Governance? Resource flows?

**Mobility of programmes**
- Which country regulates the content and mode of delivery? Access and distribution? What is the language of learning? How open is the programme?

### National/international scale

**Cross-border mobility of students**
- In bilateral relations, what balance of people movement (temporary and permanent) between nations?
- What are financial flows between country of student origin and country of education, across all aspects?
- To what extent are curricula and pedagogy transformed by educational mobility, if at all?

**Nationally negotiated joint activity**
- Who initiates? Who sets programme terms and contents? What is the division of labour? Flows of resources, knowledge, people? Is dependency created?
SOME REFERENCES


