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**[Differences between ‘globalisation’ and ‘internationalisation’: implications for science and WCU building]**

Let me begin by thanking my valued colleagues at the Center for World-Class Universities at the School of Education at Shanghai Jiao Tong University, and especially Liu Niancai, for this invitation to speak. It is an honour to participate in the WCU forums, which have not only advanced our understanding of cross-border higher education, but have helped to form the global university sector.

**[Implications of the differences between ‘globalisation’ and ‘internationalisation’]**

The international and global higher education environment continues to be very active yet it is more troubled. Today I will attempt to make sense of this complex environment by reflecting not only on trends in higher education and knowledge but on the conceptual tools we use to investigate them. It is high time we sorted out the way we use ‘global’ and ‘international’. It’s almost as if there have been two separate conversations going on, one about ‘globalisation’ and one about ‘internationalisation’. Both conversations are relevant – of the various cross-border activities in higher education and science, some are global, some are international, and some are both.

**[Zhejiang University pic]**

But we need to sort our definitions, understand the differerences between global and international, and set aside ideas that don’t work or are biased in favour of some countries and cultures at the expense of others.

**[Since the internet began and participation started to grow rapidly in the 1990s, global, regional, national and local higher education have *all* flourished worldwide]**

Our time has been the golden age of tertiary education and especially science, if quantitative measures are used. Global, regional, national and local higher and tertiary education have allflourished, except in the 25 per cent of countries which have the lowest per capita incomes, in Sub-Saharan Africa, Pakistan and Bangladesh, and parts of Southeast Asia and Central Asia.

**[Participation (%) world and selected regions 1971-2020]**

After the opening of the Internet and the accelerated globalisation of the economy, culture and knowledge in the 1990s, world level participation in universities and colleges – four fifths of tertiary is at degree level - started to take off. In both Latin and American and the Caribbean, and East Asia and the Pacific, the gross tertiary enrolment ratio started below the world average and is now well above it. Worldwide participation reached 40 per cent in 2020. It has kept on growing during the pandemic.

**[Mobile students increased by 5.5% per annum 1998-2019]**

At the same time, as you know, cross-border student mobility has expanded by 5.5 per cent a year, and there are signs that the growth rate has resumed in most of the student support countries and education supply countries, except Russia. We won’t know until China’s international border fully reopens.

**[Rise of global science]**

Activity in the global scale has expanded by leaps and bounds in the areas most affected by networked communication, the flow of ideas and knowledge and the growth of collaborative research. A global science system has evolved, based on the common pool of papers in English in the two main bibliometric collections, and on collaborative projects and the co-authorship of papers. In the natural science-based disciplines, the pool of globally recognised papers now overshadows the separate national science systems, which must connect with the global circuit to reach the cutting edge.

**[Science papers in Scopus, by type of collaboration, world: 1996-2020]**

The global system is both exclusive and inclusive. It leaves out knowledge in languages other than English, and all indigenous knowledge. At the same time, has brought many more nations into global science. Emerging science systems quicken their development by accessing the global pool of knowledge and can network freely with each other without being blocked by the strong science countries. There are at least 65 countries with self-reproducing indigenous science systems, which is double the level of thirty years ago.

**[World-class universities are globally collaborative]**

The table lists the 16 universities with the most top 5 per cent papers, by citations in Web of Science, published in the years 2017-2020 inclusive: eight from the US, four from China, three UK and one Canada. The global science system makes it possible to compare and contrast individual universities, and national systems, on the world scale, by sustaining an element of commonality and convergence. This only covers research, but research capacity and performance are central to the leading institutions across the world, and everywhere world-class universities engage in cross-border collaboration. Research metrics underpin the three most prominent global ranking systems. It's simple: without global science metrics there would be no global rankings.

**[Rise of regional higher education and science in some parts of the world]**

At the same time as the growing activity in the global scale, in the pan-national regional scale, Europe has gone from strength to strength. We have the Bologna reforms, the European Higher Education Area and Horizon Europe in research. The cross-border teams called up by Horizon are building capacity across the region. European research has been reduced by Brexit, but not fundamentally impaired, except for science in the UK. There is also growing multilateral collaboration in higher education in Southeast Asia, and more limited or embryonic regional cooperation in Latin America and the Caribbean, Sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East North Africa, and Central Asia.

**[National factors in geo-politics of higher education and science]**

Neither the global nor regional developments of the last three decades have impaired the role of national governments in establishing, regulating, coordinating and partly funding higher education and national science. In fact, until the last decade there was only modest tension between on one hand cross-border activity, on the other hand national policy and agendas. That’s changed. There has been official pushback against incoming cross-border students in Denmark and at times, the US, and threats in the Netherlands and UK. The Covid-19 pandemic has seen a strong reassertion of close national regulation of cross-border people movement, for example in China. In science and technology, we have moved from an era of broad-based engagement, hugely beneficial to shared knowledge, to a US/China imbroglio in which the US is putting pressure on other Western governments to limit cooperation with higher education and science in China. Russia’s invasion of Ukraine has fragmented cooperation in the post-Soviet zone and triggered an international self-isolation of Russian universities which could be long lasting.

**[How do we make sense of the mix of spatial factors in play?]**

How do we make sense of the mix of spatial factors in play? 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, given the continuing growth of students and joint papers, or becoming less global? Is internationalisation ‘dead’ amid aggressive nationalism? And what is the implication of these different terms ‘global’ and ‘international’?

**[Higher education is a multi-scalar sector]**

The standard national model of higher education, with local institutions embedded in the national system, plus international activity at the edges of the system, cannot not fully grasp the character of higher education and more so, of science. The standard model cannot fully grasp either the global, the pan-national regional, or the local. Nation-states continue to define, regulate and fund the sector. There’s no doubt about that. But activity and agency in all the geographical scales - local, national, regional, global – is in play. Higher education is a *multi-scalar* sector in which institutional and individual agents have open possibilities, scales interface, and causation can flow from any scale.

**[Space = *social* spaces with material coordinates]**

Human geographers tell us that geographical scales in higher education and science are not simply material spaces, empty aircraft hangers waiting for us to fill them. They are systems of social relations that have material coordinates. Because they are social relational, geographical scales have to be c*onstructed*. There was always a planet earth, but our notions of *global* space were powerfully advanced by the 1960s pictures of the earth from space, and then by the 1990s roll-out of the Internet. *National* space is also constructed. The physical territory on which a nation pre-dates the nation. It is the claim to that territory, and the organisations, infrastructures, ideologies, narratives, rules and habits supporting that claim, that make the nation. Likewise, local higher education institutions do not spontaneously appear, like weeds. They are built and continually reproduced by names, buildings, programmes of study.

**[How agents make space in higher education and science]**

How then do agents – persons, groups, institutions, national agencies – make social space in higher education? Space has three aspects: it is material, it is imaginative, and it is social practices and social relations. These three elements, set down in the diagram, continually interact. The material domain A includes pre-given *structures* such as communications networks, inherited institutions, infrastructures, language of use, laws, policies, and economic resources including sunk investments and ongoing funding. The lower two domains B and C especially embody individual, group and organisational *agency*. Perhaps the imagination in domain B is key aspect of new spaces.

For example, in domain B governments conceive science as a global arms race in technology, or as integral to nation-building. They construct an expanded and modernised national science capacity in domain C, augmenting domain A personnel and infrastructure. Another example. League table rankings were begun in domain B by scholars in Shanghai and journalists in London, in 2003 and 2004, drawing on norms of scientific production and economic competition respectively. They were implemented in domain C. This simulated a more imagining in domain B – all over the world, university leaders and governments began to see worldwide higher education sector as a global market, or prestige competition, of ‘World-Class Universities’. They implemented this new thinking in domain C as investment and strategy, and it was reproduced in domain A with structural force as realigned organizations, policies and resource allocations. Global rankings are a striking example of the potentials of spatial imagining when institutionalised in a practical prototype.

**[Multiple scales in higher education]**

Let’s look closer at space making in the different geographic scales. ‘Scale is a produced societal metric that differentiates space’. Shared scalar imagining institutionalises what agents do, reproducing the scales in apparently stable ways. People think globally, act locally, feel national, see as a state, and so on. The scales vary on the basis of scope and proximity. The broadest scale in higher education is the *world as a whole* and eveything in it, including the other scales. Then there is the *global* or planetary scale. We are more aware of the global as the eco-system collapses around us, though hypnotised as we are by the nation, we don’t think globally often enough. There is the *pan-national regional* scale as in Europe and ASEAN. There is the *nation,* which occupies such a large place in our heads. There is the *sub-national* region, the state or province, and the *city* scale. There is the proximate *local scale*, which in higher education includes both institutions, and fields of study and professional training. Arguably the three scales in mid blue are the primary ones in higher education, though the pan-national region is a fourth primary scale in Europe.

**[In higher education and knowledge all the scales are highly active]**

A striking feature of higher education and science is that all the scales are highly active. And they are not necessarily zero-sum. More activity in one scale does not have to mean less in another, though some trade-offs do occur.

**[A scientific geography of higher education}**

How then can we define these different spaces in higher education and science? In particular, what should we mean by the key terms ‘globalisation’ and ‘internationalisation’? These terms have been used in confusing fashion. They seem to carry a lot of ideological baggage. In my view the purpose of terminology is not to persuade us to one or another agenda. It is scientific, explanatory, so as to inform scholarship, policy and practice. The terminology used to map and analyse cross-border higher education should be recognisable social science, grounded in a reputable geography. It should also explain cross-border phenomena with maximum inclusion, enabling the free identification of similarities and differences. It should not seek to shape practice by constituting a universal field of cross-border higher education regardless of diversity.

**[Neutral geographic definitions]**

The slide presents neutral definitions based on standard geographic spatiality. The adjective ‘international’ refers to phenomena or relations between nations, inter-national. ‘Global’ refers to phenomena or relations at the level of the world as a whole or a large part of it. The nouns are derived directly from the adjectives. ‘Internationalisation’ refers to the creation or growth of relations between nations, or between higher education organisations or persons in nations. ‘Globalisation’ means the extension or intensification of relations in higher education on the world or planetary scale, tending towards convergence and/or integration’. No additional baggage. It is that simple.

**[Some differences between internationalisation and globalisation]**

Defined in this manner, the terms can be used to distinguish clearly between two kinds of cross-border activity. *International* activities are those that are directly regulated and/or supported by national government. Resources and governance in higher education are mostly determined inside the country *Global* activities (e.g. collaboration in science, university partnerships) can be practised outside government, using global travel and communications. Though both the nation and the global network play important roles in science, information and scientific knowledge themselves flow on a global basis. Comparisons and rankings are primarily global in character. Some activities are both international and global in form. The big challenges facing science, such as climate change are tackled on a multilateral basis (internationalisation), and are also tackled through direct cooperation between universities and between scientists without going through national governments (globalisation).

**[Higher education has long had *two kinds* of cross-border connections]**

The two kinds of cross-border relations, the double geography, are not new. From its beginnings the medieval European university had a double geography. The same was true of the great Buddhist centres of scholarship in India in the first millennium CE, like Vikramashila and Nalanda. On one hand institutions are embedded in local communities and cities, and part-autonomous but established, regulated and part-funded by national governments. On the other hand, higher education has a de-territorialised would-be universal mission in knowledge, scholarship and research. Universities have always linked freely to their counterparts in other countries. Scholars, students and ideas circulate across borders. The difference now is that the global component has grown.

**[How *not* to think about geographical space I: limitations of Methodological nationalism]**

So there’s a simple and useful geography. Some cross-border activities, such as student mobility, are controlled by the nation-state. Others are global. The nation state resources them but does not control them, though it can disrupt them - as with the decoupling in science and technology. However, it is important to keep in mind that nation-states are *not everything,* and much of what we do across borders is grounded in horizontal collegial cooperation.

This is not always understood. This is because methodological nationalism has a strong hold on thinking, even in studies of cross-border higher education and science. Methodological nationalism is ‘the belief that the nation/state/society is the natural social and political form of the modern world’. The nation is seen as sufficient to contain everything, so that if any other scale of activity becomes important, it must be outside the normal and at the expense of the nation. Methodological nationalism shapes the outlook of governments, national public debate, and much of social science. It occludes or marginalises phenomena outside the nation-state. In higher education, it marginalises cross-border connections and excludes global systems like global science.

**[Higher education is national *and* global *and* local]**

This critique of methodological nationalism is not a rejection of national identity, or a criticism of 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. The point is that higher education and science are not national *or* global. They are national *and* global, and also regional, and they are very much local.

**[How *not* to think about geographical space II: Anglophone definition of ‘internationalisation’]**

An example of methodological nationalism in cross-border higher education studies is the standard Anglophone definition of ‘internationalisation’. It uses an ideological rather than scientific approach to geographical space. Knight’s definition starts from the premise that globalisation is largely economic (underplaying its communicative aspect and missing its epistemic, its knowledge-based aspect), and is both ‘bad’ practice and external to higher education. The defence against global economics is an alternative set of ‘good’ cross-border activities under the heading ‘internationalisation’, which is seen as both nation-bounded and under the control of higher education.

As Knight said in 2003: ‘The discussion does not centre on the globalisation of education. Rather, globalisation is presented as a process impacting internationalisation … In fact, substantial efforts have been made during this past decade to maintain the focus on the internationalisation of education and to avoid using the term globalisation of education’. There are a number of problems with the ideological approach. First, the dynamic side of globalisation in higher education is hidden from sight – especially global science, which despite its monumental influence and impact, largely goes missing from the internationalisation literature. Institutions and people in higher education exercised international agency, filtered by the nation-state, but not global agency. The term ‘global’ appears but only as a subset of internationalisation.

**[A misleading global geography]**

Second, there is the misleading causal narrative. This is summed up in the much-quoted: ‘globalisation is changing the world of internationalisation’, while ‘internationalisation is changing the world of education’. This seems to empower higher education agents. It drastically simplifies a complex world for them while identifying moves they could make in response to the threat of globalisation. You can take back control of the agenda, it implies. However, only by downplaying your global activity and subordinating yourself to nation-state policies on cross-border higher education. Unfortunately, some nation-states, and universities, support those exploitative commercial practices, like treating mobile students as ‘cash cows’, that advocates of internationalisation define as external economic globalisation. But the standard definition freely admits such practices. It is all ‘integrating an international dimension’.

**[Critique of the definition from the global East]**

The third problem is that in the context of its use, the standard definition is Western-centric. It is only 110 years since Euro-American powers controlled or dominated over 90 per cent of the earth’s surface. This still shapes the context of cross-border education. To ignore it is to perpetuate it. Neo-coloniality is sustained by inherited institutional concentrations of knowledge power, global English, and the exclusion of other language and knowledge. Relations between the West and the rest ‘continue to be predicated on the Western belief that it is morally superior and that it is its right to act on such a basis’, as Yang Rui has stated. Since the Internet began the cultural contents of the Western curriculum have been little impacted by non-Western knowledge. But the cultural content of the curriculum outside the West has been transformed. Programmes about global citizenship and competences mostly (not always) focus on equipping Westerners to operate freely on a global basis. Capacity building in emerging countries often perpetuates dependence on the West. All of this calls for a wrenching self-appraisal in the erstwhile colonising countries. Nothing in the standard definition triggers this kind of critical self-appraisal.

The standard definition of internationalisation protects the Western-centric position because it is non relational. It is *solely focused on the qualities of the self*. Changing one’s own education is the objective, not achieving beneficial outcomes for all parties. The effects on non-Western societies drop from Western sight. How convenient. The definition not only allows agents to be self-referencing without being other-referencing, it shuts out the effects of self-internationalisation on the other. This framing of cross-border relations is narcissistic and negates the very idea of *inter-national* relations. Rightly, the standard definition has been harshly criticised in non-Western countries.

**[Critique of the definition from the global South]**

From the global South, Ogachi states that the pre-existing global hierarchy, global competition for student talent and exploitative commercial providers ‘deconstruct the notion of an altruistic internationalisation of higher education process’ Teferra sees the ‘benevolent intentionality in internationalisation’ as ‘a continuation of the neo-colonial project. He calls for ‘a more neutral, robust, “intention free” and inclusive definition’. These are fundamental criticisms.

**[Neutral terminology distinguishes ‘global’ and ‘international’, and allows us to Interrogate cross-border activity in higher education]**

Neutral geographical terminology for explaining cross-border higher education allows issues of global inequality and power in higher education to emerge in a clear minded fashion, opening them for investigation and debate. A better understanding of multi-scalar higher education can only take us forward.

So we can look beyond the limitations created by methodological nationalism, and the standard Anglophone definition of ‘internationalisation’. There is much more that could be said about cross-border relationships in higher education and science, and relations of power, but time is limited. I thank you very much for listening today, and wish you well in all of your work.

**[Some references]**