

support, and keeping in mind the potential inherent in the country's nascent research enterprise, a research culture of its own is surely not too far in the Saudi future. ■

---



---

## New Directions for Internationalization of Tertiary Education in Latin America and the Caribbean

JOCELYNE GACEL-ÁVILA

*Jocelyne Gacel-Ávila is a Researcher of the Mexican National Research System, Professor of the Doctoral Program on higher education, Associate Dean for Social Sciences and Humanities at the University of Guadalajara, and currently President of AMPEI, Mexico. E-mail: jgacelav@gmail.com.*

For Latin America and the Caribbean, like other regions, internationalization is a key strategy for the transformation and improvement of tertiary education, in terms of educating graduates with the cognitive and intercultural skills needed by an increasingly globally connected society and economy. The key question is if internationalization is actually being used to help the region make the transformations of tertiary education needs. The main findings of the 2014 Global Internationalization Survey, carried out by the International Association of Universities (IAU) in 2014, give some indications.

### BALANCE, PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES

The IAU survey shows some interesting new trends in Latin America and the Caribbean. In particular on external drivers for internationalization, *government policies* were ranked first ahead of *business and industry demand*, in tune with global findings. This stands in opposition to the 2010 survey, where the latter was ranked first, and reflects how weak government support was perceived at that time, as collaboration between industry and spending on tertiary education is notably low in the region. An increase in governmental support and funding has also been reported, showing a change in trends, as in the 2010 survey of Latin American and the Caribbean government funding turned out to be the lowest in the world. Both developments are definitely positive and confirm an increasing public inter-

est to foster tertiary education internationalization. Another new element—mainly due to the development of national and regional rankings—is that *international rankings* are acknowledged as among the top three drivers, of internationalization in Latin American and the Caribbean. In the past, the region traditionally ignored this phenomenon.

That part of the world is the only region reporting *increased international networking by faculty/researchers* as the main benefit of internationalization. This confirms earlier findings, as in the 2005 World Bank study on higher education internationalization, which that academic community still feels rather disconnected from the rest of the world.

At the institutional level, participating institutions consider their main risk to be that *international opportunities* are accessible only to students with financial resources, followed by *difficulty in regulating locally the quality of foreign program offerings*. For society, the main risk perceived is *unequal sharing of benefits* of internationalization and *growing gaps* among higher education institutions within countries. Both responses suggest internationalization is perceived

---

**Although priorities seem to shift over the years, the results express a concern about the potential disconnect between the role of higher education as a public good and as a tradable commodity.**

---

as a factor of increased inequity among individuals and institutions within a region already showing high levels of concern for these matters. A further concern is expressed toward foreign providers, which are on the rise in the region because of insufficient access provided by the public sector. In 2010, brain drain was ranked as the principal risk, while in 2005 the loss of cultural identity was reported as the main threat. Although priorities seem to shift over the years, these results express a concern about the potential disconnect between the role of higher education as a public good and as a tradable commodity.

As far as internal and external obstacles to internationalization are concerned, the *language barrier* is ranked higher than in other regions, a fact which coincides with the reality of low levels of foreign-language skills among students and the population overall in the region.

Regarding regional priorities for partnerships, Europe and North America are ranked first on an equal footing, Latin American and the Caribbean itself second and Asia

third. The region was chosen as second in importance by North America, but not among the top three priorities of Europeans. As occurred in the former IAU survey, this part of the world was not chosen as a first priority by any region, including itself. This reflects earlier findings, which is more focused on North America and Europe than on its own region and the rest of the world.

The highest priority for the internationalization of the curriculum is *language learning*, a logical consequence of the deficiency in this area. Latin America and the Caribbean also appears as the region with the smallest number of *joint and double-degree programs*. Although this is a modality in full growth around the world, just 29 percent of these institutions report having joint degree arrangements, and 34 percent double-degree programs, in contrast to the world average of 41 percent and 44 percent, respectively. Noteworthy are the region's *insufficient strategies for recruiting international students and scholars*, resulting in one of the world's smallest percentage of international students and scholars.

This region is reported with the smallest percentage of institutions having *internationalization policies* in place (6% lower than the world average); and, consequently, it has the highest percentage of institutions currently preparing internationalization policies/strategies (6% higher than the world average). This confirms a growing awareness that efforts should be made toward this end. The region also reports having the least institutionalized and professionalized *international offices*, something in line with other studies, such as the 2011 report on international cooperation between the European Union and Mexico. This situation might limit the potential and viability of internationalization strategies.

These highlighted findings definitely show a positive trend in Latin America and the Caribbean internationalization processes. Progress has been achieved in student and faculty mobility. Large-scale scholarship programs for international postgraduate studies and networking for scholars are top priorities. Language learning, after being reported for years as one of the main barriers, has become a top priority. Governments have increased support and funding, and institutions are in the process of improving or creating their organizational structures for internationalization.

Nevertheless, if compared with other developing regions, Asia or even Africa, the region is still lagging behind in terms of financial support, student, and faculty mobility, curriculum internationalization, organizational structures, and staff professionalization. But our main concern for the future is that efforts are mainly focused on individual strategies (mobility) and not enough on systemic strategies (curriculum, research and faculty profiles. Without denying the positive and transformative value of such actions, they have nevertheless been proved not to be sufficient to

make a decisive contribution to the sector's transformation. This could suggest a lack of conceptualization from decision makers of the transformative potential of *comprehensive internationalization*, in terms of innovation, quality, and relevance. Furthermore, an important handicap to internationalization might also lie in the political culture and management styles both at the institutional and sector level. Here, short-term strategies and actions are generally privileged, whereas internationalization requires medium- and long-term planning. In addition, other areas—such as increasing access, equity, quality, relevance, and knowledge production—are also in urgent need of support at all levels. ■

---



---

## Institutional Engagement in Internationalization of Higher Education: Perspectives from Kazakhstan

AISLI LI AND ADIL ASHIRBEKOV

*Aisi Li is a postdoctoral researcher at the Graduate School of Education, Nazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan. E-mail: li.aisi@nu.edu.kz. Adil Ashirbekov is a junior researcher at the same school. E-mail: aashirbekov@nu.edu.kz.*

Internationalization has become increasingly important in national and institutional higher education development strategies. Kazakhstan is no exception: since the 1990s, the country has entered a period of reform, with internationalization representing a vital component of this process. In 2010, Kazakhstan became a full member of the Bologna process, signaling a new phase of the internationalization of its higher education system. These new developments, initiated from the top, were not necessarily received at the institutional level with open arms. Various challenges have emerged in the past few years, ranging from the lack of capacity at individual institutions to the disjunction of strategies at the national and institutional levels.

In order to generate insight into the level of engagement of individual institutions with the internationalization of higher education in Kazakhstan, Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education is conducting a three-year research project, funded by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Although the project is only in its first year, the initial findings are indicative of several key issues for internationalizing Kazakhstan's higher education sector.