

POSSIBLE SCENARIOS

With such a predicament, is it then correct to assume that it is impossible to turn IBCs into research universities? It is perhaps too early to say whether IBCs will remain in their present state as teaching institutions. Three possible scenarios may change their outlook in the future. First, host government policies on IBCs have always changed according to national interests. Governments are becoming more aware of the fact that allowing IBCs to function as mere teaching institutions does not serve their interests if they aspire to be industrialized nations with knowledge-based economies. Host governments may mandate IBCs to undertake more research to support their economic and industrial needs. While giving mandates does not necessarily make IBCs function as research institutions, the persistent ones will try to adhere to these mandates to maintain their presence. Otherwise, they may have to abandon their investments in terms of building infrastructure in the country, and also suffer reputational damage.

Second, demands and opportunities from industries (both local and multinational) to conduct applied research may speed up the transformation of IBCs. For example, some local industries in China are emerging as global players with sufficient funding to set aside for research and development. The establishment of IBCs that are specifically aimed at conducting research and technology transfer—such as Guangdong Technion Israel Institute of Technology and Shenzhen Moscow State University–Beijing Institute of Technology (MSU–BIT) University—attests to the attractive university–industry partnership opportunities made available by local high-tech industries and entrepreneurship ecosystems. IBCs can draw on their “parent” universities’ research strengths and on local or multinational industries’ technology transfer needs to do more research in the host countries.

Third, when demand for research qualifications increases, IBCs will start offering research programs and become research focused. Countries such as Malaysia and China, which are now undergoing a massification of their higher education, may soon enter a period where the main demand for tertiary education systems lies in research qualifications. Due to massification, local national universities are becoming very adept at providing teaching programs, but may not be adequately prepared to offer research programs yet. Coupled with their governments’ ambition to become knowledge-based economies, students will more likely access IBCs to obtain research qualifications. More empirical research is of course needed to ascertain how these scenarios are currently being played out in the real world.

Changes are possible for IBCs in developing countries, but transforming them into flagship research universities

may not happen in the near future, if at all. However, there are niche areas of applied and technology transfer research that they will be able to fill in sufficiently to be perceived as research universities by their communities. This will occur in a way that is particular to the context of the IBCs, distinct from their “parent” universities. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10212>

Internationalization of Universities: The German Way

MARIJKE WAHLERS

Marijke Wahlers is head of the International Department, German Rectors' Conference, Germany. E-mail: wahlers@hrk.de.

The concept of internationalization at German universities, which has regained considerable strength since the late 1980s, has historically been based on the idea of cooperation and partnership, thanks to the post-1945 belief that only a Germany that was firmly anchored in Europe and the world could be internationally accepted and economically successful. There has been, therefore, a tradition of political support for the exchange of students and researchers embedded in international university partnerships based on an equal footing and on trust. In the 1990s, numerous binational initiatives, such as the Franco–German University and the Sino–German College for Graduate Studies, exemplified this idea of trust-based cooperation for the purpose of promoting cultural exchange and understanding between people. This cooperative approach to internationalization has since received further vital impetus from the education programs of the European Union, which require the full integration of student mobility into regular study programs.

More recently, growing competition within the German system, coupled with the effects of globalization, have resulted in the emergence of a more competitive approach. Interestingly, it was again the European dimension which provided crucial impetus here, especially the goal defined by European education ministers in 1998 of creating a competitive and internationally attractive European Higher Education Area aiming to gain a sizeable share in an expanding worldwide market of globally mobile students and researchers. It is worth noting that German universities approached the standard rhetoric of the “horse race for talent” with a degree of hesitation. The idea of self-promotion was rather foreign to them for several reasons. First, both rela-

tively open university access and the long-held assumption that the country's universities were homogenous in terms of quality meant that there was virtually no experience, nationally, of marketing to attract students. Second, it was simply assumed that the good quality of research and teaching at German institutions was already well known and that these brand credentials were enough on the international higher education market.

DIFFERENT RATIONALES FOR ATTRACTING INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Similarly, the cooperative and competitive approaches have coexisted for many years with regard to attracting international students, although these approaches have been distinct and unconnected. The more cooperative rationale is easily gleaned from Germany's tradition of offering tuition-free university education. Within this context, a growing number of international students have been studying at German universities, either taking courses as part of degrees awarded by their home institutions or for a full German degree. For students from developing and threshold countries, financial assistance has often been linked to a requirement to return to their home countries promptly after completing their studies in order to counter the brain drain effect. Providing an education to a large number of international students at the cost of German taxpayers is regarded as Germany's contribution to international exchange and global development. No less importantly, the international alumni of German institutions are valued as important ambassadors and worldwide partners for Germany.

We may observe the more competitive rationale with nationwide initiatives such as GATE—Germany, through which German universities have gradually come to terms with, and built competence in, international marketing. Universities have increasingly taken part in international education fairs and similar initiatives; some institutions have even established representative offices abroad for the purpose of attracting excellent students and early career researchers. This approach is supported not only by government, but also by industry, which views universities—sometimes, regrettably, with a rather one-dimensional perspective—as “magnets” for academically qualified individuals from abroad.

These parallel approaches have resulted in a dramatic increase in the number of international students in Germany over the past two decades—from 158,000 in 1997 to approximately 358,000 in 2017 (about 12 percent of all students). It should also be noted that the international student body is extremely heterogeneous. As in most host countries, China is by far the largest country of origin. Nevertheless, Chinese students only make up around 13 percent of the total international student body in Germany—contrast-

ing with 30 percent in Australia, 32 percent in the United States, and 37 percent in the United Kingdom. Preparatory language and content courses and ongoing support and advice for this heterogeneous international student body pose significant challenges to German universities that are more than just financial. At the same time, international students offer considerable potential to Germany as a place of study and research. This valuable contribution, for example helping achieve a truly “international classroom,” is being increasingly recognized and utilized by universities.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

With few exceptions, the substantial increase in the number of international students has occurred without universities being able to demand financial contributions or cost-covering tuition fees from this group. Not surprisingly, this has caused some astonishment around the globe, with international partners wondering whether their German colleagues were simply naïve and good-natured or, in fact, remarkably astute.

The concept of internationalization at German universities, which has regained considerable strength since the late 1980s, has historically been based on the idea of cooperation and partnership.

The question arises as to whether, and how, the two sometimes contradictory rationales described here can, in the future, be harmonized. Like other European countries, Germany could follow the example of leading host nations and demand substantial fees from international students to cover the costs of their education. The argument that German taxpayers should not be expected to pay for international students is an understandable one. Yet, the example of the introduction of fees for international students from countries outside the European Union by the state of Baden-Württemberg (starting from this current winter semester) illustrates that an all too simple cost-benefit analysis is generally inadequate in a state-dominated system like in Germany. In this case, it is already clear that the universities will not benefit from the additional income: while they must handle the additional administrative workload, universities will be required to pass 80 percent of the revenue to the federal state.

So, there is much to be said in favor of an alternative op-

tion: in the global competitive market, Germany can further enhance its profile by consistently pursuing its partnership-based approach. This would mean that the country deliberately sets itself apart from the mainstream of recruiting international students to cover deficits in university budgets. There is plenty of evidence that not only universities, but also the economy and society, reap long-term benefits. German universities are therefore doing well to further internationalize their structures and offer attractive conditions to students, researchers, and experts from all over the world. Attractiveness not only depends on the legal framework for studying, research, and employment, but also on the establishment of a cosmopolitan culture within universities and beyond. The argument does not extend, however, to posit that students—including international students—should be exempt from making a financial contribution to the costs of their degree. For a long time, the German Rectors' Conference has expressed its support for the introduction of moderate, socially supported tuition fees for all students.

It remains to be seen how the situation will evolve further. The newly elected state government in North Rhine–Westphalia, Germany's most populous state, has announced its intention to introduce tuition fees for students from countries outside the European Union. It is not yet clear exactly how this will work, whether other federal states will follow suit, or what impact this will have on the higher education sector's internationalization efforts. But what is already clear is that universities will only be able to pursue a clear internationalization strategy if they are given greater scope for autonomous decision-making in international matters—from admissions and staff recruitment to resource allocation. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.92.10213>

Mapping Internationalization on US Campuses

LUCIA BRAJKOVIC AND ROBIN MATROSS HELMS

Lucia Brajkovic is senior research specialist, and Robin Matross Helms is director for internationalization and global engagement, American Council on Education. E-mails: lbajkovic@acenet.edu and rmhelms@acenet.edu.

A signature research project of the American Council on Education's (ACE) Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE), the *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses* study, assesses every five years the

current state of internationalization at American colleges and universities, analyzes progress and trends over time, and identifies future priorities. The 2016 *Mapping* survey—like the three previous iterations—addressed the six key areas that comprise the CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization: articulated commitment; administrative structures and staffing; curriculum, cocurriculum, and learning outcomes; faculty policies and practices; student mobility; and collaboration and partnerships. This article is based on a longer report, which is available at www.acenet.edu/mapping.

KEY FINDINGS FROM THE 2016 MAPPING SURVEY

As in 2011 and previous iterations of the study, the final picture painted by the 2016 *Mapping* data is of a complex landscape—promising gains in many areas, slower (or negligible) progress in others, and some noteworthy shifts in broader trends and priorities. The past five years have generally seen greater institutional support for internationalization, in terms of both administrative structures and staffing, and financial resources. Articulated commitment to internationalization in mission statements and strategic plans is more prevalent, and is increasingly supported by specific policies and programming that operationalize broad ideals. Two-year institutions, in particular, have seen notable progress in a number of areas, whereas doctoral institutions seem to have plateaued in certain aspects of internationalization.

While the data in the individual pillars of the CIGE Model for Comprehensive Internationalization are for the most part encouraging, a comparison of overall percentages across categories indicates that for many institutions, internationalization efforts are still focused first and foremost on the external; student mobility in both directions and international partnerships are identified as top priorities for internationalization. On-campus internationalization efforts, in contrast, are seen as relatively less important; internationalization of the curriculum/cocurriculum and faculty professional development rank number four and number five, respectively, in terms of overall priorities for internationalization. Though 2016 saw progress in terms of student learning outcomes and academic requirements, still only about half of institutions reported active efforts toward curriculum internationalization. When it comes to faculty policies and support, progress over time has been markedly slower than in many other areas, and recognition of faculty contributions to internationalization is a concern going forward.

This external orientation for internationalization efforts is ultimately problematic in that it neglects the core of the academic enterprise. At its heart, higher education is about student learning, and for the majority of US students