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‘Globalisation’ and ‘internationalisation’ are two terms that suffer equally from an identity crisis and plasticity of meaning. This paper differentiates these two concepts and then explores their related trends and impacts in terms of Australian higher education. Globalisation’s influence on internationalisation through market competition and corporate managerialism is redefining the priorities of international education. New rules of engagement now dictate that advocacy for internationalisation embraces some of the trends resulting from globalisation. Empirical evidence highlighting international education programs in terms of needs, outcomes and impacts is essential for the core values of world citizenship, global competence and international understanding to be asserted as genuine pursuits of teaching, research and service in higher education. In this regard, American approaches to maintaining and increasing support for internationalisation provide an instructive example for Australian institutions.

Globalisation has been the buzzword of the 1990s, and a decade of hindsight illustrates how it has created a culture of competition, corporate managerialism, efficiency and accountability in higher education. This article argues that globalisation has undermined the core purposes of internationalisation while simultaneously thrusting other elements of internationalisation to the forefront of education policy. A review of the literature on globalisation reveals that it is fundamentally an economic process radically changing the face of the university. It is also argued that globalisation is not simply a neutral imperative which disarms government policy, but is instead a process where nation-states, swept up in the current of globalisation, have difficulty planning a course through the rapids. The argument here is against extreme versions of educational transformation where national educational systems dissolve in the wash of global irrelevance. Rather, globalisation is responsible for only a partial change toward the internationalisation of higher education. By highlighting this distinction, a critical contradiction emerges: as globalisation is mediated within the nation-state by its politics, history, culture and type of government, a hierarchy of winners and losers is created. In essence, the rules of engagement in the landscape of higher education have changed, and for the traditional aims of internationalisation to prevail – for it to be a constructive, potent force in dimen-
sions of teaching, research and service in higher education – new advocacy strategies that conform to the priorities of globalisation need to be asserted.

Traditionally, international education’s core values have included a notion of world citizenship, global competence and international understanding. However, promotion of these areas has done little to generate more student and faculty exchanges, fund new language programs or diversify the curriculum. Similarly, the economic benefits of hosting international students may have struck a cord with university chancellors in Australia, but this hasn’t typically translated into broad support for internationalisation across the university and community sectors. On the other hand, in an era of performance-based funding, monitoring internationalisation initiatives in ways that justify and quantify needs and outcomes so that programs measure up to new standards of efficiency and accountability, can be a significant addition to the advocacy arsenal. Potts (1998) argues the from most critical areas of support for internationalisation stem not from the government, but from institutional decision-makers. In this regard, institutional impacts in the form of headcounts, credit hour production, grades, published research output, retention rates and degree completions can help establish internationalisation as a criterion of academic quality. This will leverage fundamental support for further integration of internationalisation into the mainstream functions of an institution, and simultaneously support the underlying core values of internationalisation. This strategy, combined with traditional advocacy methods, has seen limited but important success in the United States and has very real implications for Australian higher education.

GLOBALISATION DEFINED

Globalisation. The word rolls off the tongue as though it is a prerequisite for one’s mobile phone plan. In an abstract way it is. The state of today’s telecommunications industry in Australia owes much to the forces of globalisation. It is also one of the key concepts shaping contemporary higher education policy. In its broadest form, globalisation describes social processes that transcend national borders. The theory has been thoroughly debated in recent years (Hirst and Thompson 1996; Reich 1993; Robertson 1992; Waters 1995), and most definitions include notions of economic, political and cultural integration on a world scale, creating a single culture and society where geography is no longer the fundamental organising principle.

It is argued here that globalisation is essentially an economic process of integration that transcends national borders and ultimately affects the flow of knowledge, people, values and ideas. This acceleration of development calls into question how nation-states can guarantee future economic growth and prosperity. Reich’s (1992) argument in The Work of Nations clearly ties globalisation to economic processes. In his view, modern technology, combined with influential multinational corporations (MNCs), has allowed the expedient and cheap transportation of goods, and instantaneous transfer of information, to create a global market where the notion of a national economy is irrelevant. Hirst and Thompson (1996) convincingly challenge Reich’s rationale that global market forces are uncontrollable, and therefore that all other domains including education must fall under
the same rationalist ideology. They refer to historical evidence of international flows of products, capital and workers during the last century which shows that recent flows are not so extraordinary. They also challenge Reich's premise that MNCs have transformed the world economy, noting that MNC penetration is far from global and highly uneven, and that MNCs still have much to gain from being located in national economies (Hirst and Thompson 1996, p.87; Porter 1990).

This article assumes a tempered view of these positions while recognising that economic globalisation is not simply a myth. A century ago large parts of the world had little to do with globalisation, whereas today few economies in the world remain unaffected by trade and investment. Furthermore, globalisation pre-1914 was driven by falling transport costs, but it is now driven by plunging communication costs. This crucial difference has opened up new ways businesses can organise on a global level, and encourages international integration. Finally, growth in international financial markets has ballooned. In 1973, on a typical day of trading, $15 million of foreign exchange changed hands, whereas in 1995 this figure had reached $1,300 billion (Latham 1998, p.11).

The political discourse of globalisation has largely been about the erosion of national sovereignty and autonomy. Jones (1998) notes that the political character of globalisation brings into question responsibilities and accountability within the nation-state. Cooper (1996), among others, has also argued the nation-state no longer retains full control of defence, historically a government monopoly. Nuclear weapons have reduced the need for military action, while regional and international security agreements, which include supranational rights of inspection and notification of military activity, have proliferated. NATO as a regional defence organisation with a supranational command structure is one such example. Hobsbawm (1994) and Offe (1993) further argue that states are losing internal control. As welfare services degenerate, political credibility is questioned in the form of electoral cynicism. Hobsbawm likens the rise of private security services and mail couriers – historically managed by ministries or government departments – as examples of the state losing power and privilege within its borders. Finally, political globalisation can also imply a loss of sovereignty to an ever-increasing number of regional and global organisations, such as the European Union, World Bank, International Monetary Fund or the World Trade Organization, to name only a few.

This ability of globalisation to fragment, just as it unifies, relates to the modern acceleration of globalisation that has changed how we conceive of time and space.

Giddens (1990, p.21) calls this 'distanciation' whereas Robertson (1992, p.55) labels it 'relexivity'. Both are speaking about a conceptualisation of the world as a whole, where social relations are restructured across time and space. As a result, writes Pieterse (1995), uniformity and standardisation through technology, commerce and culture are making the world a singular place. The intensification of time and space link the global and local as never before, a process illustrated in cultural globalisation.

Cultural globalisation has the potential to reduce diversity to matters of lifestyle, consumption and pleasure seeking, but it is ultimately a force that celebrates difference while simultaneously neutralising it (Jones 1998). Both Pieterse (1995) and Robertson
(1995) view it as a homogenising and heterogenising process where the net effect is actually increasing cultural variety. For example, Pietrse sees global telecommunications as a force that can generate awareness of political difference as much as common identity, and reinforce both regional and ethnic identities. Waters (1995) describes the effect of cultural globalisation on ethnicity as capable of reviving and differentiating it from politics and economics. In this sense, cultural globalisation legitimates ethnicities just as it popularises multiculturalism.

Globalisation today is a multifaceted concept that is driven by economic processes that developed after 1945 and which have culminated in an acceleration of time and space that has blurred the boundaries of what were once global and local. Economic globalisation, propelled by technology, has quickly and dramatically altered the face of culture and politics so that local events, personalities, trends, news, values and issues are both generic and unique. Green (1997) notes the real challenge of globalisation theory is to demonstrate that it is, or at least will be, historically distinctive and truly global. Both claims remain debatable. What is clear is that the current economic, political and social influences of globalisation are changing many aspects of society including national higher education policy. As a subset of this landscape, internationalisation is also experiencing significant change.

INTERNATIONALISATION DEFINED

In 'Globalization of the university' (1992), Gagliano was not the first to confuse internationalisation with globalisation. While internationalisation has been interpreted in perhaps as many ways as globalisation has, its intrinsic qualities are altogether different. Rembert's (1992) philosophical view of the true purpose of international education includes the cognitive justification of being liberal truth-seekers open to many cultural perspectives. In addition, the notion of world citizenship in which internationalisation 'requires some idea of the good society we hope to promote in the world – a society of many nations and peoples ... This is the true purpose of international education: to prepare people to be community-builders in an interdependent world' (1992, p.46). The exchange of people, ideas, goods and services between two or more nations or cultural identities is the typical means to this end. Globalisation may be mediated in the same fashion, but it is a process that is transnational, where events and activities in one part of the world directly affect seemingly unrelated communities in very different places on the planet. In sum, internationalisation assumes a relationship that is closely tied to a country's history, culture, educational resources and priorities, and in this way is an example of how a country responds to globalisation (Groenings 1987; Knight 1997; Lingard and Rizvi 1998). This distinction is clearly illustrated through the role of higher education in subsequent sections.

One of the main findings of a 1995 conference on the internationalisation of higher education, sponsored by the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Center for Educational Research and Innovation, was that universities play a crucial role in contributing to the core values of internationalisation. Knowledge is
increasingly becoming a prerequisite for participation in today’s society, and pre-eminent of all the purposes of mass higher education is provision of this knowledge, which is increasingly of a multicultural, international character (Windham 1995). In this context, internationalisation in higher education can be defined as ‘the process of integrating an international-intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service of the institution’ (Knight and de Wit 1995, p.17). Harari (1989) suggests a more detailed definition in which internationalisation in higher education encompasses not only the conventional curriculum, student and scholar exchanges, cooperative community programs, training and a variety of administrative services, but also a distinct commitment to and attitude towards a global perspective that transcends the entire institution and shapes its culture. It is this last concept of a global perspective that is taken here to be fundamental to the process of internationalisation in higher education. Rembert (1992, p.45) elaborates on just what is meant by a ‘global perspective’ by including foreign language proficiency, international understanding, recognition of ethnic influences at home and abroad, and the ability to live and work with other peoples, cultures and issues, not just to understand them. While producing graduates with a global perspective is only one of many purposes to internationalisation, it is arguably the most important because it is directly tied to educating the individual, the student, the ‘client’.

Like globalisation, internationalisation is also driven by an economic rationale to succeed (Knight 1997; Sadlak 1998; Windham 1995). There are principally two themes here. As a result of globalisation, technological, scientific and economic competitiveness is paramount among nation-states. One of the most effective ways of improving and maintaining this competitive edge is developing a highly skilled, knowledgeable workforce. The role of higher education in this regard is very important, as is the value of a global perspective as an outcome. The second theme relates to the export of higher education services and products as an important source of revenue in higher education, with multiplier effects for the economy at large. The political rationale can also take several forms. For example, Australia’s internationalisation efforts only 15 years ago were primarily based on development assistance, an extension of its foreign policy. Today, cultural, scientific and educational exchanges assume a small supporting role in diplomatic relations, while the export of education services has become a major part of its foreign policy (Back et al 1996).

In some countries, internationalisation is seen as a means of promoting national identity in the face of homogenisation. According to Waters, cultural globalisation is a direct consequence of expansion of European culture and implies ‘that every set of social arrangements must establish its position in relation to the capitalist West’ (1995, p.3). In this context, internationalisation serves to strengthen and add value to cultural and ethnic diversity. Similarly, intercultural interaction among students and communities is considered important in promoting international understanding and contributing to teaching and learning in education. Finally, the academic rationale is based on the achievement of international academic standards in teaching and research, which can improve the quality of higher education. Establishing internationalisation as a criterion
of quality in teaching, research and service moves it into the mainstream university structure. It is this area where internationalisation has fallen well short of its potential in both the United States and Australia. Ironically, support for internationalisation in higher education has been threatened to varying degrees by the impact of globalisation, but these same trends also offer an avenue of opportunity. In effect, globalisation’s new rules of engagement, explored below, are reshuffling the deck of priorities for internationalisation.

GLOBALISATION’S IMPACT ON AUSTRALIAN INTERNATIONALISATION

The degree of change encountered by higher education in the last two decades as a result of globalisation is substantial, even in an historical context. Slaughter and Leslie (1997) argue that these changes are as great as those at the end of the nineteenth century when the Industrial Revolution created the wealth necessary for the establishment of the post-secondary education system and its professionalisation are. One of the most profound changes in higher education, and a direct result of globalisation, is the staggering global increase in demand for access to higher education. In 1980 there were about 51 million students in higher education; by 1995 there were 82 million, an increase of 61% (Sadlak 1998, p.101). By 2010 this number is expected to increase to 97 million (Australian, 28 April 1999, p.39). Similarly, the pattern of international student flows across national boundaries has been one of growth and diversity. In 1995 UNESCO reported more than 1.5 million international students enrolled in higher education study in more than 50 major host countries. However, more than three-quarters of all international students study in just ten host countries, Australia being one of these. In 1999 Australia enrolled 99,250 international students in universities (IDP 1999), up from 16,013 a decade earlier, which amounts to an increase of more than 500% (AEI 1999).

Reich was not the first to emphasise that ‘a nation’s primary assets will be its citizens’ skills and insights’ (1992, p.3) and argue that communication, cooperation and collaboration will be crucial in succeeding at the centre of global webs of enterprise (Kennedy 1993; Porter 1990; Thurow 1992). Universities today are linked more closely than in the past to the nation-state, and paradoxically to international consortiums, receive more students from more diverse backgrounds, and increasingly educate their students with an aim towards specific outcomes in knowledge-intensive disciplines in search of a human capital, competitive advantage. A report by Bikson and Law (1994) entitled Global Preparedness and Human Resources surveyed perspectives from the academic community and multinational corporations on human resource needs of the future. Both groups agreed that specific subject-matter knowledge, prior work experience, cross-cultural competence, and cognitive, social and personal skills were all crucial. More importantly, both groups acknowledged cross-cultural competence as a ‘critical new human resource requirement created by globalism’, and felt that universities had an unsatisfactory record in educating graduates with such skills (1994, p.24). This ties closely into the ongoing debate regarding key competencies throughout OECD countries. This debate originally began in Australia with the publication of the Finn Report in 1991, which explicitly mentioned a ‘cultural
understanding competency' linked to lifelong employability (Scott and Bodsworth 1997). However, the cultural understanding competency has since disappeared from discussion in Australia possibly due to confusion over its meaning.

Another trend captured by Slaughter and Leslie (1997) in the term 'academic capitalism' is the position of higher education at a crossroads of contradiction and competition as universities adopt quasi-market approaches to management and obtain private-sector funding. Government departments, legislators, politicians and university managers are shifting the balance of power away from academics, which is changing the work culture of universities from a collegial to corporate managerial style (Currie and Newson 1998). Marginson (1997a) notes that a quasi-market approach to higher education has evolved where management is structured along corporate lines and is partly entrepreneurial, yet the number of student places and nature of the degrees are subject to government regulation, and student demand is partially subsidised by the state. The result is a new corporate ethic in higher education. A competitive market approach to internationalisation has also been a trend in higher education in many countries (Mallea 1995). Institutions now compete internationally for research that can be transformed into marketable goods and services while international contacts and activities strengthen a nation’s or an institution’s position relative to its competitors (Cowen 1996). International education as an export commodity is perhaps the best example of academic capitalism, and Australia’s achievements in this realm are noteworthy.

The Australian government share of funding of higher education between 1983 and 1993 fell from 91% to 61% (Marginson 1997b, p.8). In 1987, the then Minister for Employment, Education and Training, John Dawkins, imposed national economic and research priorities with a view to making Australian higher education more entrepreneurial and competitive. Australian higher education underwent radical restructuring in which international student policy was directly implicated. Central to these reforms was the establishment of a visa charge for international students, as well as the charging of the full average cost of a student place. As a result, academic departments and programs were given significant incentive to raise revenue through internationalisation strategies. Departments that recruited international students received up to 70% of the full cost of tuition from those students (Industry Commission 1991, p.157). Over a decade later, Australian education as an export commodity is a $3 billion industry, ranked eighth overall (Australian, 28 April 1999, p.39). Indeed, Rhoades and Smart (1996) and Shinn, Welch and Bagnall (1999) argue that Australia is at the forefront of entrepreneurial strategies that support internationalisation.

These changes are evidence of a general trend towards policy convergence in higher education and internationalisation. Ideas of how best to promote and achieve the ideals of education have been increasingly transmitted through bureaucrats working in business, government administration and supranational organisations like the OECD and UNESCO. For example, Gagliano notes that the rhetoric of internationalisation has gone global: 'What was once an international option for a few universities, has now been almost universally accepted, rhetorically at least, as an imperative for all institutions of
higher education' (1992, p.327). Not surprisingly, each of Australia's 38 universities has a policy of internationalisation explicitly mentioned in their mission statement and/or their corporate plan (Back et al 1996). Policy convergence is also felt through the OECD's impressive research capacity. McNeely and Cha (1994) suggest the OECD is an important catalyst for spreading research conceptions as institutional mechanisms. Two 'global ideologies' propagated by the OECD and clearly apparent in Australian higher education (an OECD member since 1971) are market liberalism, which has already been reviewed, and new managerialism, which deserves some analysis (Breneman 1993; Lingard and Rizvi 1998).

New managerialism often manifests itself in terms of greater accountability and efficiency. Welch (1998) cites comparative and historical examples of how the 'efficiency movements have coalesced around an agenda of cost containment, an increased business influence, a narrowing and vocationalising of the curriculum and an instrumental concern with enhanced system performance' (1998, p.165). In this context, the Dawkins market reforms with regard to internationalisation can be viewed as encouraging institutions to be more responsive and thus more efficient. Similarly, Marceau's (1993, p.4) research on trends in international funding and governance policy provides further evidence of how public policy is increasingly geared towards: 1) reducing per-student costs, 2) increasing graduation rates, 3) rationalising course offerings, and 4) increasing accountability and efficiency of management of higher education (Ball 1998; Currie and Newson 1998; Dale 1997; Meek 1995). Today's user-pays ethos and constant threat to non-revenue-producing international education programs are a reflection of a growing trend toward efficiency and corporate managerialism in international education.

A recent unsuccessful attempt to pass federal legislation to make Australian university student union fees voluntary is a clear example of how general higher education funding cuts potentially impact international education. Making union fees voluntary, it was argued, would have eliminated many campus services such as food outlets, child care and accommodation, and would have limited student choice. Queensland's Education Minister, Dean Wells, recognised this would also have impeded universities' ability to attract fee-paying international students (Sydney Morning Herald, 5 August 1999, p.11). It is also noteworthy that a $21 million federal disbursement of funds to Australia Education International over the next four years is earmarked largely for marketing and promotional purposes, not to increase the capacity or quality of existing programs (AEI 1998). Furthermore, the professionalisation of international student services has come at the expense of more accountability and bureaucracy. Australian Education International recently carried out a national benchmarking survey of university international offices in an effort to develop indicators for innovation in student services (Simmonson et al 1998). The net effect of these reforms is to increase expectations of performance levels within international student services, while at the same time scaling back funding for these services and increasing international student loads.

Corporate managerialism has also resulted in devolved decision-making in international education. Strategies for internationalisation are implemented across many
departments and faculties and as such are at the mercy of forces inside and outside the institution. University mission directives, particular interests of a pro-vice chancellor, immigration policy, or federal education initiatives and foreign policy often leave directors of programs and academics with reduced autonomy. For example, recent legislative changes in Australian immigration law have on the one hand made it easier for students from gazetted countries to apply for a student visa, but on the other hand have placed more responsibility on international education offices for processing student applications from non-gazetted countries. In this case, the winds of political decree have surrendered a margin of power to local sources in the name of efficiency and perceived cost savings (DIMA 1999).

Finally, technology is rapidly changing higher education and the focus of strategies for internationalisation. While the current trend is simply to cut costs and make existing coursework and materials more widely available via Web-based platforms, examples of virtual universities are no longer novel. The Internet at the very least offers hope in lowering administrative costs, expanding access, and making learning more flexible and individualised. At the same time, email and news groups have now become standard tools for expanding the academic community by creating global connections between like-minded academics and administrators working in very different parts of the world. Direct and substantial benefits towards international education export strategies include the profitability of distance education, Web-based delivery of courses and degrees, and offshore campuses. In 1995, seven Australian universities had off-shore campuses catering to 1,400 students, while another 22 institutions were involved with providing distance education to 5,000 students (Back et al 1996, p.25). Today, offshore campuses are the fastest-growing sector of international education, up 28.3% in 1997 and catering for over 20,000 students (Australian, 28 April 1999, p.39). In sum, globalisation is creating new reward structures and incentives for some elements of internationalisation, while constraining others. Globalisation's new rules of engagement have created a culture of managerialism and leaner market systems of higher education that are putting increasing pressure on policy-makers to justify internationalisation's rationale solely as a lucrative export industry.

In this context, Australian internationalisation strategies have excelled in a climate of limited resources when measured solely by increases in international student numbers and revenue from fees. However, as universities are reformed as a key component in the economic agenda of Australia, their ability to supply human capital with a global perspective is left in doubt. Similarly, Australia's user-pays ethos has evolved alongside course rationalisation, and while a corporate culture has resulted in devolved decision-making, this has also opened up international education to attack from both inside and outside the university establishment. Australian universities are quick to elaborate policies pertaining to internationalisation, yet staff within the system are given few real incentives to internationalise their curriculums or develop innovative programs that further international exchange and learning. The focus on technology has largely been confined to a niche market of Web-based courses and offshore campuses. In short,
internationalisation strategies in Australian higher education have lacked clear priorities that transcend all levels of an institution and, as a result, are not a basic and integrated function of the university.

NEW STRATEGIES OF ENGAGEMENT

Support for internationalisation has been threatened to varying degrees by the impact of globalisation. However, the changing rules of engagement, described earlier, also offer new opportunities for elevating the status and importance of internationalisation in higher education. New strategies of engagement were highlighted in the 1995 OECD study by the Center for Educational Research and Innovation on financing and effects of internationalisation in higher education. This report concluded that internationalisation must evolve a sustainable base of support in student interest, faculty dedication and institutional budget allocations. More importantly, the report goes on to say:

A major research need is to document the effects of internationalisation on values, attitudes, employability, productivity and citizenship rather than to continue to assert that these effects are inevitably positive. (Windham 1995, p.18)

The study also showed that identifying the benefits of student motivation, learning and broader educational gains, even if such findings are only based on participant perception’s, does influence the selection and funding of international programs. To date, internationalisation strategies have largely failed to identify empirical needs, develop indicators of these needs and measure the outputs of the programs in terms of how they address and meet these needs (Potts 1998). The assumption, according to Potts, has always been that international education is an inherent good, and while promoting mutual understanding and world citizenship as a rationale is philosophically sound, it lacks intellectual rigour.

Former United States Secretary of Education William J. Bennett once said that proposals for international education made him nervous because he assumed them to be an invitation ‘to suspend judgment and get wishy’ (Rembert 1992, p.46). The fact that neither American nor Australian advocates of international education can refer to a solid quantitative research base identifying how internationalisation raises academic standards and improves the quality of education is remarkable given countless anecdotal and qualitative studies that point to such outcomes (Bigelow 1997; Clyne and Rizvi 1998; Pittaway et al 1998; Nesdale and Todd 1997; Volet and Ang 1998). This is even more unusual considering the same constrictions to internationalisation imposed by globalisation – namely a corporate culture of efficiency, accountability and performance – have encouraged, if not required, such data to be generated and evaluated in many other sectors of higher education.

The sheer pressure of accountability and performance measurement in the United States higher education system, coupled with the dire need for internationalisation to demonstrate outcomes to generate funding, has finally produced two novel studies from which Australia can learn much. The National Security Education Program (NSEP) is
one such example. In 1991 Oklahoma Senator David Boren succeeded in getting the National Security Education Act funded in the United States Congress, creating an endowment of US$150 million (Boren 1992, p.15). The NSEP has since become the largest federal education program since 1958, with aims of educating Americans in less commonly taught foreign languages, developing future leaders who have cultivated international relationships, developing a cadre of professionals who have a global perspective and increasing the number of staff who can teach these skills (NSEP 1999, p.1). The legislative rationale for funding the Act, however, was based on strengthening United States economic competitiveness and providing ‘the necessary resources, accountability and flexibility to meet national security needs’ (Slater 1998, p.2). In sum, support largely came from a Congress who saw the NSEP as capable of identifying and addressing clearly articulated needs in international education.

As a result of its specific origins, the NSEP is the only federally funded program in international education that undertakes a formal process to identify and assess need. The NSEP is required by law to identify the geographical regions, languages and fields of study critical to the future of United States national security. The program canvasses federal departments and agencies in order to determine areas it will emphasise in funding priorities. These agencies and departments have directives ranging from the traditional national security issues, to themes of economic cooperation and competition, sustainable development, environmental degradation, international disease control and democratisation. Each agency is regularly surveyed and asked to determine the short-term (3-5 years) and long-term (5-20 years) issues, languages and academic disciplines, as well as a cross-combination of these skills, deemed most important to their human resource needs (Slater 1998, p.4).

Beyond articulating need, the NSEP goes two steps further in documenting how products of international education are making a difference. In this regard, the NSEP is tracking the careers of its alumni and building a bank of evidence linking international education, market needs and job performance, as well as gaining important feedback for future course programs. The NSEP is also measuring language proficiency and language learning as it relates it to different types of study abroad. Robert Slater, the current director of the NSEP, expects the emphasis on performance and accountability to remain a fixture in the federal sector as well as higher education. In this light, he sees the NSEP efforts towards needs assessment, alumni career tracking and measuring language proficiency as crucial to protecting and expanding the mandates and funding for international education (Slater 1998, p.6).

The second example is Potts’ (1998) ‘third dimension analysis’ of international student impacts, which is particularly relevant to the Australian context. He argues that the intercultural value of internationalisation, as well as its economic impact – first and second dimensions – simply have not made a strong enough case for international education strategies. Furthermore, the emphasis on economic impacts has established a trend of providing quantitative data with an immediate impact on bureaucrats and politicians. While these strategies remain important, he argues that the most critical sources of sup-
port for international programs are campus administrators who may recognise the merits of first and second dimension impacts, but are most likely to respond to quantitative data internal to their institution (Speier 1996). This third dimension analysis, which addresses institutional impacts in the form of headcounts, credit hour production, grades, revenue and degree completions can help establish internationalisation as a criterion of academic quality (Potts 1998, p.3). This approach can also generate fundamental support for further integration of internationalisation into the mainstream functions of an institution, while supporting the underlying core values of internationalisation.

Potts surveyed 15 public universities in the US over three semesters for data that compared international and domestic students. In every percentage measure except headcount, both graduate and undergraduate international students had average impacts that exceeded their domestic counterparts. For example, international graduate students only comprised 10 percent of headcount, yet accounted for greater percentages in course load, graduate tuition dollars, number of degrees awarded and graduate assistantships held. Put differently, international students were more productive than domestic students, cost the institution less and earned equal grades compared to their American counterparts (Potts 1998, p.8). With these findings, Potts is developing a software model designed for international educators to measure institutional impacts on a particular campus.

The institutional initiatives advocated by Potts have not yet been replicated in Australia, although the climate is ripe for such efforts. The recent Australian federal government green paper, New knowledge, New Opportunities: A Discussion Paper on Higher Education Research and Training, emphasises, among other efficiency measures, the importance of graduate degree completion rates, published research output and revenue-enhancement schemes (Kemp 1999). The NSEP initiatives at the federal government level have also been pursued in limited fashion by the Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs (DEETYA) in the study The Characteristics and Performance of Higher Education Institutions (1998). While this study did not include international students, it does provide a wealth of information on ‘institutional effectiveness’ in terms of student course satisfaction, graduate progress and retention rates, as well as postgraduate outcomes. In fact, the Graduate Careers Council of Australia has been conducting national surveys examining postgraduate outcomes since the 1970s, which is a potentially valuable source of information for study abroad advocacy.

In many respects Australian international educators and administrators are better positioned than their American colleagues to take advantage of an existing base of rich information, given the much smaller size of the higher education system and a more coherent national policy. In a rare example of original quantitative research, Dobson, Sharma and Calderon (1998) empirically evaluated international undergraduate and Australian students’ grades by field of study using student progress units, which are generated when subjects are successfully completed. Their study revealed that international students significantly outperformed Australian students in architecture, arts, humanities, social sciences, business, engineering and science, with similar attainment in
the fields of agriculture, education, health, law, medicine, nursing and veterinary science. This study illustrates the importance, and indeed the necessity, of international educators taking time to justify requests for additional resources through quantitative research.

CONCLUSION

Globalisation is here to stay. Protectionism and capital controls could potentially divert or slow the current of economic globalisation, but the intangible and free-flowing character of political ideas and cultural icons embedded in globalisation will remain elusive to repeal. However, nations are not likely to be subsumed into a global network, but will probably continue as the primary source of political representation and accountability. As capital, goods and knowledge become more global, governments and industry will increasingly depend upon their citizens' skills as an important instrument of national policy. Consequently, nation-states will increasingly draw upon education as a means of national development. The role of internationalisation in this process is uncertain, but what is clear is that institutions and governments are in a position to make choices about the extent to which globalisation governs internationalisation in higher education. The trends outlined in this article describe international education being pulled across a wake of reforms whose primary ethos is composed of a culture of competition, corporate managerialism, efficiency and accountability. In this climate of uncertainty it would be naive to assume that international student enrolments in Australia will continue to increase without continued and adequate government and institutional support.

As the rules of engagement change, so must advocacy strategies for internationalisation. Empirical evidence highlighting international education programs in terms of needs, outcomes and impacts are essential for internationalisation strategies to evolve a sustainable base of support in student interest, faculty dedication and institutional budget allocations. Most importantly, the economic and institutional impacts should be put in perspective: they are not the goal, but merely a means to an end. The ultimate objective is for these strategies to help broaden the credibility of internationalisation within the mainstream aims of higher education. In so doing, the core values of international education, those of world citizenship, a global perspective and international understanding, can then be asserted as genuine pursuits of teaching, research and service in higher education.
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