

ETBs AS A VEHICLE FOR INTERNATIONALIZATION

Despite these barriers, the professionals who were interviewed feel that ETB programs have a positive impact on their respective institutions. ETBs have resulted in more internationalized administrative procedures, higher international student numbers and diversified classrooms, as well as increased numbers of international staff and improved English skills among staff. Some also feel that ETBs have facilitated the mainstreaming of internationalization. As such, ETBs appear to have a positive effect on the development of internationalization at the institutional level and can be seen as a mechanism enhancing the process.

ETBs also seem to have a positive impact beyond the institutions themselves. According to national agency representatives, ETBs have financial benefits both for the institutions and the local economy, and they bring increased opportunities for internationalization at home and for attracting international talent to the country. Some national agency staff also mention increased quality as an additional benefit of developing ETBs. Others, however—both at HEIs and at national agencies—raise concerns over a potential lowering of educational quality due to insufficient language skills among teaching staff and the cancellation of higher quality programs offered in local languages.

AN OPTIMISTIC AND MORE THOUGHT-THROUGH FUTURE FOR ETBs

Overall, research shows that most actors are positive about ETBs, both at the institutional and national levels. As one interviewee hypothesizes, this could be partly because ETBs have not yet reached a critical mass in most European countries (unlike in the Netherlands) and are not seen as a particularly controversial topic for analysis and discussion. The interviewees believe that their HEIs will continue offering ETBs in the future and that the demand and, as a result, the supply of such programs will continue to increase globally. At the same time, interviewees recognize a growing need to be strategic about their ETB offering and to identify niche programs. The future is likely to bring both quantitative and qualitative changes to ETBs in Europe, as well as, potentially, an increased discussion about the value of such programs when they become a more common feature of the education landscape. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10775>

Hybrid Internationalization in Korea: A Promising Development?

HEE KYUNG LEE AND BYUNG SHIK RHEE

Hee Kyung Lee is a graduate student in the Department of Education, Yonsei University, Seoul, Republic of Korea. E-mail: hkleez@yonsei.ac.kr. Byung Shik Rhee is professor of higher education and director of the Center for Global Higher Education, Department of Education, Yonsei University. E-mail: beyoung@yonsei.ac.kr.

Over the past several decades, a large number of students have participated in cross-border higher education, mostly in major English-speaking countries. However, students in developing countries are now looking for other options. Through inbound internationalization strategies such as increasing the use of English on campus, Korea has become one of those destination countries.

Recently, Korean higher education institutions (HEIs) have witnessed a new, fast-growing internationalization model that combines existing features of internationalization—the typical study-abroad model in which international students are taught in the host country’s primary language and the decade-long Korean internationalization model in which international students are educated in separate academic programs—with recently developed, demand-based educational programs. We would call this combination a demand-based, locally oriented, hybrid model of internationalization, or simply a *hybrid model*. Although it is too early to tell how good it is, we hope that our assessment will help HEIs in non-English speaking developing countries to explore new internationalization strategies.

THE LAST DECADE’S POPULAR APPROACH TO INTERNATIONALIZATION IN KOREA

To internationalize its HEIs, Korea has focused on creating “English-friendly” learning environments. HEIs have recruited foreign faculty from elite institutions and established English-speaking international colleges such as Underwood International College at Yonsei University. The number of courses taught in English continues to grow. For example, Pohang University of Science and Technology has become a bilingual campus that uses both Korean and English as formal academic and administrative languages.

Moreover, since 2005, the Korean government has been offering scholarships to incoming international students through the Study Korea Project. It has also created a global education hub by inviting five renowned univer-

sities from English-speaking developed countries, such as George Mason University and the State University of New York, to the Incheon Free Economic Zone. This internationalization approach has turned out to be quite successful: over a decade, the number of undergraduate, degree-seeking international students has increased from 9,835 in 2005 to 45,966 in 2017.

WHAT IS WRONG WITH THAT APPROACH?

Despite the unprecedented growth of international student enrollments in Korea, this decade-long strategy appears to be only partially successful, for three reasons. First, the use of EMI alone does not seem to attract incoming international students. Most of them are from Asian countries, mostly China, and are not interested in learning in English as much as studying in English-speaking countries. Studies show consistently that quite a few came to Korea because of the attractiveness of learning Korean culture and language.

Second, it may not be cost-effective in the long run. Because this strategy does not meet the academic demands of most incoming international students, Korean HEIs can only offer a limited academic environment to those students. Therefore, recruiting international students may require a supplemental, attractive scholarship program that is costly to both the government and participating HEIs.

To internationalize its HEIs, Korea has focused on creating “English-friendly” learning environments.

Third, Korea is not in a good position to showcase its English-friendly environment as a strength since English is not Korea’s primary academic language. Although a decent number of academic staff earned their final degrees in English-speaking countries, so did faculty in other countries. Any other country with financial and human resources can pursue this very same strategy. Overall, it is not as demand-driven, cost-effective, and competitive as we had hoped.

A RECENT DEVELOPMENT: AN EMERGING HYBRID MODEL

Recently, in Korea, a new model of internationalization has emerged, which we propose to call “demand-based, locally oriented, and hybrid,” or simply *hybrid*. As an example, Global Leaders College (GLC) at Yonsei University only accepts students whose educational background is unrelated to Korea. They take classes separate from the rest of the

students at the university. What is unique is that this institution has created, and teaches, what its students would like to take—a Korean culture and language program.

Why is the hybrid model better? First, it is more cost-effective. Since there is neither enrollment limit nor tuition cap for international students, participating HEIs can charge students more tuition and generate revenue. Cost saving is also possible because English-speaking faculty are no longer needed.

Second, this model secures benefits to both providers and receivers of the program. By offering programs tailored to the students’ academic needs, such as step-by-step Korean language support and a “Korean Language and Culture Education” major, GLC recognizes and respects the reason why international students chose to study in Korea. Faculty do not have to worry about the negative impact of English on the quality of their teaching. In fact, this is a model for any country wanting to use its unique advantages to internationalize its higher education.

IS IT SUSTAINABLE?

Adopting this hybrid model may mitigate the biased conception that non-Western countries can promote national competitiveness only by successfully integrating into the global academic network that communicates in English. Adopting it also values the strengths and competitive edge of each nation’s educational capacity. As the dominance of English is currently at stake with the rise of anti-immigration policies in the major English-speaking countries, leveraging Korean culture and language as a resource is novel and opportune.

But is this model sustainable? Perhaps. The popularity of Korean culture continues to be on the rise, as demonstrated during the PyeongChang 2018 Winter Olympics, with opening and closing ceremonies enlivened with K-pop music. But how long will Korean culture and language remain culturally attractive? Equally important is how right this strategy is—or perhaps the question should instead be about what should be sustained. This hybrid model does not solve the highlighted existing issue of internationalization, academic capitalism—it even contributes to maintaining it. It sounds right that HEIs should accommodate the demands of international students because students pay for them, but we should not let a market-driven approach prevail in internationalization endeavors. International students may have come simply to consume educational services. Nevertheless, HEIs have a social duty to foster cross-cultural and global understanding among students, especially those who cannot afford to study abroad, and the exclusive nature of this hybrid model, which limits interactions between international and local students, restricts

such opportunities. It is not mobility itself that should be sustained, but the students' experiences gained from the change of academic and social environment provided by mobility.

MOVING FORWARD

Korea has undoubtedly become a regional education hub, as it produces and furthers knowledge about Korean culture and language that incoming international students ask for. Although this strategy may bring more profit to HEIs, English-driven internationalization strategies will also remain important. Not only do they provide a valuable learning experience for domestic students, but English is the academic language of the current era.

For the hybrid model to become sustainable, we need to make it more inclusive and help international students not only to feel satisfied during college but also to thrive after graduation. Students should gain something long lasting and meaningful for the money and time they invested in the program. As a result of their diplomas, have they become more tolerant toward cultural differences? Moving forward, are they able to utilize such attitudes at work and in daily activities? When adequately addressing these limitations, the model can serve as a complement to the English-driven internationalization model popular in non-English speaking countries. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10788>

National Policies and the Role of English in Higher Education

XINYAN LIU

Xinyan Liu is a master's degree student in the International Higher Education program at Boston College, US. E-mail: liupm@bc.edu.

This essay is based on a study with the same title, commissioned by the International Association of Universities (IAU) in Paris, and accessible at [HYPERLINK "mailto:liupm@bc.edu"liupm@bc.edu](mailto:liupm@bc.edu).

As the impact of globalization widens and deepens, higher education worldwide has been actively responding by internationalizing tertiary institutions. The use of English as medium of instruction (EMI) has been one among many initiatives undertaken. That is partially attributed to the status of English as the current lingua franca of the aca-

demical community in research, publishing, and teaching.

The status of local language(s) in non-English-speaking societies is sensitive to the introduction of English as the main language of knowledge production, especially in regions or countries that have faced various forms of oppression. The preservation of the language and culture of minority groups or of the main national group can be impacted, depending on how English-medium policies are implemented. The use of EMI cannot be analyzed independently from the broader national language policy. With responsibilities to ensure both equity and access, and to contribute to global knowledge in a visible way, many non-English-speaking countries are facing a dilemma.

The applicability of EMI varies greatly depending on the general development of higher education.

Past research and debate have mostly focused on northern European countries, as they were among the first to introduce EMI. With English spreading globally with unmatched momentum and speed, it is crucial to examine the impact of the phenomenon on a larger scale. In this article, we broaden the discussion by including a diverse group of countries including Brazil, France, Malaysia, South Africa, and Spain. The two key aspects discussed here concern existing national policies regarding language in higher education in the target countries and the role of English in their respective higher education systems.

LOCAL LANGUAGES VS ENGLISH

In relation to the development of EMI, some themes are consistent throughout the five countries of the study, but there are also significant differences. The fact that fluency in English boosts employability considerably has become a strong incentive for higher education institutions, since they are responsible for educating the workforce for a knowledge-based labor market. In particular, employability also implies mobility, in step with rising global trade relations and collaborations. South Africa shows higher employability rates for graduates who are proficient in English. In Malaysia, students *feel* that English proficiency is essential to find a job or get a promotion.

While this might be an evident conclusion to draw, research finds considerable value in maintaining local languages in South Africa, Malaysia, and in the Catalan and Basque regions in Spain. Local languages serve as an im-