

Internationalisation in Higher Education

N.V. Varghese

Internationalisation and Cross-Border Mobility in Higher Education

Abstract: The modes of trade in cross-border education under the GATS framework are the mobility of programmes, students, institutions, and teachers. Although student mobility traditionally has been the most common form of cross-border higher education, institutional and programme mobility have become important modes of trade in this century. The emergence of education hubs and the fast expansion of MOOCs is a reflection of the changing landscape of cross-border higher education.

Introduction

Cross-border education refers to the mobility of students, institutions, teachers, and programmes across countries. Traditionally, cross-border higher education was associated more with study abroad programmes for students. Although student mobility continues to be an important form, the scope and meaning of cross-border education became wider with other forms of cross-border mobility becoming evident. For example, institutional mobility in the form of branch campuses and education hubs is a phenomenon of this century, and programme mobility in the form of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) emerged in this decade. These two forms of cross-border mobility – institutional and programme mobility – occupy an important place in the current discourses on internationalisation and cross-border mobility in higher education. The changing forms and the widening scope of cross-border education are indications of an expanding role of globalisation in higher education. With the emergence of knowledge economies, the premium attached to knowledge production increased, and institutions producing knowledge became dear to investors. ‘International knowledge’ has become a powerful determinant in the globalised competition for talented students, resources, and reputation (Weiler, 2001). The globalisation of higher education, especially under the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) framework, legitimised the market-mediated cross-border activities in higher education. Cross-border education has become a multi-million-dollar enterprise drawing profits in billions. The competition among providers to invest in cross-border institutions, programmes, and the recruitment of foreign students to generate income and maximise profit has become a common phenomenon among the global players in education. This paper attempts to analyse the cross-

border flows in higher education in the context of the internationalisation and globalisation of higher education. The next section draws a distinction between internationalisation and globalisation of higher education, followed by a discussion on the modes of trade under GATS in section 3. Sections 4, 5, and 6 discuss different forms of cross-border flow, namely, student mobility, institutional mobility, and programme mobility in higher education. The final section makes some concluding observations.

Internationalisation and globalisation of higher education

Internationalisation can be seen in terms of different phases based on its major motivations and orientations. In the beginning, universities were global institutions attracting international faculty and students. They became national entities in the post-World-War period, when new nation states were born. With the onset of the globalisation processes, internationalisation became a strategy to mobilise additional resources for higher education institutions. It can be argued that although academic interest was a major motivation for internationalisation in the beginning, diplomatic and financial interests became more important in subsequent phases.

Internationalisation at home and abroad

Internationalisation implies integrating international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the scope and purpose of higher education (Knight, 2004). Internationalisation brings about changes in national higher education institutions by orienting them to global contexts and by developing relevant skills and competencies demanded in the global market. Such reorientation is expected to make higher education more relevant, improve the quality of teaching and learning, enhance learning outcomes, and develop global citizens.

Internationalisation has now become a stated mission in the strategic development plans of many universities. For many higher education institutions, it is part of their efforts to improve quality, to enhance prestige and global competitiveness, and to generate revenue. The development of global citizenship has become an important objective of internationalisation in the context of conflicts and terrorism becoming major social concerns. Global citizenship in the present context implies a deeper understanding of emerging international inter-connections, a higher level of social responsibility, comparable skills and global competencies, and increased civic engagement. These objectives of internationalisation cannot be achieved if the effort is centred around the small share of students crossing

borders. In fact, the scope of internationalisation should be extended to all students, including those who do not go abroad for studies.

The internationalisation of higher education can take place both at home and abroad. Internationalisation at home is a process whereby students acquire an international understanding and outlook through the courses offered. This does not involve moving institutions, persons, and courses across borders. Although 98 per cent of students can experience internationalisation at home, this aspect is less emphasised in policy discussions. Internationalisation at home is an approach in which the curriculum and learning outcomes have an international outlook without cross-border mobility of students and institutions. Internationalisation abroad implies cross-border movement of persons, study programmes, and institutions (Knight, 2006). The emphasis in discussions is more on internationalisation abroad, although it accounts for only 2 per cent of the global enrolment in higher education, since it involves the cross-border flow of students.

Phases of internationalisation

The medieval period represents the first phase in the internationalisation of universities and higher education. Universities by definition were conceived as international institutions attracting international faculty and students. The use of Latin as the common language of academic discourse during this period helped the inflow of students and faculty to universities such as Sorbonne (Altbach, 1998). During this phase, the major motivation for internationalisation seemed to be academic interests and the pursuit of knowledge.

The post-World-War-II period represents the second phase in the internationalisation of higher education. The emergence of nation states in the post-war period re-oriented higher education institutions towards national priorities and national development. Public funding and support in the form of scholarships were forthcoming during this period. This period also saw the moving away from international languages to national languages as the medium of instruction in many countries. Internationalisation was motivated more by diplomatic engagement with developing countries (Lane, 2015), especially with former colonies that became independent during the post-war period, and as a means for building relationships with developing countries.

The governments in the developed countries offered fellowships and financial support through cooperation projects and academic exchange programmes. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Fulbright programme, Colombo Plan, British Council and Commonwealth scholarship programme, and the German Academic Exchange Service, commonly known

as DAAD, are examples of national efforts to promote cross-border education (Altbach & Knight, 2006). The next phase in the internationalisation of higher education is in the context of economic globalisation. During this period, internationalisation was motivated by commercial interests and profit-making considerations. Cross-border higher education became a market-mediated process to produce the skills to suit the requirements of a global labour market and to generate income and profit. Recent estimates indicate that the United States earns \$27 billion from cross-border education, the United Kingdom earns around \$26 billion, Australia \$12 billion, and Canada \$6 billion (Lane et. al., 2015). The perceived role of universities changed from promoting national development to producing graduates for the global market. Universities became autonomous, less reliant on state funding, and market-oriented in their operations. Economic rationality and commercial interests act as major incentives to promote cross-border education in the context of globalisation (Varghese, 2013). Producing for the global market implies focusing on producing standardised skills, revising education content to suit global market requirements, improving interpersonal interaction skills in multi-cultural contexts, and promoting a world language as the medium of instruction.

In fact, many countries reformed curricular contents, recruited foreign faculty members, and introduced courses offered in English, which is increasingly becoming the language of globalisation, 'the premier language of business and professions and the only global language of science, research and academic publication' (OECD, 2008, p. 20). English has become the 'Latin of the 21st century' – proficiency in English empowers, whereas a lack of proficiency 'seriously disenfranchises' (Mathews, 2013) people in the globalised world.

Modes of trade in cross-border education

Higher education has become a market-driven activity and a commodity to be traded across borders. The profitability of the sector attracts millions of students, a multiplicity of providers, and billions of dollars. In fact, higher education institutions compete in terms of attracting students, establishing branch campuses, and expanding cross-border study programmes. Cross-border mobility in higher education has become an item traded within the framework of GATS.

Trade in education under the GATS framework takes place in four modes (Knight, 2002).

- a) Cross-border supply of services. Under this mode of trade, the programmes cross borders while the consumers remain inside the country. E-learning-

based distance education programmes are good examples of this type of cross-border education.

- b) Technological developments have widened the scope for establishing online universities and massive open online courses (MOOCs).
- c) Consumption abroad: The consumers (students) cross the border and travel to other countries for pursuing higher studies. This is the most visible traditional form of cross-border education.
- d) Commercial presence of providers in another country: Branch campuses, twinning and franchising arrangements between universities from the developed and the developing world belong to this category. This is a new form of cross-border education.
- e) The presence of persons in another country: The most visible form of this mode of cross-border education is the mobility of teachers and professors from one country to another as an employee of a foreign university, as part of an academic partnership, or to teach at branch campuses.

The most common form of cross-border education takes place through student mobility, institutional mobility, and programme mobility. Cross-border education has traditionally implied student mobility and teacher mobility. The other two forms of mobility are of recent origins in this century.

Internationalisation: Cross-border student mobility

The most visible and most discussed form of cross-border mobility in higher education is student mobility. The number of students crossing borders has more than doubled, from 1.9 million in 2000 to 4.6 million in 2015 (UIS, 2016). The most familiar pattern of cross-border student flow is from developing to developed countries. North America and Western Europe continue to be favourite destinations for most cross-border students.

The relative share of cross-border students hosted in North America and Western Europe declined over the years from around two-thirds in 2000 to around three-fifths in 2010. In 2000, nearly 90 per cent of students from North America and Europe crossed borders to study in another country of the same region; 80 per cent of students from Latin America travelled to North America and Western Europe for their studies (Varghese, 2008). By 2010, these percentages declined to 86.4 per cent and 75 per cent, respectively. East Asia and the Pacific have become a more attractive place for student mobility in 2015 than in 2000. This region hosted more than one-fifth of the global mobile student population in 2015. This region

has increased its share primarily due to the increased student flow to Australia, China, Japan, and South Korea.

A good share of cross-border students are hosted by limited number of countries. A group of nine countries account for nearly 60 per cent of international students (Table 1). Among these countries, the United States continues to host the largest share of international students. However, its share declined from 25 per cent in 2000 to 19.7 per cent in 2015. The US is followed by the UK, Australia, France, and Germany. There has been a decline in the relative share of foreign students in many of the North American and Western European countries.

The flow of students from each region shows some interesting features (UIS, 2012). The most favourite destination for Arab students is France (29%); for Central and Eastern Europe, it is Germany (16%); for Central Asia, it is the Russian Federation (46%); for East Asia and the Pacific, it is the US (28%); for Latin America and the Caribbean, it is the US (33%); for North America and Western Europe, it is the UK (23%), for South and West Asia, it is the US (38%), and for Sub-Saharan Africa, it is France (19%).

The share of foreign students in the total domestic higher education enrolment is less than 4 per cent in the US, compared to more than 15 per cent in countries such as the UK, Australia, and New Zealand. Hosting a larger share of international students has implications for the diversification of study programmes and curricula to suit the needs of international students. Efforts have been made in this respect, as evident in the results of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in these countries. The NSSE survey contains the records of students who participated in defined learning activities and the amount of teacher and institutional support they received in doing so.

Whereas nine countries (Table 1) together accounted for 73 per cent of foreign students hosted worldwide in 2000, their share declined to 59.6 per cent in 2015. This reflects the fact that a larger number of countries are now attracting international students. In fact, many countries have adopted internationalisation strategies to attract more students. For example, the number of international students hosted by China increased from 36,000 in 2006 to nearly 123,000 in 2015, accounting for nearly 2.9 per cent of the total international student population. The biggest increase was experienced by the Republic of Korea, from nearly 8,000 in 2004 to 55,000 in 2015 – an increase of nearly seven times. Malaysia remains an important country, although there has been a decline in the number of students hosted in the country, from 65,000 in 2010 to 60,000 in 2015. This may be partly due to difficulties in attracting larger numbers of students to the branch campuses.

Table 1: Distribution of foreign students by host countries, in percent

Host Country	2000	2005	2010	2015
USA	25.0	21.9	19.2	19.7
UK	12.0	11.8	10.9	10.0
Germany	10.0	9.6	5.6	5.0
France	7.0	8.7	7.3	5.5
Australia	6.0	7.7	7.6	6.5
Canada	6.0	4.9	2.7	3.7
Japan	4.0	4.7	4.0	3.1
New Zealand	0.0	1.5	1.1	1.2
Russian Federation	3.0	3.3	3.6	4.9
Others	27.0	27.4	38.0	40.4
Total (millions)	1.9	2.7	3.6	4.6

Source: UIS, various years

The largest sending countries in 2015 were China (800,000), India (254,000), and the Republic of Korea (108,000). These three countries together accounted for one-fourth of the international student population in 2015. Of these countries, 22.5 per cent of Chinese students, more than 50 per cent of Indian students, and 56.6 per cent of Korean students were hosted by the US in 2010. What is important to note here is that China has made the highest increase in sending students abroad for studies – an increase from 6.8 per cent in 1995 to 17.4 per cent in 2015 (Table 2). India, too, has increased its share of international students from 2.3 per cent to 5.5 per cent. The share of cross-border Chinese students nearly tripled, whereas the share of cross-border Indian students nearly doubled.

Table 2: Share of international students by country of origin, in per cent

Country	1995	Country	2015
China	6.8	China	17.4
Korea	4.0	India	5.5
Japan	3.7	Korea	2.3
Germany	2.7	Germany	2.5
Greece	2.6	S. Arabia	1.9
Malaysia	2.4	France	1.4

Country	1995	Country	2015
India	2.3	USA	1.7
Turkey	2.2	Malaysia	1.7
Italy	2.1	Japan	0.8
Hong Kong	2.1	Others	63.1
Total (millions)	1.7 mn	Total (millions)	4.6 mn

Source: UIS, various years

A degree from a university of repute from the developed world is valued very highly by students and is considered a premium in the labour market. These graduates have better access to high paying jobs and enjoy social prestige attached to the degree and the jobs that these degrees fetch. Therefore, investing in a foreign degree is rewarding, and households do invest in degrees from foreign universities.

The choice of a country of study seems to be influenced by several factors. Some of the common factors include the academic reputation of the university, the language of instruction, the cost of education, and the visa rules. A large share of international students opt for countries such as the US, the UK, Canada, and Australia. In fact, these four countries accounted for more than 50 per cent of international students in 2000 and for more than 40 per cent in 2015 (Table 1). Another point of attraction is that all four countries use English as the language of instruction, although Canada offers courses in both English and French. As discussed earlier, higher education in English offers better opportunities for higher-paying jobs in a globalised labour market.

The cost of education is another important factor when choosing a country for higher studies. The emergence of Australia as an important player in the first decade of the present century and New Zealand in the latter half of the previous decade are good examples because of the low cost of education and relaxed visa regimes. In fact, a good share of cross-border students from China shifted their destination from the US to Australia. Indian students followed a similar pattern, although the US continues to be the first choice for Indian students.

Visa rules are a major factor influencing cross-border students' choice of study destination. What matters in this decision is not only the visa regulations for the study period but also the immigration policies in the post-study period, that is, the opportunities to stay and look for employment. There is a positive association between flexible visa rules, easy availability of employment opportunities, and choice of country for higher studies. In the recent past, Germany implemented the European Union (EU) blue card system, which permits foreign students who

graduated from German universities to work and take residence in Germany. When the visa rules became very strict and were restricted mostly to visa for the study period only, the cross-border student flow to Australia and UK declined. However, Australia revised the visa rules to make them more flexible for employing foreign students graduating from Australian universities. There is a sharp decline in the number of Indian students seeking admissions in the UK after the country restricted the visa for the study period only. One of the reasons for New Zealand emerging as a favourable destination for cross-border students is its low cost of education and flexible post-study visa rules.

Several countries have relaxed visa rules also to meet shortages of highly skilled workers in the domestic labour market. Many of them find foreign students graduating from their universities to provide a more reliable regular supply of highly skilled personnel in the future. One of the earlier estimates indicated that nearly 90 per cent of Chinese and Indian doctoral students would like to stay in the US after their studies (Kapur & McHale, 2005). This situation has changed with accelerated economic growth in India and China at a time when many of the mature economies were in a state of crisis. The fact remains that the cross-border student flow is seen as providing a reliable regular supply of highly skilled from the developing to the developed countries (Tremblay, 2002).

Internationalisation: Institutional mobility and education hubs

Institutional mobility emerged as a new phenomenon in the globalisation of higher education in the 2000s. Institutional mobility takes place through branch campuses and through franchising or twinning arrangements. Franchising denotes the delivery of courses of a foreign university inside the country by an authorised domestic institution, whereas twinning refers to joint ownership and delivery by institutions in the home and host countries. A branch campus is an 'off-shore operation of a higher education institution operated on its own or through a joint-venture which, upon successful completion of the study programme, award students a degree from the foreign institution' (Knight, 2006). The branch campuses award foreign degrees through face-to-face instruction-based teaching-learning process (ACE, 2009; Cao, 2011).

International branch campuses are becoming a new form of providing cross-border education. They act as education hubs attracting students from within the country and abroad. Countries and cities such as Malaysia, Singapore, Hong Kong, Abu Dhabi, Dubai, Doha, Qatar, Mauritius, and the like are good examples of the successful operation of education hubs.

Malaysia is developing an international education hub targeting the undergraduate education market. Abu Dhabi has campuses of the Sorbonne (France)

and New York University (US). Dubai Knowledge Village (DKV), established in 2003, hosts several international universities from Australia, India, Pakistan, Iran, Russia, Belgium, the UK, Ireland, and Canada. Dubai also has an education city called Dubai International Academic City (DIAC). The DIAC is the world's largest free zone dedicated to higher education and has a large number of international branch campuses (IBCs) enrolling more than 20,000 students.

Education City in Doha has six branch campuses by international institutions. Singapore's Global Schoolhouse (GS) initiative, launched in 2002, houses over 16 leading foreign tertiary institutions. The aim of the Global Schoolhouse is to make the country a global talent hub. It is estimated that the GS has already attracted over 86,000 international students. Hong Kong is emerging as a regional education hub. Bhutan is planning to build a US\$1-billion education city to encourage prestigious universities and colleges worldwide to establish affiliated institutions in the country. Mauritius has already developed collaborations with prestigious foreign universities in the US, UK, France, India, South Africa, and others to establish a 'knowledge hub'.

According to the CBERT database (CBERT, 2016) there are a total of 249 international branch campuses in operation. In 2016, a group of five countries accounted for more than 70 per cent of international branch campuses (Table 3). The largest exporters of branch campuses are the US (78), UK (39), Russia (21), France (28), and Australia (15). The largest importers of branch campus are China (32), United Arab Emirates (31), Singapore (12), Malaysia (12), and Qatar (11). Together, these countries host 98 international branch campuses, or 39 per cent of total branch campuses worldwide. The international branch campuses initially established in small countries and Gulf countries attracted a large share of students. This trend is changing now with China emerging as the country hosting the largest number of international branch campuses in 2016.

Table 3: Distribution of international branch campuses by country in 2016

Export Country	Number	Host Country	Number
USA	78 (31.3)	China	32 (12.9)
UK	39(15.7)	UAE	31 (12.4)
France	28 (11.2)	Singapore	12(4.8)
Russia	21(8.4)	Malaysia	12(4.8)
Australia	15(6.0)	Qatar	11(4.4)

Source: CBERT (2016); Note: Figures in parentheses are percentages of the total

Initially, the branch campuses were exported by the developed countries. This trend is changing. India is taking the lead in exporting international branch campuses, although India does not permit international branch campuses to operate in India. Many private universities from India are establishing branch campuses in other countries. Amity has branch campuses in the US, UK, China, Singapore, United Arab Emirates (UAE), and Romania and plans to have branch campuses in 50 countries by 2025. The Manipal group has campuses in Malaysia (2), Dubai, Antigua, and Nepal. The JSS Academy of Technical Education has established an independent institution in Mauritius. DY Patil Post-Graduate School of Medicine established a partnership with the University of Technology in Mauritius (UTM) in 2009. Four Indian private institutions are represented in the Dubai International Academic City. China also plans to export international branch campuses. For example, the Xiamen University of China plans to establish a branch campus in Malaysia; Soochow University of China wants to open one in Vietnam (Lane & Kisner, 2013).

The ownership patterns of international branch campuses vary. Some are wholly owned by the parent institution; others are run in a partnership mode whereby the national government subsidises the cost and acts as a co-owner; ownership of international branch campuses by a private partner is also common. A survey (ACE, 2009) found that a majority of branch campuses had a local partner in the host country. Most of the local partners in Asia and Europe are colleges and universities, whereas those in the Middle East are businesses, local governments, and non-profit organisations. Another survey (Lane & Kisner, 2013) found that there were broadly five types of branch campus ownership patterns; i) fully owned by the home campus; ii) rented from a private party; iii) owned by the local government; iv) owned by a private partner; and v) owned by an educational partner.

Some branch campuses receive financial or material support from their host countries except in Europe. The support very often comes in the form of facilities, such as land leases at a discount or rent-free facilities. Some of the branches in the Middle East received financial support from the government. Students attending three of the seven branch campuses in the Middle East were eligible to receive financial aid from the local government.

The ACE survey (ACE, 2009) showed that business programmes continue to dominate in Asia and Europe. IT courses occupy the second position, followed by international courses common in Europe and computer courses in the Middle East. The field of international relations was common in Europe but not in other regions. Almost half of all degree programmes in the Middle East were offered in the STEM¹ fields.

1 STEM stands for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

A recent survey among students at branch campuses in the UAE found that students prefer studying at a branch campus in the UAE over studying at Western universities because of the financial benefits (less expensive), a 'hassle-free' life, personal safety, religion, familiarity, comfort with the local culture and lifestyle, and improved prospects in the local/regional labour market after graduation (Wilkins & Balakrishnan, 2012).

There are people who caution about education hubs and branch campuses, as they can lead to fierce competition, and the impact of foreign competition on domestic institutions may not be favourable to the latter. Furthermore, some believe that higher education hubs can be dangerous to local institutions since money goes to the foreign universities, and their presence can be used as an argument by the government to justify investing less in higher education. And in response to this increasing trade, there are likely to be complaints about the impact of foreign competition on domestic institutions (Lester, 2013).

The other view is that education hubs stop the outflow of students and money from developing countries. For example, India spent around US\$4 billion on foreign exchange for Indian students studying abroad. It can be argued that the country could have save around US\$4 billion in foreign exchange had the students stayed in India and received a foreign education (Tilak, 2008) through education hubs.

Internationalisation: Cross-border programme mobility

Correspondence courses offered by the brick-and-mortar system have long existed as a form of distance education programme. Open universities, which focus only on distance education, emerged in the 1960s. They became popular with the Open University in UK, which was followed by similar institutions in many countries, including the Open University in Thailand, the University of South Africa (UNISA) in South Africa, Indira Gandhi National Open University in India, Wawasan University in Malaysia, the African Virtual University, and many others. Beginning around the turn of the century, the next stage in the development of distance education was online courses and fully accredited online universities. The Open Educational Resources (OER) facilitated the provision of digitised materials free of cost to all. The 2002 Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Open Course Ware project and the 2006 OpenLearn programme at the Open University in the UK extended free online access to their courses and popularised OER. Massive open online courses (MOOCs) emerged as the major form of learning without boundaries and as an alternative to the brick-and-mortar system of higher education. MOOCs are changing the landscape

of global higher education provision (Yuan et al., 2008) and even lead some to predict that MOOCs mark the 'end of university as we know it' (Harden, 2013).

The growth in MOOC enrolments was exponential. Within a year of their launch, 3.1 million users were enrolled in MOOCs. MOOC enrolments in doubled each year in 2014, 2015, and 2016 to reach 58 million (Table 4). Coursera, with an enrolment of 23 million, accounting for nearly 40 per cent of total enrolment, led the league in 2016, followed by edX. France Uni Numerique accounts for more than 16 per cent of total enrolment (Table 4).

Table 4: *Enrolment in MOOCs 2016*

MOOCs Platforms	Enrolment (in million)	Share of Enrolment (in per cent)
Coursera	23.0	39.6
edX	10.0	17.2
Canvas.net	6.0	10.3
FutureLearn	5.3	9.13
Miriada	4.0	6.89
France Uni.Numerique	9.7	16.72
Total in millions	58.0	

Source: ICEF Monitor, January 2016

It may be interesting to see who benefits from MOOCs. It seems that MOOCs have tremendous potential to change the higher education scene, not only by enrolling large numbers but also by using MOOCs to improve teaching and learning and by encouraging other institutions to use these courses to reinforce their courses to think creatively and innovatively and to explore new pedagogical practices, business models, and flexible learning paths in their provision (Yuan & Powell, 2013). In fact, many universities are compelled to rethink how to make their curriculum delivery models and courses truly flexible and accessible (Carr, 2012). The blending of virtual classrooms with real classrooms will be a process of reinventing education and changing the landscape of higher education globalisation.

Early on, MOOCs were seen as an American phenomenon, because the provider platforms and most users of these platforms were based in the US. Other countries soon joined to develop MOOCs platforms. FutureLearn (UK), iVersity (Germany), UniMOOC (Spain), Open2Study (Australia), and Université Numé-

rique (France) are initiatives to explore possibilities for international visibility and attractiveness (Gaebel, 2014).

MOOCs are penetrating higher education markets in the developing world. Many developing countries in South and Southeast Asia, as well as in Latin America and Southern Africa, have already made major investments in distance and online education. The technological infrastructures in the urban centres of the developing countries are more comparable to those available in the developed world. This is one of the factors fueling the spread of MOOCs in the urban areas of developing countries.

Developing countries such as Brazil (Veduca), China (XuetangX and Ewant), and Rwanda (Kepler from Generation Rwanda) are examples of countries relying on higher education provisions through MOOC platforms. India launched an Indian MOOC platform called SWAYAM (Study Webs of Active-learning for Young Aspiring Minds). It is an online platform developed by the All India Council of Technical Education (AICTE) and built by Microsoft. Indian MOOCs offer courses in English and in several Indian languages. They are expected to offer 2,000 courses for 30 million students by 2020. As of July 2017, SWAYAM offers 323 courses in India.

Internet connectivity is improving in the developing countries. However, regular access to reliable broadband internet connectivity is not easily available at affordable prices in many developing countries (Trucano, 2013), and it will remain a constraint for the fast expansion of MOOCs in many countries. Similarly, the language of communication in many of the MOOCs is another constraint. The dominant language of communication in MOOCs is English. Many students in the developing world do not have the proficiency level expected to pursue and complete MOOCs. Although efforts are made by countries such as India, China, and countries in the Arab world to offer MOOCs in local languages, access to MOOCs will be better for those who can communicate in English.

The limited number of studies and surveys available indicate that MOOCs at present serve the relatively well-to-do, who already possess a university degree (Gebel, 2014). Many of them are young professionals who are already employed. Many of them see MOOCs as an opportunity to gain additional knowledge and skills for their professional advancement, since online courses offer opportunities to study at the world's top universities and be taught by the best teachers.

Another issue related to offering MOOCs is the mechanisms in place for the proper evaluation and assessment of student performance. This is especially relevant if the course is to be accredited by existing accrediting agencies. Students are also keen to get a certification after completion of the courses. A promise of

certification may also improve completion rates of courses offered on MOOC platforms.

The expansion of MOOCs is very fast. Will they replace the brick-and-mortar system of higher education? Professors such as Sebastian Thrun, the founder of Udacity, predict that MOOCs will replace existing universities, and that by 2060, there will only be 10 universities in the world. Some think that MOOCs bring near-universal access to the highest-quality teaching and scholarship at a minimal cost. Consequently, ‘we may lose the gothic arches, the bespectacled lecturers, dusty books lining the walls of labyrinthine libraries-wonderful images from higher education’s past’ (Harden, 2013, p. 3).

It seems many countries are relying on MOOCs to supplement existing classrooms and teaching-learning processes. It is more realistic to argue that MOOCs are seen by educational leaders in the developing world more as a reliable source to reinforce quality in the study programmes than as a threat. MOOCs may help institutions to think creatively and innovatively and to explore new pedagogical practices, business models, and flexible learning paths in their provision (Yuan & Powell, 2013). It seems that hybrid courses and blended courses may become more widespread, which may strengthen the courses offered by the existing universities. In fact, MOOCs provide an opportunity for brick-and-mortar universities to restructure their academic activities and pedagogical practices and to transit to new ways of offering and organising their study programmes (Varghese, 2014).

Concluding remarks

The internationalisation of higher education in the context of globalisation has become a market-mediated process, where internationalisation is an item of cross-border trade. The new providers of higher education are more often investors than educators, and cross-border trade in education is a lucrative business involving billions of dollars.

Although there are four modes of trade in education under the GATS framework, this paper focused on three important modes, namely trade through the cross-border mobility of students, institutions, and programmes. The paper shows that although the student flow used to be the most common form of cross-border education, institutional and programme mobility, which emerged in this century, are expanding very fast. The student flow is mostly from developing to developed countries, whereas institutional and programme mobility are from developed to developing countries. In all three types and forms of cross-border higher education flows, the financial flow is from the developing to developed countries.

Higher education remains an expanding sector, especially in the developing world, even during the recent period of economic crisis. Cross-border higher education continues to see unabated growth. Cross-border education, especially in terms of programme mobility, shows the extensive possibilities of expanding the system. It is also relied upon to reinforce teaching and learning, and to improve the quality of higher education in many countries. The strategies to develop higher education need to focus on making use of cross-border education opportunities to improve quality in an expanding system at an affordable cost.

References

- Altbach, Philip G.: *Comparative Higher Education: Knowledge, the University and Development*. Ablex Publishing Corporation: Greenwich 1998.
- Altbach, Philip G. / Knight, Jane: "Internationalisation of higher education: Motivations and realities". In: *National Education Association, The NEA Almanac of Higher Education*. NEA, Washington D.C. 2006, pp. 27–36.
- American Council of Education (ACE): *US Branch Campuses Abroad*, ACU Brief, September 2009.
- Cao, Yi: "Branch campuses in Asia and the Pacific: Definitions, challenges and strategies". *Comparative International Higher Education* (3) 2001, pp. 8–10.
- Cross-border Education Research Team (C-BERT): *Research and news about transnational higher education*, January, University of Albany: New York 2016.
- Carr, Nicholas: "The crisis in higher education", *MIT Technology Review*, 27 September 2012.
- Gebel, Michael: *MOOCs: Massive Online Open Courses*. European University Association: Brussels 2014.
- Harden, Nathan: "The end of the university as we know it". *American Interest* 8(3), 2013, n.p., retrieved from <https://www.the-american-interest.com/2012/12/11/the-end-of-the-university-as-we-know-it/>.
- Kapur, Devesh / McHale, John: *Give Us Your Best and Brightest: The Global Hunt for Talent and Its Impact on the Developing World*. Brookings Institution Press: Baltimore 2005.
- Knight, Jane: *Trade in Higher Education Services: Implications of GATS*. Observatory of Borderless Education: London 2002.
- Knight, Jane: "Internationalisation remodeled: Definitions, rationales, and approaches". *Journal of Studies in International Education* 8 (1), 2004, pp. 27–37.
- Knight, Jane: *Higher Education Crossing Borders: A Guide to the Implications of the GATS for Cross-border Education*. UNESCO/Commonwealth of Learning: Paris 2006.

- Lane, Jason E.: “Higher Education Internationalisation: Why Governments Care”. In: Ullberg, E. (ed.): *New Perspectives on Internationalisation and Competitiveness: Integrating Economics, Innovation, and Higher Education*. Springer: New York 2015.
- Lane, Jason E. / Owens, Taya L. / Kisner, Kevin: *A Cross Border Higher Education, International Trade, and Economic Competitiveness: A Review of Policy Dynamics When Education Crosses Borders*. ILEAP, CUTS International Geneva and CARIS: Toronto, Geneva and Brighton 2015.
- Lane, Jason E. / Kisner, Kevin: “Five models of international branch campus facility ownership”. *International Higher Education* (0), 2013, pp. 9–11.
- Lester, Simon: “Liberalizing cross-border trade in higher education: The coming revolution of online universities”. *Policy Analysis* (720), 2013, pp. 1–16.
- Mathews, David: “Expansion causing ‘chaos’ across the world”. *Times Higher Education*, 12 April 2013, n.p., retrieved from <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/expansion-causing-chaos-across-the-world/2003149.article>.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD): *Higher Education for 2030: What Futures for Quality Access in the Era of Globalisation?* OECD: Paris 2008.
- Tilak, Jandhyala B.G.: “Higher education: A public good or a commodity for trade? Commitment to higher education or commitment of higher education to trade”. *Prospects* (38), 2008, pp. 449–466.
- Tremblay, Karine: “Student mobility between and towards OECD countries: A comparative analysis”. In: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (ed.): *International Mobility of the Highly Skilled*, 2002. OECD: Paris, pp. 39–70.
- Trucano, Michael: “More about MOOCs and developing countries”. *EduTech*, 12 November 2013, n.p., retrieved from <http://blogs.worldbank.org/edutech/moocs-developing-countries>.
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS), various years: *Global Education Digest: Comparing Education Statistics Across the World*. Montreal: UIS.
- Varghese, N.V.: *Globalisation of Higher Education and Cross-border Student Mobility. IIEP Research Papers*. IIEP/UNESCO: Paris 2008.
- Varghese, N.V.: “Globalisation and higher education”. *Analytical Reports on International Education* 5(1), 2013, pp. 7–20.
- Varghese, N.V.: “MOOCs and higher education in developing countries”. In: *Conference documents on MOOCs 4D: Potential at the Bottom of the Pyramid*. University of Pennsylvania: Philadelphia 2014, n.p.
- Weiler, Hans W.: “Knowledge, Politics and the Future of Higher Education: Critical Observations on a Worldwide Transformation”. In: Hayhoe, Ruth / Pan, Regina Egetenmeyer, Paula Guimaraes and Balázs Németh - 9783631736258

- Julia (eds.): *Knowledge Across Cultures: A Contribution to Dialog Among Civilisations*. Comparative Education Centre: Hong Kong 2001, pp. 25–43.
- Wilkins, Stephen / Balakrishnan, Melodena: “How well are international branch campuses serving students?” *International Higher Education* (166), 2012, pp. 3–5.
- Yuan, Li / MacNeill, Sheila / Kraan, Wilbert: “Open educational resources. Opportunities and challenges for higher education”. Joint Information System Committee (JISC) CETIS: Bristol 2008 pp. 134, retrieved 27.7.2017 from https://oerknowledgecloud.org/sites/oerknowledgecloud.org/files/OER_Briefing_Paper.pdf
- Yuan, Li / Powell, Stephen: *MOOCS and Open Education: Implications for Higher Education – A White Paper*. Centre for Educational Technology and Interoperability Standards (CETIS): UK 2013.

István Vilmos Kovács & István Tarrósy

The Internationalisation of Higher Education in a Global World

Abstract: This contribution looks at what drives the internationalisation of higher education in a global context. To that end, we begin by describing the place and role of universities in our global world. Internationalisation is an obvious knowledge and energy source to find adequate responses to new expectations. The contribution offers an analysis of the circumstances and working features that can contribute to preparing and implementing an internationalisation strategy, also addressing the usual risks.

The context of globalisation

International education specialist Jane Knight is right when she explains that “[t]he world of higher education is changing and the world in which higher education plays a significant role is changing” (2008, p. 2.). In any region of our globalising world, higher education institutions are dominant actors regarding development. Every university or college belongs to a region that has its own characteristic system of institutions, processes, and culture, which reflect its particular history and the actual functional division of labour. Universities are born within such a unique environment, and thus they cannot be taken into consideration alone, as sole players, taken out of their given milieu. There is an obvious interconnectedness and interdependence of regions and their institutions (see Tóth & Tarrósy, 2002, pp. 66–71).

Universities have always had a – minimum – role to communicate with the regional government, later with labour market agencies and politicians. Today [they] also work as entrepreneurial organisations, attracting fee-paying students and participating in lifelong learning movements for adults. (Dobay, 2007, p. 11)

In addition, as of today, the environment is part of a truly global, transnational picture. ‘Globalisation is probably the most pervasive and powerful feature of [this] changing environment.’ (Knight, 2008, p. 3) It is essential, therefore, to first look at and understand the realities of this global context so that the complexities of the internationalisation of universities can be grasped.

The creation, sharing, and application of knowledge has become a major factor in the economic development of most countries. Since knowledge has gained a primary role in driving industry and shaping society, universities are to meet

more and more related challenges. A 2002 World Bank report entitled *Constructing Knowledge Societies* found that aside from the increasing role of knowledge, technological change, including the revolution in ICT, is the major global driver of change in higher education (World Bank, 2002).

Higher education institutions (HEIs) have also experienced an intense demographic transition in three dimensions. The accelerated enrolment growth, the extension of the learning age to a lifelong learning perspective, and the decline of the age groups completing secondary education are common features in a number of industrial countries (OECD, 2008).

Higher education enrolment in the OECD countries exceeds 50 per cent. Between 2002 and 2015, the number of EU tertiary graduates almost doubled from 23.6 million to 38.7 million (Eurostat, 2016). Their learning needs are much more diverse than those of their predecessors, who prepared for roles in a narrow scientific and intellectual elite. The decline of public finances and the mobilisation of alternative resources are also key issues of institutional strategies in most countries.

Globalisation is different from other processes such as internationalisation or modernisation. As George and Wilding (2002, p. 2) point out, it is widely accepted that globalisation involves at least the following main strands:

- increasing and deepening interconnectedness of societies in different parts of the world;
- almost unimpeded flows of financial capital, news and cultural images across the world;
- rising activity and power of multinational companies (MNCs);
- rising economic growth accompanied by rising inequalities in many countries;
- a global consumer culture in the making;
- more travel and migration by more people from more countries to more countries;
- faster methods of transport and electronic communication so that time and space are increasingly being compressed;
- greater awareness by the public of what is happening in the world and of the possible implications for their own country;
- rapid growth of governmental and non-governmental supranational organisations that supplement, supplant, and support the activities of the nation state.

In an interconnected transnational system. 'Globalisation is transforming rather than superseding the state' (Lawson, 2012, p. 142) by driving political, economic, and social processes, and affecting information and communication technologies together with the creation and transmission of knowledge. The 'network

state' (Castells, 1997) differs from the nation state of the Westphalian order in that it needs to position itself in a setting with a multitude of other types of power-holding entities (or those aspiring to gain power). But although the international policy-making arena has become crowded, the tasks of the state 'have not changed. [States, therefore, governments] still have to manage, with respect to their domestic constituencies, the dual relationship between domination and legitimation, and between development and redistribution' (Stalder, 2006 p. 122).

As 'globalisation makes us more vulnerable because we are more interdependent with one another' (Li, Jiagang, Xiaoyuan, & Hairong, 2012, p. 104), collaboration is encoded in the world. Simply because in certain issues and instances, there is no other way but to cooperate so that states do not 'get hurt', which is their ultimate national goal at the same time. Having said that, national survival, and consequently national interest, will determine state behaviour, strategy, and action – both for cooperation and competition.

As the OECD sums up in its 'Higher Education to 2030' scenario on globalisation, the responses are articulated in national and local contexts, and even the common features are reflected in several ways. The nation state remains the site of sectoral policy formation with its impact on the global competitiveness of national higher education institutions. At the same time, globalisation, with its open information environment, with the role of global education and research networks, made global connections and co-operation more strategic than ever. The OECD concludes that mapping the global landscape in a comprehensive manner could properly assist national policy makers, institutions, and higher education professionals (OECD, 2009, p. 32).

Competition on the higher education market, due to the increasing number of public and private higher education institutions as well as the Bologna process as a driving power of the European Higher Education Area, [and in many countries of the economically advanced North, as a result of demographic pressures] are forcing institutional changes. (Pausits, 2007, p. 85)

In parallel with the above-mentioned convergence of national systems, there remains considerable room for national and institutional policies and measures. Globalisation and internationalisation in higher education have different directions, while at the same time they are interrelated. Internationalisation is a response to the globalisation of our societies, and an intake of measures targeting a more controlled adaptation process. It is a conscious response to global challenges in order to exploit its opportunities. OECD argues that for a single government, the medium of internationalisation might be the proper field for managing the

impact of globalisation. Multi-lateral collaborations, such as the Bologna Process and the regional higher education associations, can help national governments comply with this strategic challenge (OECD, 2009, p. 23). Within the global realm, we are witnessing the rise of new regional structures, together with both intra- and inter-regional activities.

Once a regional agenda and architecture is constructed (e.g. the EU), regions often reach out to other regions to facilitate the development process via the building of linkages. [...] All signs point to a continued relevance of regional engagement and cooperation. (Robertson, 2017, p. 11)

Institutional challenges

Today's universities face several challenges. The traditional standards of their operation are no longer a guarantee for excellence. Research is overrated compared to teaching, and other activities that promote internal and external relations, structures, and processes leading to social impact. Research itself is challenged by competing expectations. Mode-one research is confronted with mode two (Gibbons et al., 1995). The first mode defines the 'issue' as the result of the researcher's curiosity, for the most part keeps disciplinary identity intact, leads to peer-reviewed scientific publications, and is assessed by citations by other mode-one researchers. The second mode tries to respond to social and economic problems and needs, values interdisciplinarity, and the elaborated responses and proposed solutions are assessed by their applicability in practice. The interpretation of what research means is further enriched by the fact that the links between education and research are multifaceted, and the potential of new combinations is often underestimated. Traditionally, research feeds the content of teaching, provides theoretical foundations and evidence supporting the delivered content. However, the supremacy of research is not anymore unanimously supported. Learning can be organised as research; learning and teaching can be the object of scientific inquiry and vice versa.

Higher education traditionally follows simple protocols for teaching and learning: lectures, seminars, tests, exams, matching subjects, teachers, classes, and auditoriums. Subjects (courses) are basically derived from what the team of lecturers are capable of and get used to teach. Making study programmes more relevant to real-life situations is a growing demand, as is the call for curricula to meet the ever-changing present and future needs of the labour market. These issues can be part of pedagogical discussions. The principles of the *universitas spirit* can also be interpreted as the hesitation to serve the expectations of the labour market

or any other utilitarian purposes. Supporting scientific discovery, the holistic development of the personality, or sustaining cultural continuity seem a more attractive intellectual challenge for many traditional universities than meeting the needs of students.

The teacher and teaching-centred education are invited to become student and learning-centred. This profoundly reshapes the role of higher education teachers (Weimer, 2002). The one-way knowledge transfer is replaced or diversified by mutual learning opportunities, triggered by the different expectations of heterogeneous groups of students. Higher education has recognised the need of professionalising teaching and learning in higher education.

Aligned with the above changes, the third mission of higher education institutions is to open up to the external environment in order to increase the social impact of both research and education. Due to the often-decreasing state financing, new channels of funding also imply changes in basic functions. 'Entrepreneurial-type' universities are born with a new role, 'with a new paradigm: "serving the region", instead of (or simply alongside) "serving science"' (Dobay, 2007, p. 15).

Internationalisation

International partnership in research and in the design and delivery of training programmes has a vitalising role. Internationalisation is an obvious knowledge and energy source to find adequate responses to the above-described expectations. International cooperation of both students and teachers multiplies the richness of perspectives, the available knowledge and resources. Internationalisation is a broader concept. It has been an overwhelming trend in higher education worldwide, and 'a vehicle for the development of top-notch talent in innovation,' according to the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC) in the city of Chengdu. It is certainly not a new term, not even a new phenomenon. Its 'popularity in the education sector has soared since the early eighties. Prior to this time, international education and international cooperation were the favoured terms and still are in some countries' (Knight, 2008, p. 4).

The new terms we use today include borderless education, cross-border education, virtual education, internationalisation 'abroad' and internationalisation 'at home', as well as networks, twinning and franchise programmes, corporate universities, education providers, or branch campuses. (Knight, 2008, p. 5). According to Halász,

the changes affect essentially all aspects and functions of higher education from the transformation of the institutional management, the structure and content of qualifications through the funding of education to research and sectoral governance (Halász, 2010, p. 3).

As Knight (2003a, p. 2) summarises, internationalisation is a process in which an international, intercultural, or global dimension is integrated into the goals, functions, and the implementation of higher education activities.

According to the OECD study *Internationalisation and Trade in Higher Education*, there are two approaches of internationalisation. Enriching the national education and research activities of higher education institutions with international, intercultural dimensions is only one direction of internationalisation activities, referred to as ‘internationalisation at home’ in the related literature (Knight, 2004). The other direction is transnational education, which involves border-crossing by students, trainers, programmes, and institutions (OECD, 2004). The mobility of students, instructors, and programmes, outsourced trainings and faculties set up in other countries belong to this category (Knight, 2003b).

If strategic thinking about internationalisation is an accepted part of everyday work, then internationalisation encompasses the whole institution and becomes an integral and organic part of all activities. The question of coordination is how to mobilise or help those who can promote the international dimension of education, research, and the development of the related services.

Global competition requires that institutions explore and utilise the knowledge they gained through international relations, which can contribute to the quality and efficiency of its functions in a complex way.

Content of the internationalisation strategy

While internationalisation has become an indicator of high-quality higher education, dialogue on the quality and content of internationalisation is beneficial as well. This dialogue can be inspired effectively by launching the design of an internalisation strategy. According to Hénard and colleagues, the institution’s international strategy should align with national policies, involve stakeholders in the entire process, and set an evaluation framework to assess the impacts of the strategy (Hénard, Diamond, & Roseveare, 2012, pp. 10–14).

Higher education institutions are actors in the global economy, and Barakonyi (2004) highlights the fact that higher education institutions, like business organisations, require professional management, development programmes, and new organisational models based on a ‘new public management’ paradigm.

Internationalisation may have an impact on the following areas:

- the curriculum of the training programmes;
- the development of HR functions according to the aspects of internationalisation, from recruitment to internal training, performance evaluation, organisational development, and contacts with former staff;
- the strengthening of the language skills of the institution's entire staff;
- exploring the positive energies of the international exchange of good practices of pedagogical innovation and intercultural media;
- the development of student services;
- improve the feedback system of stakeholders so that international students and trainers can study and work in an appropriate development environment;
- professional and proactive management of international tenders and projects;
- exploring unexplored resources capable of facilitating internationalisation;
- strengthening student participation;
- strengthening reflection on their own internationalisation process (diploma theses, PhD researches, action researches, exchange of working practices, joint projects with successful partner institutions);
- internationalisation-related internal knowledge-sharing, the institutionalisation of the (international) professional development of the staff;
- exploring international learning opportunities for internationalisation, understanding good examples and models;
- exploring the possibilities of experimentation and adaptation;
- strategic solutions ensuring successful implementation, such as the development of a system of responsibilities, resources, follow-up and feedback, must be the part of decisions.

Partnership is an effective form of creating long-term engagement in strategy-making. Table 1 helps identify the areas where preparatory work can involve a wide range of stakeholders. The following 10 topics show that internationalisation can be approached from so many aspects (Table 1).

Table 1: Strategy in the making: Topics for partnership

University functions	Incoming mobility	Outgoing mobility	Joint projects	Institutional presence abroad
R+D	Incoming research mobility working group	Outgoing research mobility working group	Joint R & D project working group (organised by the bidding office)	Working group on presence abroad opportunities
Teaching and learning	Incoming student and teacher mobility working group	Outgoing student and teacher mobility working group	Dual, plural, common graduate full training working group	
Relationship with the environment, business orders, marketing	Working group for incoming service provision and discussion on development demands	Working group on exploiting opportunities for outgoing mobility	Working group on analysing infrastructure and service needs for joint projects	
Infrastructure, internal services, administration, milieu				
Management, organisation development, leadership, HR, student involvement				

Source: Kovács & Tarrósy, 2015, pp. 2–8

Efforts to renew the teaching and learning process

The reason for reshaping higher education services also concerns the teaching and learning function of higher education institutions in several ways:

- There is an increased emphasis on the future skill needs of students exceeding the traditional scope of the learned disciplinary area in order to respond to the changing features of the labour market as well as to enable them to play prospective social roles.
- The learning outcomes-based approach helps reshape the programme and the course designs aligned with the new expectations. To harmonise learn-

ing outcomes with the design of tailored learning and assessment remains a demanding professional challenge.

- The professionalisation of teaching needs easier access to the findings of learning research and more tools to support the professional development and appraisal of teachers.
- More cooperation is needed, at least among those higher education teachers involved in a relevant study programme. Cooperation is inevitable in the cases of programmes jointly delivered by different faculties (as often happens to ITE) or by different universities even if they are not from the same countries.
- The potential of the active involvement and role of students in the entire processes across all university functions can hardly be overestimated. Students, with their diverse backgrounds, are not only learners but partners for research and providers of knowledge, especially due to the intense involvement of practitioners who start higher education in a later phase of their life or return to upscale their knowledge. The mutual benefit of validating prior learning and experience and building on it is an increasing challenge.

One specific form of internationalised study programmes is when they are jointly designed and delivered and possibly even result in multiple degrees. Research has found that these study programmes have a positive impact on students' motivation to learning, improve their career options and employability, generate revenue, and help create access to further funding sources. Some higher education institutions and systems use these programmes for sharing knowledge on how to improve the quality and efficiency of third programmes (Hénard et al., 2012, pp. 19–22). Another benefit, according to Asgary and Robbert, is that 'international dual degree models are significantly superior in terms of academic, intellectual and experiential learning; therefore, graduates of these programmes will be better prepared to lead international ventures and serve as global citizens' (Asgary & Robbert, 2010, p. 317).

On the other hand, dual degree programmes need proper leadership and commitment from staff. The involved higher education institutions have to be culturally open, inventive, and future-oriented. Students also need to have some specific characteristics. They must be prepared to manage a higher level of uncertainty and engage in performance. International study programmes may face difficult learning and implementation periods and challenges during their evolving provision. Their potential for outstanding impacts is their obvious driving force (Asgary & Robbert, 2010)

Is internationalisation the good, the bad, or the ugly, then?

Although all the global, transnational challenges and opportunities mentioned earlier cannot be bypassed, Peter Scott draws our attention to the different aspects (and understandings) of internationalisation. The ‘good’ aspect has always accompanied international higher education in the form of exchanges, scientific collaboration, or contributions to the social and economic performance of a given region. The ‘bad’ aspects are, as Scott (2011, n.p.) argues, ‘the mainstream drivers [...] First is the pressure to recruit international students, almost entirely because they can be charged higher fees. [...] Second is the drive for geopolitical and commercial advantage. [...] Third is global positioning.’

All this may indicate that we can extend our knowledge and perception about the notion of geopolitics, and include also the geopolitics of higher education into our narratives. The ‘ugly’ aspect, finally, is linked with strategies that subvert core responsibilities, as institutions struggle to recruit students – in many parts of Central and Eastern Europe, for instance, as a result of demographic challenges resulting from ageing and shrinking populations – from abroad, ‘less discerning international students to fill their places’ (Scott, 2011). The ‘foreign adventures’ that institutions are involved in may also carry financial and reputational risks. Therefore, according to Scott,

there is an urgent need to reset the compass of internationalisation, to steer towards the good and away from the ugly. Not only is this morally right, it is also probably in the best long-term interests of the sector. At the very least, it provides firm ground on which to stand against the rising wind of anti-immigrant, anti-foreigner, anti-‘other’ populism. (Scott, 2011, n. p.)

This is especially true in our current times, when growing xenophobia also hits higher education as a result of the ongoing refugee crisis in Europe.

When looking further at the ‘good’ and the ‘bad’ sides of internationalisation, a 2010 IAU study can also reveal certain important ideas. As Marmolejo (2010, n. p.) points out:

When asked about the most important benefits of internationalisation, the top three reasons at the global level listed in order of relevance were [for the universities asked]: increasing international awareness of students; strengthening research and knowledge production; and fostering international cooperation and solidarity.

Obviously, as global tendencies have been pulling all the corners of the world more closely together, higher education and research become more closely linked, too. However, the IAU survey also highlights regional disparities, which seem to have stabilised rather than disappeared. This is definitely not the ‘good’ side of the story.

When institutions prioritise their partnerships, they may not look beyond their own regions and the traditional contexts of connections. For instance,

in the Asia-Pacific region the first geographic priority for the internationalisation policy in the majority of their institutions is Asia-Pacific, followed by Europe. For European institutions the first priority is placed on Europe itself and the second one on Asia-Pacific. For North America the first priority is Asia-Pacific, followed by Europe. (Marmolejo, 2010, n. p.)

Marmolejo even takes this further by pointing out that

Sadly, the only region considering Africa as the principal priority is precisely Africa, but aside from that, none of the regions even consider Africa as a second or third priority. Even worse, Latin America is not even considered a priority by those Latin American institutions, which participated in the study, and none of the other regions of the world considers Latin America among their top three choices. If a region of the world is completely off the radar of international educators from all over the world, it provides at least a good 'wake-up' call.

Fostering regional dialogues, therefore, has become a key prerequisite for successful and even more, meaningful internationalisation.

There are several risks, adding to the challenges explained earlier, that HEIs have to reckon with when ambitiously committing themselves to amplify the process internationalisation:

- lack of consensus;
- resource dependence;
- too much complexity;
- ignoring or misjudging cultural differences;
- shortage of capacities.

Concluding thoughts

As Marijk van der Wende (2017, p. 6) points out:

Critical voices rail against internationalisation as an elite cosmopolitan project; against the use of English as a second or foreign language for teaching and learning; against global rankings and the resulting reputation race with its annual tables of losers and winners; against the recruitment of international students for institutional income; and other forms of 'academic capitalism'.

Despite these reservations, there is obvious support behind the internationalisation of higher education as one of the most powerful drivers of innovation and change. Therefore, internationalisation is ever so significant in the development of teaching and learning in higher education institutions and in most aspects of

university policy. Via newly developed teaching programmes and methodologies, such as the COMPALL joint-module methodology programme, the different cultural and disciplinary traditions and advancements can be overarched and re-connected. Such re-connection then may contribute to a refined definition and interpretation of what internationalisation can and should mean for higher education locally, regionally, and transnationally.

References

- Altbach, Philip G. / Reisberg, Liz / Rumbley, Laura E.: *Trends in Global Higher Education. Tracking an Academic Revolution. A Report Prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education*, UNESCO, Paris 2009.
- Asgary, Nader / Robbert, Mary Ann: “A cost-benefit analysis of an international dual degree programme”. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 32(3), 2010, pp. 317–325.
- Barakonyi, Károly: “Egyetemi kormányzás. Merre tart Európa?” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 51, 2004, pp. 584–599, retrieved 4.6.2017 from <http://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00017/00105/pdf/4szbarakonyi.pdf>.
- Castells, Manuel: *The Power of Identity: The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture*. Volume II. Malden: Blackwell 1997.
- Dobay, Péter: “Universities: A Regional Diploma-Mill or a Global Innovation Centre?” In: Tarrósy, István / Milford, Susan (eds.): *European Higher Education in a Changing World. A View from the Danube Region*. Publikon Books–IDM: Pécs–Vienna 2007, pp. 11–22.
- Eurostat: *Tertiary Educational Attainment EU-28, 2002–2015*. Luxembourg: Eurostat 2016, retrieved 2.6.2017, from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/File:Tertiary_educational_attainment,_EU-28_2002-2015.JPG.
- George, Vic / Wilding, Paul: *Globalisation and Human Welfare*. Palgrave: London 2002.
- Gibbons, Michael / Limoges, Camille / Nowotny, Helga / Schwartzman, Simon / Scott, Peter / Trow, Martin: *The New Production of Knowledge. The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. SAGE: Stockholm 1994.
- Halász, Gábor: “Global Trends in HE, Policy Responses in the EU and in the OECD countries”. In: Drótos, György / Kovács, Gergely (eds.): *Higher Education Management*. Aula Kiadó: Budapest 2010, pp. 13–31, retrieved 4.7.2017 from [http://halaszg.ofi.hu/download/BCE_\(teljes\)_\(2010\).pdf](http://halaszg.ofi.hu/download/BCE_(teljes)_(2010).pdf)
- Hénard, Fabrice / Diamond, Leslie / Roseveare, Deborah: *Approaches to Internationalisation and Their Implications for Strategic Management and Institu-*

- tional Practice*. OECD Publishing: Paris 2012, retrieved 10.6.2017 from <http://search.oecd.org/edu/imhe/Approaches%20to%20internationalisation%20-%20final%20-%20web.pdf>.
- Knight, Jane: “Internationalisation: Key Concepts and Elements”. In: Gaebel, Michael / Purser, Lewis / Wachter, Bernd / Wilson, Lesley (eds.): *Internationalisation of European Higher Education. An EUA/ACA Handbook*. Raabe: Berlin 2008, pp. 1–22.
- Knight, Jane: “Updated internationalisation definition”. *International Higher Education*, 33, 2003a, pp. 2–3, retrieved 10.6.2017 from https://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/cihe/pdf/IHEpdfs/ihe33.pdf.
- Knight, Jane: *GATS, Trade and Higher Education. Perspective 2003 – Where Are We? The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education*: London 2003.
- Kovács, István Vilmos / Tarrósy, István: *The Internationalisation of Higher Education. Handbook for Higher Education Leaders and International Co-ordinators*. Tempus Public Foundation: Budapest, 2015, retrieved 14.6.2017 from: <http://www.tka.hu/docs/palyazatok/a-felsooktatas-nemzetkoziesitese-c-kiadvany.pdf>.
- Lawson, Stephanie: *International Relations*. Second Edition. Cambridge–Malden: Polity Press 2012.
- Li, Yitian / Chen Jiagang / Xue Xiaoyuan / Lai Hairong: “Democracy, globalisation and the future of history. A Chinese interview with Francis Fukuyama.” *International Journal of China Studies* 3(1), 2012, pp. 95–107.
- Marmolejo, Fransisco: “Internationalisation of higher education. The good, the bad, and the unexpected”. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 22.10.2010, n.p., retrieved 12.06. 2017 from <http://www.chronicle.com/blogs/worldwise/internationalisation-of-higher-education-the-good-the-bad-and-the-unexpected/27512>
- OECD: *Internationalisation and Trade in Higher Education: Opportunities and Challenges*. OECD Publishing: Paris 2004, retrieved 12.6.2017 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264015067-en>.
- OECD: *Higher Education to 2030*. Vol. 1: Demography. OECD Publishing: Paris 2008, retrieved 14.6.2017 from <http://www.oecd.org/edu/skills-beyond-school/highereducationto2030vol1demography.htm>.
- OECD: *Higher Education to 2030*. Vol. 2: Globalisation. OECD Publishing: Paris 2009, retrieved 14.6.2017 from <http://www.oecd.org/edu/ceri/highereducationto2030volume2globalisation.htm>
- Pausits, Attila: “Higher Education Management 2020. Challenges and New Approaches in the Future”. In: Tarrósy, István / Milford, Susan (eds.): *European*

- Higher Education in a Changing World. A View from the Danube Region*. Publikon Books-IDM: Pécs-Vienna 2007, pp. 85–96.
- Robertson, Susan L.: “Competing in a global higher education market”. *Forum*, Spring 2017. Published by EAIE, Amsterdam, pp. 9–11.
- Scott, Peter: “Universities are all ‘internationalising’ now”. *The Guardian* 7.6. 2011, retrieved 12.6.2017, from <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2011/jun/07/universities-global-ambitions-internationalising>.
- Stalder, Felix: *Manuel Castells and the Theory of the Network Society*. Polity Press: Cambridge 2006.
- Tóth, József / Tarrósy, István: “Co-operation between science and economy in Hungary. The place and role of universities”. *Der Donauraum* 42(4), 2002, pp. 62–72.
- van der Wende, Marijk: *Opening up: higher education systems in global perspective*, Published by the Centre for Global Higher Education, UCL Institute of Education, London, 2017, retrieved 30.08.2017 from <http://www.researchcghe.org/perch/resources/publications/wp22.pdf> pp. 6
- Weimer, Maryellen: *Learner-Centered Teaching. Five Key Changes to Practice*. John Wiley: Denver 2002.
- World Bank: *Constructing Knowledge Societies. New Challenges for Tertiary Education*. World Bank: Washington, D.C. 2002, retrieved 8.06.2017, from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTAFRREGTOPT/TEIA/Resources/Constructing_Knowledge_Societies.pdf.

Que Anh Dang

Crossing Borders and Shifting Boundaries in Joint Master's Programmes between Asia and Europe

Abstract: This contribution addresses the complexity in establishing Erasmus Mundus joint master's programmes between European and Asian universities. It analyses the rationales of collaboration, governance model, and sustainability of the programmes. It argues that university consortia construct a 'third space' where they shift the boundaries between regional, national, and institutional regulatory environments in order to sustain the partnerships and improve learning and teaching experiences.

Why are European-Asian joint master's programmes desirable?

Joint programmes have increasingly been seen as a means to achieve multiple goals of the internationalisation of higher education. In addition to classic academic and intellectual exchange, there is a global awareness of the economic and diplomatic importance of international joint programmes. Higher education institutions are becoming key players in the global knowledge society, and they are increasingly driven by economically oriented rationales (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010), which may be related to enhancing the international reputation and quality of an institution or to improving the competitive position of a country or a region. Approaches chosen to achieve these goals range from institutional, national strategies to regional cooperation policies. Consequently, various forms of joint programmes emerge in different parts of the world, especially in Europe, where supranational political, financial, and technical support is made available for the internationalisation of higher education.

Two important European strategies, the Bologna Process launched in 1999 and the European Union (EU) Lisbon Strategy launched in 2000, are aimed at strengthening the role of universities and building a 'Europe of Knowledge' (Wright, 2004). The Bologna Process emphasises the cooperation, networking, and commensurability of higher education across Europe, whereas the Lisbon Strategy, particularly its competitive agenda, aims at making the European education and training systems 'a world quality reference' and the Union 'the most-favoured destination of students, scholars and researchers from other world regions' (EC, 2006, p. 240). Joint programmes, hence, have been seen

as an innovative way to materialise these objectives, loaded with expectations of becoming a hallmark of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and contributing to Europe as a competitive economic region. Precisely for these reasons, the EU in 2004 launched a new outward-looking programme, known as Erasmus Mundus (EM), which attracted international talent and promoted cooperation with countries beyond the EU borders. Whereas other European aid programmes specify and limit the eligible countries and establish a kind of donor-recipient relationship with non-European countries, Erasmus Mundus was open to all partner universities and students in the whole world. This implies the complexity in establishing partnerships, mediating different interests, negotiating multi-level rules, designing international curricula, and delivering joint courses to students of diverse backgrounds (Dang, 2007). Joint programmes are neither new nor unique; however, very scant scholarly attention is paid to how they work in practice and what lessons could be gleaned from developments in an Asia-Europe collaborative context.

This contribution, therefore, examines two cases of EM joint programmes in the field of education. Each of these two-year master's courses is jointly offered by a consortium of European and Asian universities and mainly financed by the European Commission in the form of partnership development and management funds and study grants for students and visiting scholars. First, the Master Programme in Lifelong Learning: Policy and Management (MALLL) was offered from 2006 to 2017 by a consortium of four universities from Denmark, England, Spain, and Australia. Second, the Master in Research and Innovation in Higher Education (MARIHE) ran from 2011 to 2016 and involved four universities from Austria, Finland, Germany, and China. The cases are chosen because they both are in the field of education and involve non-European partners. They both were successful in offering unique programmes to a large number of students and in obtaining two rounds of funding from the European coffers. However, the Master Programme in Lifelong Learning is closed down, and the Master in Research and Innovation in Higher Education suspended its intake in 2017. Hence, the trajectories of their partnership developments present interesting cases to explore.

The chapter seeks to explain how these international partnerships were established and developed over time, what processes of negotiation took place, and what factors affect the operation and sustainability of the joint programmes in this specific field of education. Drawing on the primary empirical data from the author's six-year experience of studying and working in the Master Programme in Lifelong Learning and five interviews with the Master in Research and Inno-

vation in Higher Education students and professors, the chapter will analyse the advantages and constraints encountered in the development of partnerships. It is also argued that these EU-funded joint programmes tend to construct themselves as a 'third space' where they move in and out on an ongoing basis and shift the boundaries between this supranational 'third space' and different national and institutional regulatory environments in order to maintain the partnerships and pursue their superordinate educational purposes, such as improving student learning experiences and professional networks among academics, rather than the competitiveness or financial gains of their member institutions.

Crossing borders and shifting boundaries

Joint programmes are defined differently in the literature. Some definitions specify technical aspects, such as a single joint qualification awarded at the end of an international collaborative programme, that determine the type of joint degree programme and distinguish it from other types of cooperation (Knight, 2011; Schüle, 2006). Such narrow definitions fail to capture other important characteristics, such as the 'jointness' and 'cohesion' in the course design, curriculum, learning and teaching experience, admission criteria, assessment of student work. As the case studies show, this jointness can only be achieved through various processes of crossing not only physical borders between countries and universities but also shifting intangible boundaries, such as culture, discipline, institutional norms and rules. Boundaries are 'conceptual distinctions' constructed by people and organisations to categorise reality and recognise a collective identity, such as distinctive characters of a higher education system or a university (Amaral, Tavares, Cardoso, & Sin, 2015). Although higher education institutions increasingly interact with external environments and international partners, they maintain their identity through the concept of boundaries, which are influenced by cultural, legislative, and political contexts.

In developing joint programmes, boundaries are often viewed as sources of potential obstacles, but they can also be a source of deep learning when they force collaborators to take a fresh look at their long-standing practices (Tsui & Law, 2007). As a result, collaborators may create opportunities for the transformation of conflicting ideas and practices into a rich zone of learning. Tsui et al. (2007) also argue that in the course of resolving contradictions, very often, a more encompassing motive is constructed for the joint actions of collaborators, thus shifting boundaries. Consequently, collaborators create a 'third space' temporally or physically where different ideas meet and form new meanings – where negotiations, learning, and changes take place. Precisely for these reasons, the joint

programmes examined in this chapter emerged as a ‘third space’ – a new territory mediating between academic, cultural, and regulative systems and between regional, national, and institutional levels. But the joint programmes alone cannot construct themselves into a ‘third space’. The next section will analyse how the regional initiative, Erasmus Mundus, serves as a mechanism that enables the emergence of such a ‘third space’.

Governance model and the creation of a ‘third space’

Erasmus Mundus joint programmes have a unique form of governance. The most noticeable feature is that the dominant source of funding comes from the European Commission. In the first phase (2004–2009), Erasmus Mundus scholarships were granted to non-European students only, and courses were designed and delivered by consortia consisting of three European universities (at least one partner university from a EU member country). However, in its second phase (2009–2013), a number of Erasmus Mundus scholarships (with a lesser amount of money per scholarship) were added for European students. At the same time, the consortia were required to engage non-European universities to diversify mobility opportunities and to make the Erasmus Mundus programme more attractive, truly international, and less ‘Eurocentric’. As observed by Dale (2016), Erasmus Mundus joint programmes are sponsored by *transnational* funding and implemented by *subnational* institutions that operate *internationally*. Here *trans* means *cross* nations, *sub* refers to *below* nations, and *inter* denotes *between* nations. All these prefixes connote various borders and boundaries and different levels of governance in the structure of Erasmus Mundus. This joint programme model requires border-crossing and boundary-shifting, thus facilitating the creation of a ‘third space’ where the members move in and out on an ongoing basis, actively learning to recognise and shift the boundaries between multilevel regulatory environments in order to sustain the partnerships.

Both the Master Programme in Lifelong Learning and the Master in Research and Innovation in Higher Education institutional partnerships were built on personal relationships between individual academics who knew each other before. Between 2006–2010, the Master Programme in Lifelong Learning was jointly offered by the Danish University of Education, the London Institute of Education (England), and Deusto University (Spain). In 2010, the University of Melbourne (Australia) joined the consortium. Students could study the first two semesters in either Denmark or England but they were required to complete the third semester in Spain. The semester in Australia was mainly for the European students.


Dissertations in the final semester had to be written and assessed at one of the three European universities. The choice of university for the dissertations was determined by the availability of supervisors and expertise at each place and visa requirements.

The Master in Research and Innovation in Higher Education was founded in 2011; from the beginning, the consortium included Beijing Normal University (China) alongside Danube University Krems (Austria), University of Tampere (Finland), and University of Applied Sciences Osnabrück (Germany). All students started in Austria, then moved together to Finland for the second semester and to China for the third semester. The three European universities supervised and assessed the dissertations in the fourth semester.

The consortia were managed by a Steering Committee made up of academic representatives from all member universities and supported by a secretariat located at the coordinating university and an administrative committee consisting of administrators from all member universities. The committee met face-to-face three times per year. An overall governance model of the Master Programme in Lifelong Learning and the Master in Research and Innovation in Higher Education, at the time of writing, is illustrated in Figure 1 below, raising the questions of which entity regulates what, and according to which rules?

The main funder (the European Commission) devises its own rules (Erasmus Mundus Programme Guide) on how to run Erasmus Mundus joint programmes. This funder and its executive agency maintain close contacts with the Steering Committee (via the Coordinator/Manager of the Consortium) for all matters ranging from student recruitment, their mobility tracks to finance management. Although the department leaders (deans) sign the consortium and finance agreements, the Steering Committee – a special international unit created to mediate between different practices and regulations (e.g. the Danish law on free tuition vs. the English law on full tuition fees, different grading systems and grade conversions between China, Australia, and Europe) – makes a new set of rules to run the joint programme. For example, each consortium set their own selection/admission criteria, common tuition fee, and student assessment criteria which are different from other domestic courses at each member university. This shared institutional regulatory space is created and legitimised by the Commission as a 'new and distinct space of regional educational governance' (Dale, 2016, p. 78). However, this space may at times become detached or isolated from their host universities, especially when organisational changes occur due to university mergers and staff turnover, or even due to the personal agendas of the programme coordinators who want to create their own space.

Figure 1: A governance model of an Erasmus Mundus joint programme



Source: Author’s compilation

The power of the funder

Since the launch of the EU Lisbon Strategy in 2000, the European Commission has extended its involvement in the higher education sector through various European initiatives (Keeling, 2006), such as supporting structural reform under the umbrella of the Bologna Process/European Higher Education Area, Erasmus Mundus for strengthening European integration, and enhancing the competitiveness and global reach of European higher education. This involvement has also increased the European Commission’s power in its various forms. Lukes (2005) conceptualises those forms in three dimensions. In the first dimension, power is visible in decision-making processes. In the Erasmus Mundus programme, not only the outcomes of such process count but also other aspects of power, such as the power to keep certain issues off the table, or to exclude certain groups, or to limit their access to decision-making processes. As observed in the two cases, national ministries of education were not directly included in the flow of information. The second dimension consists of the power to set and control the agenda, in the form of the structure, governance, organisation, and evaluation of the joint programmes. The third and perhaps

most powerful dimension incorporates and transcends the first two dimensions. This third face of power is not directly visible because it is the capacity to shape preferences and to secure consent and compliance to domination without the explicit exercise of power. Not only is the European Commission able to set criteria for participation in the consortia and the selection of joint programmes for funding, it can also use the prestigious status of the Erasmus Mundus programme to steer the action of participating universities. For instance, Beijing Normal University (BNU) has convinced the Chinese Ministry of Education to give permission and recognise the 2-year Master's in Research and Innovation in Higher Education, although the national law requires 3 years for a master's degree.

Dang: How to get the permission to run a 2-year master's degree?

BNU: [...] I said it is an Erasmus Mundus programme [...] It is a real challenge for us because joint degree programme is not allowed by the Chinese law. I don't use the word 'joint programme' but a kind of student mobility. I am not telling lie, but only part of the truth. I told them all the good things I know about the project. If I tell them it is for student learning/understanding, they will not believe me, but I tell them that the programme is contributing to the socio-economic development through mobility activity, developing creative talent of diverse backgrounds. I use the word 'creative talent'. I have to link the European programme to the Chinese discourse. (Interview 3, May 2014)

This answer explains how a partner mediates between different regulative contexts and also demonstrates that power works most effectively and insidiously when it is hidden.

Motivations for collaboration

In the two cases, both internal and external factors motivate universities to collaborate. Internal factors such as developing a specialised subject area (e.g. life-long learning), pooling and developing talent (recruiting international teachers and students), leveraging resources, and building and expanding professional networks act as incentives for engaging in a partnership. Internal factors vary across the partner universities and over time. For example, the Master in Research and Innovation in Higher Education consists of three European specialised universities/faculties of education with relatively limited resources (expertise, teaching staff), meaning the partnership enables them to design and offer programmes and learning experiences that were not possible at individual universities alone (interview 1, 3 in May 2014). As for Beijing Normal University, the main motivation for participating in an Erasmus Mundus programme was to increase their prestigious position nationally and internationally. In

the case of the Master Programme in Lifelong Learning, despite the fact that Denmark has a long tradition of lifelong learning, the joint programme was established as the first international master's course specialised in this subject and taught in English at the Danish University of Education. International lecturers were recruited to develop the modular curricula and to teach alongside the Danish lecturers, many of whom were reluctant to teach in English. Joining the Master Programme in Lifelong Learning, Melbourne University was keen to attract more European students to their campus which has mainly been populated by Asian students. They also need partners for sending their students to Europe. In both cases, internal factors also include the academics' individual motivations to expand their capacities (international teaching and research experience) and professional networks. Although the partner universities and their staff have their own motivations and priorities for participating, the partnership can still be established and developed as long as it is mutually beneficial.

In terms of external factors, perhaps the strongest pressure comes from the requirements for cross-border partnership set by the European Commission. Another external factor is the perception that employers value the inter-cultural competences and international experience of students graduating from joint programmes (interviews 2, 3, 4 in May 2014). The internal and external motivations shape the options and behaviours of the participating universities and individuals nested under the joint programme.

The role of champions

The success of the Master Programme in Lifelong Learning and the Master in Research and Innovation in Higher Education depends considerably on having an overall consortium leader as well as coordinators at each university. They are members of the Steering Committee in the figure above. They can be seen as champions who play a key role in developing enthusiasm and ensuring support for the joint project (Chapman, Pekol, & Wilson, 2014; de Róiste, Breetzke, & Reitsma, 2015). Some of these champions in the Master Programme in Lifelong Learning and the Master in Research and Innovation in Higher Education were deans of the participating academic faculties, others were senior academics or rising star academics with vast professional networks. These champions are important but they are also in a delicate position: they need to constantly and actively move between their institutional environment and the 'third space', mediating between their long-term institutional attachment and the temporary project-based joint programme.

The sustainability of partnership

Although Erasmus Mundus joint programmes can expand resources and capacities, they also increase operational complexity. There is an immense time commitment required to establish and maintain a partnership and make it thrive. While the international partnership may be personally and professionally rewarding for those involved, the commitment may be too high if the work is not valued by the management and academic community within the host institution. That was the case with the Master Programme in Lifelong Learning in its last five years due to university mergers and a change of leadership at the Danish and English partners. The enthusiasm of the people involved and the energy invested in the partnership gradually diminished. At the same time, the European funding came to an end. Lack of institutional support at all participating universities, huge administrative burdens, and staff changes ruined the idea of putting together a new funding application. Consequently, the Master Programme in Lifelong Learning is closed down after ten years of operation. In the case of the Master in Research and Innovation in Higher Education, enthusiasm and commitment remain high, but the competition for European funding is so fierce that the joint programme had to suspend its operation in 2017. Unlike other high-tech or commercial subjects, the nature of an educational programme and its low 'return on investment' make it more challenging to recruit self-paying students to sustain the costly international joint programmes.

Concluding remarks

Using the case studies of the Master Programme in Lifelong Learning and the Master in Research and Innovation in Higher Education, this chapter has explained how European-Asian joint programmes work in practice. While recognising the importance of economic rationale of joint programmes in general, the focus of this chapter is on the development rationale and the challenges faced by individual partners and the consortia. The institutional partnerships are built on personal friendships. The explicit benefits of the partnership are the learning from one another and the collegiality that bonds partners together. Although such a development rationale is well suited to the field of education, it does cause financial vulnerability and affect the viability of joint programmes.

In order to sustain the partnerships, the partners have to negotiate and mediate between different and even conflicting regulations of the main funder, national laws, and member universities. Using Lukes' three-dimensional concept

of power (decision-making, agenda-setting, manipulation/latent authority), the chapter argues that the European Commission shapes the processes and practices at institutional and national levels. Such influence also encourages boundary-shifting and facilitates the creation of a ‘third space’ in temporal, spatial, and physical terms. The sustainability of joint programmes also depends significantly on the role of leader-champions who believe strongly in the partnerships and have the ability to generate effective cohesiveness and support to maintain the commitment of all members through different stages of partnership development.

References

- Amaral, Alberto / Tavares, Orlanda / Cardoso, Sónia / Sin, Christina: “Shifting institutional boundaries through cross-border higher education”. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 20(1), 2015, pp. 48–60.
- Chapman, David W. / Pekol, Amy / Wilson, Elisabeth: “Cross-border university networks as a development strategy: Lessons from three university networks focused on emerging pandemic threats”. *International Review of Education* 60(5), 2014, pp. 619–637.
- Dale, Roger: “Erasmus Mundus and the EU: Intrinsic Sectoral Regionalism in Higher Education”. In Robertson, Susan L. / Olds, Kris / Dale, Roger / Dang, Que Anh (eds.): *Global Regionalisms and Higher Education: Projects, Processes, Politics*. Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, UK et al. 2016, pp. 65–84.
- Dang, Que Anh: *Erasmus Mundus: Europeanisation and Internationalisation as a Foundation for the Globalisation of European Higher Education*. (Unpublished semester paper, Danish School of Education). 2007.
- European Commission (EC): *The History of European Cooperation in Education and Training. Europe in the Making – An Example*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publ. of the European Communities 2006.
- Keeling, Ruth: “The Bologna Process and the Lisbon Research Agenda: The European Commission’s expanding role in higher education discourse”. *European Journal of Education* 41(2), 2006, pp. 203–223.
- Knight, Jane: “Doubts and Dilemmas with Double Degree Programs”. *Revista de Universidad y Sociedad del Conocimiento* 8(2), 2011, pp. 297–312
- Lukes, Steven: *Power: A Radical View* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke 2005.
- Rizvi, Fazal/ Lingard, Bob: *Globalizing Education Policy*. London & New York: Routledge 2010.

- Róiste, Mairéad de / Breetzke, Gregory / Reitsma, Femke: "Opportunities across boundaries: Lessons from a collaboratively delivered cross-institution Master's programme". *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 39(3), 2015, pp. 470–477.
- Schüle, Ulrich: *Joint and Double Degrees within the European Higher Education Area. Towards Further Internationalisation of Business Degrees. CIDD Papers on International Business Education* (Vol. 1) 2006.
- Tsui, Amy B. M. / Law, Doris Y. K.: "Learning as boundary-crossing in school – university partnership". *Teaching and Teacher Education* 23, 2007, pp. 1289–1301.
- Wright, Susan: "Markets, corporations, consumers? New landscapes of higher education". *Learning and Teaching in the Social Science* 1(2), 2004, pp. 71–93.

Nils Szuka & Juan J. Garcia Blesa

Activating Students in Distance Education: The Integration of E-Learning Scenarios into Short Learning Programmes

Abstract: This article offers a self-reflective account of the ways in which the European Distance Education in Law Network (EDELNet) has tackled the challenge of combining e-learning modules with face-to-face intensive study programmes or Short Learning Programmes in order to enhance the activating and student-centred learning effects of its activities.

Problem outline

The role of distance education in higher education – content is dead!

At a time when quick, cheap, and easy access to almost unlimited content resources is available virtually to anyone in the West, the role of higher education programmes in law, social sciences, and humanities is shifting dramatically. In the past, universities usually acted as a conveyor belt for ready-made knowledge, transporting it from relatively exclusive circles of knowledge production to the mass of students. The goal of the process was generally to secure a more or less accurate reproduction of ideas officially labelled as knowledge. Twenty-first-century democratic societies, however, demand that universities become training centres for autonomous, competent learning for knowledge producers across the whole social spectrum.

This is also true of legal studies. Traditionally structured as an authority-based preparation for social hierarchy (Kennedy, 1983; 1998), the relevance and the legitimacy of legal studies are decreasing today across Europe. The modern lawyer's identity is trapped in a technocratic spiral of frustration, cynicism, and irrelevance in view of the overwhelming challenges modern democracies are currently facing. Barely transparent, costly, slow, and sometimes hardly effective legal remedies and procedures are pushing millions in Europe to rely on arbitration and mediation rather than on publicly administered justice for the solution of vital social problems. This is not necessarily a negative phenomenon. But it is beyond doubt that one of its main causes is the type of legal education that the operators of the legal system go through and the kind of professional culture that

it generates among them, making them unable to channel adequately many of the important changes society is demanding.

From this point of view, mainstream, authority-based didactic approaches in law have become obsolete. The view that learning consists of filling the vessel of students' minds with large amounts of content needs to be combined, if not superseded, with programmes focused on competence and skills training. This shift is not without risk. If the goal of allowing students to become autonomous knowledge producers, and thus more relevant social actors, is to be achieved, the transformation must be accompanied by a strong emphasis on critical thinking and the transfer of learning outcomes.

A different understanding of the potential advantages of distance teaching today is beginning to open new scenarios of improvement for higher education at large. In this context, the adequate combination of student-centred approaches and blended learning scenarios can allow distance universities to bridge the gap in legal education (Gerdy, 2002–04; Grealy, 2015; Hewitt, 2015; O'Neill & McMahon, 2005; White & Crowley, 2015).

Special needs of specific target groups in distance education – the problem of activating students

Campus universities are usually focused on a very limited type of student. Generally, anyone above the age of 21 is considered to be a 'mature student' and hence somewhat out of place at a campus university. Students with children, with full time jobs, living in distant or rural areas or just socially removed from the higher education system (due to economic or cultural reasons) need to be given a better chance to get access to good quality higher education that can improve their professional perspectives and their lives in general. Again, distance universities are better suited to fill this gap.

New didactic approaches in distance education enable instructors and students to concentrate face-to-face learning time in short, intensive units that allow for high-quality learning experiences.

Obstacles to internationalisation in legal studies in general and in respect of the target group

Legal education has proven to be especially resistant to internationalisation. Owing to its strong ties to the state sovereignty doctrine, law is still presented in the average classroom as a Cartesian series of almost watertight compartments. This view, however, turns a blind eye on the current European legal reality furthering

a rigid legal mind and somehow giving students the sense that national law can after all be used at convenience to ignore the implications of European integration.

The different requirements to practice law in EU countries, institutional reluctance and lack of resources, understanding, commitment, or expertise in key areas, like language skills or intercultural communication, represent further obstacles. All this makes it a challenge to bring together law students from different EU countries in the same classroom and achieve meaningful results.

Intercultural complexities in international distance education processes

The philosophy of the EDELNet Partnership is based on the idea that ‘internationalisation cannot be based on mobility only. It must also promote the comprehensive and purposeful competence to deal with cultural diversity’ (Bosse, 2010). Consequently, any international learning activity is conceived as an opportunity to help both students and instructors develop their own intercultural competence. For this reason, EDELNet has developed a student-centred blended learning programme in intercultural communication for both students and teachers, including online and face-to-face activities embedded in the regular law learning programme.

The EDELNet Partnership

How an idea took shape

The first contact between the EDELNet partners was built up in the years 2003 and 2004 at meetings of the Law Teachers Association of the United Kingdom and led to a first approach for cooperation in the field of ERASMUS-Intensive Study Programmes in the years 2007/2008. The three partners subsequently organised ten intensive programmes with more than 300 students in the years 2008–2017. Until 2014, these Short Learning Programmes were solely organised for students at the bachelor’s level; since 2015, the partners have organised Short Learning Programmes at the bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral level.

As a steady and reliable basis for their partnership, all partners can provide a distinguished profile and the expertise of longstanding stakeholders in the higher distance education sector with a high degree of professionalism and possible benefits for the scientific community. All three partners have many years of expertise in distant teaching, especially in modern and highly innovative fields of blended learning in respect of legal education as well as excellent technical facilities and expertise in the implementation of blended learning teaching concepts.

Structure of the partnership

Within the previously mentioned partnership agreement, the establishment of an executive board and a supervisory board was stipulated. These boards, which meet face-to-face and online on a regular basis, consist of different members of the academic and management staff of the partner universities, including different hierarchical levels, and have different tasks and responsibilities in the academic and administrative management of the partnership. The executive board organises, plans, and monitors the activities, the system of evaluation and quality assurance and, if appropriate, drafts proposals on changes and project applications of the network to be put before the supervisory board. Every year, it presents to the supervisory board a draft for an annual plan of activities and for an annual report that includes the outcome of the quality assurance. The supervisory board oversees the activities of the executive board and appoints the president of that board. Furthermore, the cooperation agreement governs other organisational questions such as copyright issues, use of names, confidentiality, and dispute resolution mechanisms. Regarding dispute resolution, alternative dispute resolution mechanisms are strongly preferred by all partners.

Learning and teaching activities

All partner universities base their overall learning and teaching activities on a 'blended-learning' format. 'Blended learning' refers to the range of possibilities presented by combining internet and digital media with established classroom forms that require the physical co-presence of teacher and students (Frisen, 2012). As part of their blended learning concepts, all partners use a broad range of these possibilities to meet the challenges and obstacles their diverse student body and its needs impose on them. Due to the analysis in section I of this article, the partners cannot rely on long-term classroom settings, but need to use the format of 'Short Learning Programmes'. Within these condensed Short Learning Programmes, the partners combine the benefits of classroom meetings with an accurate and well-designed preparatory phase to use the classroom time as profitably as possible.

Within the partnership, Short Learning Programmes are conducted annually for students in all learning cycles. Details about these Short Learning Programmes will be laid down in section III of this article:

- Bachelor of Laws (210 ECTS study programme), conducted in the summer months of each year with around 30 students from the partner universities
- Master of Laws (90 ECTS study programme), conducted in the summer months of each year with around 20 students from the partner universities

- Doctoral School, conducted in the winter months of each year with around 15 students from the partner universities

A central part of the EDELNet Project is innovation and the quality of teaching. Knowledge and experience in online activating education vary among the group of teachers. To prepare the teaching staff of the participating universities for meeting the project goals in this field, all partners agreed to conduct annual courses in the field of student-oriented teaching. Within the project, there are annual face-to-face seminars, each featuring 15 participants and 3 instructors, in which participants work together with experts from the partner universities, learn from experience, wrap up results and, in the following years, hand them over to a new group of professors and the academic learning community at large. The seminars are prepared with course materials structured in accordance with the concept of blended learning. All seminars will be designed to incorporate the latest knowledge about attractive and effective distant teaching.

Additionally, since EDELNet is not a temporary, isolated project, the partners were aware that their academic activities not only require cross-cultural cooperation. They also knew that the exchange is not only between different types of knowledge but also between different cultures, that is, between ‘different and incommensurable universes of meaning’. In order to meet the challenge imposed by this, the partners train their teaching and management staff in the intercultural aspects that affect communication in both their scientific and their administrative roles. Thus, there are annual face-to-face staff training activities with preparatory materials.

As a solid groundwork for all further activities and as high-quality outputs, scientists of all partners are to develop various blended-learning course materials to be used by students and teaching staff in all learning cycles. These course materials comprise the following topics:

- Legal English eCourse I
- Legal English eCourse II
- Intercultural Communication eCourse
- Doctrinal Legal Research Materials
- Research Design and Management Materials
- Academic Attitude and Ethics Materials
- Interdisciplinary Legal Research Materials
- Research Methods in International Law Materials
- Research Methods in EU Law Materials

Short Learning Programmes of the EDELNet and the integration of e-Learning scenarios

Purpose and scope of Short Learning Programmes: the EDELNet LL.B. and LL.M Summer Schools

The use of Short Learning Programmes within the EDELNet partnership varies significantly from the doctoral level to the master's and bachelor's levels. While on the doctorate level, Short Learning Programmes are utilised as an enhancing complement to a larger online programme, the master- and bachelor-level Short Learning Programmes represent the main component of the EDELNet cooperation at these two levels. This means that the main learning experience is intended to happen during the face-to-face activity. The goal, therefore, is to apply this tool to key transversal elements of the regular curriculum of all participating institutions, making sure that students can later connect that experience to a significant part of the rest of the programme at their home institutions. Consequently, the online courses offered at these levels are a complement to the face-to-face activity rather than the other way around. Yet the use of the online courses in these scenarios has proven to be of great importance.

Advantages of the introduction of e-learning scenarios in Short Learning Programmes

By introducing e-learning scenarios into Short Learning Programmes, the project can benefit students and teachers in several fields:

- In the first instance, the actual contact time used in face-to face-meetings can be reduced. Short Learning Programmes, which are prepared with e-learning scenarios, allow students to gain professional experiences in a foreign language with an intercultural background in short periods without any loss of quality. Students with limited possibilities of living abroad for longer terms can prepare themselves online, so the actual face-to-face times can be reduced.
- Students and teachers gain additional ICT competences by using e-learning scenarios and applications. They learn from the opportunities, challenges, and obstacles that e-learning scenarios provide for students and teachers.
- The use of e-learning scenarios gives room for the inclusion of disadvantaged students in transnational learning processes. E-learning scenarios enable students from abroad, students on parental leave, or disabled students to take part in the international learning experience.

- The possible workload and thus the awardable ECTS credits for students can be enhanced without the need for inserting unrealistic resources, neither by the students nor by the teaching staff.
- The use of e-learning scenarios in Short Learning Programmes fosters the possibility for teachers to experiment with modern and didactical approaches and modern ICT technology.

The LL.B. Summer School

The LL.B. Summer School was the nucleus of the EDELNet Project, held annually since 2008 and boasting more than 300 alumni by 2017. The Summer School started as a pure face-to-face activity; the only surrounding activity was the provision of textbooks about the basics of each participating country's legal system. The partners eventually shifted contents to the ICT-based preparation period and surrounded a shortened one-week face-to-face phase with virtual classroom activities to prepare the actual classes. Altogether, the LL.B. Summer School partners can award up to 10 ECTS credits to the participating students. As a result, the LL.B. Summer School now runs through three phases:

a) Phase I: Specialised preparation

aa) Legal reading: Introduction to law

To gain a basic understanding of supranational legal principles, all participating students are asked to read and prepare some chapters of the book *Introduction to Law* edited by Jaap Hage and Bram Akkermans. This book is 'special in the sense that it introduces students to law in general and not to the law of one specific jurisdiction' (Hage & Akkermans, 2014, p. 1). With this approach, the book meets the demands of the project, which aims not just at enhancing students' knowledge of their own legal system but to foster their understanding of supranational legal interrelations.

bb) Legal English I

In accordance with the transnational approach of EDELNet, both distant and face-to-face learning activities are offered to all students in English. In order to ensure active participation and effective learning, the face-to-face phase of all Short Learning Programmes is preceded by a Legal English e-course that prepares students for participation in meetings and discussions. Firstly, the course covers the grammar structures of legal English. Secondly, the course familiarises participants with the main vocabulary for the concepts of constitutional law, criminal law, and

private law that will be addressed in the e-learning preparations for the Summer School. Mastering these Legal English grammar structures and vocabulary enables participants to effectively interact and communicate with their foreign peers in formal and informal interaction.

cc) Intercultural Communication e-course

As mentioned earlier, all participants – students and teaching staff – need basic intercultural communication skills to be able to benefit from the transnational setting of all learning and teaching activities. Therefore, all participants are asked to take part in the project's Intercultural Communication e-course. This highly innovative intellectual e-course consists of materials on the application of intercultural communication structures. The e-course was developed together with academics based at the Faculty of Psychology at FernUniversität in Hagen. The e-course serves as a basis for achieving one of the project goals: the development of an interculturally sensitive work community of law students and instructors trained in interdisciplinary thinking.

dd) Preparation of case studies

The case studies, as explained in the next section, deal with the fictional state of Transdanubia. In one part of the programme, students have to participate in a parliamentary debate in the fictional state. In preparatory group work, several groups of students have to discuss via virtual means the standing rules of the fictional parliament, that is, rules concerning speaking times, voting rules, and so forth. The proposals drafted by the different groups via virtual classrooms are discussed in the face-to-face meeting and then adopted by a majority of students. By introducing an ICT-based group work format, students discuss with each other, get to know each other, and work together before meeting in person for the first time. As a secondary effect, the case study produces a set of rules that students have discussed and adopted themselves. From a pedagogical point of view, therefore, they have taken an active part in the learning process.

b) Phase II: Face-to-face meeting

aa) Wrap-up sessions for Legal English I and Intercultural Communication

As a first step towards transporting all learning outcomes of the preparatory phase to the face-to-face phase, students are provided with wrap-up sessions concerning the e-courses. In these wrap-up sessions, all students have the possibility to ask questions and make first use of the things they have learned. The knowledge gained in the e-courses is sustained and consolidated by the wrap-up.

bb) Role plays 'Transdanubia'

Since all teachers are engaged in the idea of activating learning processes – that is, processes where students take an active part in their education, as opposed to passively absorbing lectures – the LL.B. Summer School uses case studies and role plays to give students an active part in their own learning process. With this setting, the programme aims at opening up students' minds for the challenges and opportunities of transnational legal collaboration and at giving diverse student groups the chance to discuss legal problems and their implications in an international framework. For that purpose, after some short input by members of the teaching staff, students work on three case studies dealing with the fictional state of 'Transdanubia'. The idea for this state was developed by Prof Dr Huub Spoormans of the OU NL. All case studies use the learning platform Moodle for organising group work and distributing materials and results.

The fictional state of Transdanubia is a landlocked republic in Central Europe, which until 1989 was part of the socialist bloc. In recent years, the state moved towards full membership in the European Union and is now a full member of the Council of Europe. In the first case study, students get some additional information on the population, the economy, and other aspects of Transdanubia and are asked by the country's Ministry of the Interior to give advice regarding the basic outline of a possible constitution. Students are split up into groups to discuss the possible reform of Transdanubia's constitution. Each group is expected to come up with proposals on the electoral system, the executive system, judicial review, the protection of basic rights, and minority protection. During these discussions, students get a broad overview of the possibilities that different constitutions provide. They learn not to take everything they know for granted and discuss ways to enhance the quality of their own constitutions' provisions.

In the second case study, students are put in the position of members of parliament of the state of Transdanubia. They discuss, and in the end maybe decide on, a draft bill the government introduces to parliament. The draft bill deals with controversial proposals on the media infrastructure and the composition of the constitutional court of Transdanubia, showing similarities to recent developments in a Central European state. The fictional parliament consists of 300 members (each Summer School student represents 10 votes in the house). The majority of votes needed to pass the law is 160 (or 16 students). The seats in parliament are divided along three political parties: the Party of the People (governing party) with 140 members (14 students), the Democratic Party (opposition) with 110 members (11 students), and the Independent Party with 50 members (5 students). The students conduct their discussions under their own regulations, which they agreed on based on their preparatory work. In the end, they vote on the draft

bill. With this case study, students on the one hand learn to organise discussion processes and on the other hand reflect on the topics set in this case study from their own and the intercultural point of view.

The third case study deals with a possible ‘Traxit’, that is, the exit of the state of Transdanubia, now a member of the European Union, from the EU. After getting input from the Central European, Spanish, and Greek perspectives (the latter as an example of a disadvantaged state), students discuss the implications and dangers of member states leaving the European Union.

c) Phase III: Post-processing

In the post-processing of the Short Learning Programmes, the different participating countries have the possibility of asking students to complete an assignment to wrap up the programme and to justify the awarding of further ECTS credits. The German FernUniversität Hagen, for example, asks students for a written assignment of up to 10 pages. Including this assignment, the workload of FernUniversität Hagen students amounts to 300 hours for the whole SLP in all three phases; therefore, 10 ECTS credits may be awarded.

The LL.M. Summer School

The master-level summer school lasts five days and follows a similar logic as the undergraduate programme. During the preparatory phase, students get basic information on key aspects of the face-to-face programme that brings them closer to each other in terms of their background knowledge as well as their linguistic and intercultural communication skills. The programme itself revolves around a moot court where students are the main players.

a) Phase I: Specialised preparation

The preparatory phase takes two months and consists of a series of online courses and meetings accompanied by permanent support from both instructors and administrative staff.

aa) Legal reading: Moot court materials

A mandatory online course has been developed to provide students with knowledge about national and international contract law. Since the moot case deals with the international sale of goods, the basic concepts of this topic are presented, accompanied by basic references in this field. This course has an online environment where students can contact the instructors or their fellow students at all times to get clarifications or further information they might need.

bb) Legal English II

Participants must complete an advanced legal English course before they may attend the LL.M. Summer School. Part of the course focuses on advocacy skills; the rest is devoted to the writing skills necessary for court proceedings. LL.M. students are also allowed to take the basic legal English I e-course.

cc) Intercultural Communication e-course

A mandatory basic e-course on intercultural competence is also offered to the LL.M. Summer School students. This course is the same as the one offered to undergraduate students.

*b) Phase II: Face-to-face programme**aa) Wrap up sessions for Legal English II and Intercultural Communication*

The online courses on advanced legal English and intercultural competence are coupled with one face-to-face unit each. These sessions aim to reinforce the learning process by dealing with the practical application of the targeted skills. Simulations, teamwork, and individual coaching are included in these sessions.

bb) Moot Court

The moot court allows students to experience the real work of a lawyer by confronting a rather ordinary case of arbitration with international elements. In the morning of the first day, right after being split into plaintiff and defendant teams, students are presented with the moot case they will have to process together in order to stand before the moot court at the end of the activity. To prepare for the case, they can consult with the team of instructors regarding subject-matter issues, procedure, or court rhetoric.

*c) Phase III: Post-processing**aa) Evaluation*

Once the moot court is concluded, students receive both group and individual feedback from the instructors involved in the activity. Feedback on their performance in the other activities of the face-to-face programme, like Legal English or Intercultural Communication, is provided immediately upon completion of these units.

After all face-to-face learning and networking activities are finished, students are invited to participate in a written evaluation of the programme, which is complemented by a face-to-face feedback discussion on the programme. This feedback is later analysed by the managing board of the partnership; the results are used to introduce improvements every year.

Conclusion

After several years of trial-and-error learning, the experience gathered in the EDELNet programme has been overwhelmingly positive. Most students evaluate their experience as very positive and share a clear view that it helps them achieve their learning goals and improve their chances of successfully completing their studies.

References

- Bosse, Elke: “Vielfalt erkunden – ein Konzept für interkulturelles Training an Hochschulen.” In: Hiller, Gwenn / Vogler-Lipp, Stefanie (eds.): *Schlüsselqualifikation Interkulturelle Kompetenz an Hochschulen. Grundlagen, Konzepte, Methoden*. Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden 2010, pp. 109–133.
- Friesen, Norm: Report: “Defining Blended Learning”. 2012, retrieved 22.7.2017, from http://learningspaces.org/papers/Defining_Blended_Learning_NF.pdf.
- Gerdy, Kristine B.: “Teacher, coach, cheerleader, and judge. Promoting learning through learner-centered assessment”. *Law Library Journal* 94(1), 2002, pp. 59–88.
- Grealy, Freda: “Mobile professional learning for the legal profession in Ireland. A student-centred approach”. *The Law Teacher*, 49(3), 2005, pp. 303–322.
- Hage, Jaap / Akkermans, Bram (eds.): *Introduction to Law*. Springer: Maastricht 2014.
- Hewitt, Anne: “Can you learn to lawyer online? A blended learning environment case study”. *The Law Teacher* 49(1), 2015, pp. 92–121.
- Kennedy, Duncan: “Legal Education as Training for Hierarchy”. In: Kairys, David (ed.): *The Politics of Law. A Progressive Critique*, 3rd Edition. Basic Books: New York, 1998, pp. 54–75.
- Kennedy, Duncan: “The political significance of the structure of the law school curriculum”. *Seton Hall Law Review*, 14(1), 1983, pp. 1–16.
- O’Neill, Geraldine / McMahon, Tim: “Student-centred Learning: What Does It Mean for Students and Lecturers?” In: O’Neill, G. / Moore, S. / McMullin, B. (eds.): *Emerging Issues in the Practice of University Learning and Teaching*. AISHE: Dublin, 2005, pp. 27–36
- White, Fidelma / Crowley, Louise: “The international summer school experience. A worthwhile challenge”. *The Law Teacher*, 49(1), 2015, pp. 1–21.