into a commodity and privatized “the more it will
either corrode the collective knowledge base or itself
corrode as it distances itself from that collective
wellspring.”

Education is not merely a value-free instrument for
the transfer of skills across national and regional
boundaries, as some might like us to believe. On the
contrary, education must embrace the intellectual,
cultural, political, and social development of individuals,
institutions, and nations. This “public good” agenda
should not be held hostage to the vagaries of the market.

International “trade” in education services,
particularly at the higher education level, has grown
significantly in the past period, with increasing numbers
of students studying outside their home countries,
increased international marketing of academic programs,
and the establishment of overseas “branch campuses,” etc.

It should come as no surprise that the movement of
students and staff is mainly from South to North, while
export of educational services in the form, among others,
of educational information, provision, and facilities (e.g.,
branch campuses) is in the reverse direction.

**Education is not merely a value-free instrument for the transfer of skills across national and regional boundaries.**

We believe that the internationalization of higher
education is better addressed using conventions and
agreements outside of a trade policy regime. We will
continue to lobby key bodies such as UNESCO to
champion this approach. We will also continue to build
and strengthen our bilateral and multilateral
partnerships.

I hope that the effects of trade liberalization on efforts
to internationalize higher education can be minimized.
However, of some concern is whether already limited
financial resources might increasingly be used for trade-
driven activities rather than those that emphasize
intellectual and social gains. I am convinced that a
fundamental rethinking of the inclusion of education in
GATS is needed. We must avoid, at all cost, an approach
to GATS that puts our education in peril. Only time will
tell whether it is indeed possible to engage with GATS
in ways that hold promise for our own agendas and
needs.

This is an edited version of a speech presented at a confer-
ence on higher education in Bergen, Norway.
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Given the changes and challenges facing the inter-
national dimension of higher education in a more
globalized world, the importance of having clearly arti-
culated rationales for internationalization cannot be
overstated. Rationales are reflected in the objectives,
policies, and programs that are developed and eventually
implemented. Rationales dictate the kind of ben-
efits or expected outcomes one would expect from
internationalization efforts. Without a clear set of ration-
ales, the process of internationalization is often an ad
hoc and fragmented reaction to the overwhelming num-
ber of new international opportunities available. The last
decade has seen some important and discernible shifts
in the rationales driving internationalization.

**National Level Rationales**

Traditionally, the rationales driving internationalization
have been divided into four groups: social/cultural,
political, academic, and economic. These generic catego-
ries remain a useful way to analyze rationales. However,
there are new and emerging rationales that cannot be
neatly placed in one of these four groups.

**Human Resources Development.** The knowledge economy,
demographic shifts, mobility of the labor force, and in-
creased trade in services are factors driving nations to
place more importance on developing and recruiting
human capital or brain power through international
education initiatives. There are signs of heightened pres-
sure and interest to recruit the brightest students and
scholars from other countries to increase scientific, tech-
nological, and economic competitiveness.

**Strategic Alliances.** The international mobility of students
and academics as well as collaborative research and edu-
cation initiatives are being seen as productive ways to
develop closer geopolitical ties and economic relation-
ships. There has been a definite shift from alliances for
cultural purposes to those based on economic interests.

**Commercial Trade.** In the last decade, more emphasis
has been placed on economic and income-generating
opportunities. New franchise arrangements, foreign or satellite campuses, on-line delivery, and increased recruitment of fee-paying students are examples of a more commercial approach to internationalization. The fact that education is now one of the 12 service sectors in the General Agreement on Trade in Services is positive proof that importing and exporting education programs and services is a potentially lucrative trade area.

Nation Building. While some countries are interested in the export of education, others are interested in importing education programs and institutions for nation-building purposes. An educated, trained, and knowledgeable citizenry and workforce able to do research and generate new knowledge are key components of a country’s nation-building agenda.

While some countries are interested in the export of education, others are interested in importing education programs and institutions for nation-building purposes.

Social and Cultural Development. The social/cultural rationales, especially those that relate to intercultural understanding and national cultural identity are still significant; but perhaps their importance does not carry the same weight in comparison to the economic and political rationales listed above. It is yet to be seen whether, in light of the pressing issues stemming from culturally based clashes within and between countries, there will be more interest and importance attached to the social and cultural rationales.

Institutional-Level Rationales
Of course, a relationship exists between national and institution-based rationales, but not always as close as one would expect. This depends on many factors, one of which is how much the internationalization process is a bottom-up or top-down process within any given country. Again, the four categories of rationales apply to institutions, but it appears that other emerging rationales are of greater consequence.

International Profile and Reputation. Traditionally, prominence has been given to the goal of achieving international academic standards (no matter how they may be defined). This motivation appears, however, to have been subsumed by the overall drive to achieve a strong worldwide reputation or “brand” name as an international high-quality institution. This drive relates to the quest for name recognition internationally in an attempt to attract the brightest of scholars and students, a substantial number of international students, and high-profile research and training projects.

Student and Staff Development. There seems to be renewed emphasis on internationalization as a means of enhancing the international and intercultural understanding and skills of students and staff. The escalating number of national, regional, international, and cultural conflicts are pushing academics to help students understand global issues and international and intercultural relationships. The mobility of the labor market and cultural diversity in communities and work places require that both students and academics have an increased understanding and skills to work and live in a culturally diverse or different environment.

Income Generation. On the other side of the ledger from human development is the motivation of economic development. There is no question that more institutions are increasingly looking for internationalization activities as a way of generating alternative sources of income. For-profit internationalization is a growing phenomenon. Another key factor is the growth in the number of new private commercial providers who are primarily in business to generate income on a for-profit basis.

Traditionally, prominence has been given to the goal of achieving international academic standards.

Strategic Alliances. The number of bilateral or multilateral educational agreements has increased exponentially in the past decade. Linkages can be for different purposes: academic mobility, benchmarking, joint curriculum or program development, seminars and conferences, and joint research initiatives. It is often the case that institutions cannot support a large number of agreements, many of which are thus inactive and mainly paper-based arrangements. All in all, the rationale for developing key strategic international education alliances at both the national and institutional level is not so much an end unto itself but a means of achieving academic, scientific, economic, technological, or cultural objectives.

Research and Knowledge Production. Given the increasing interdependence among nations, it is clear there are global issues and challenges that cannot be addressed at
the national level alone. International and interdisciplinary collaboration is key to solving many global problems such as those related to environmental, health, or crime issues. Institutions and national governments are, therefore, continuing to make the international dimension of research and knowledge production a primary rationale for internationalization of higher education.

All in all, the rationales driving internationalization vary from institution to institution, from stakeholder to stakeholder, and from country to country. Differing and competing rationales contribute to both the complexity of the international dimension of education and the substantial contributions that internationalization makes to higher education and the role it plays in society.

A clearer articulation of the values guiding internationalization is becoming increasingly important. Why? Values give shape and meaning to the rationales and expected outcomes that underpin institutions’ and nations’ drive to internationalize. There is room for greater reflection and clarity in the articulation of the values, especially cooperation and competition and the positioning of education as a “public” or “private good,” in the provision of higher education.

National Leadership and International Quality Review in Higher Education
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As national leaders in countries around the world continue to respond to questions about higher education operation and quality internationally, considerable debate has arisen over what role this national leadership itself plays in establishing expectations of quality in an international environment. How can national leaders build an international community and on what basis? What are the core commitments on which to base policies, practices, and values associated with quality in an international setting? International quality review or quality review in an international setting refers to the policies, practices, and procedures used by higher education and the quality assurance and accreditation community to scrutinize the quality of higher education institutions and programs choosing to operate internationally.

National Leadership
The primary task of creating an international culture for quality review falls to national leaders of both higher education and quality assurance. The leaders need to forge basic ties and connections among countries to create an international culture grounded in rigorous and responsive approaches to quality. Participants in this culture may include colleges, universities, accreditation and quality assurance bodies, national organizations working together, regional organizations, and international organizations. Its tools may be national and international clearinghouses, bilateral and multilateral quality assurance agreements, codes of practice, electronic databases, and other communication networks.

What are the core commitments on which to base policies, practices, and values associated with quality in an international setting?

National leaders have considered several options about how to organize this important effort. These range from (1) national leaders creating appropriate networks to undertake international quality review, to (2) national leaders ceding responsibility for quality to an international quality assurance or accreditation entity of some sort, to (3) relying on other international organizations (rather than national leaders) to frame international quality review issues and approaches (e.g., the World Trade Organization).

National leaders also must address significant differences of opinion about standards for international quality review. Some quality assurance leaders favor a single template of standards to which all national quality assurance organizations (and thus higher education institutions) would be subject. Others are more comfortable with an organic model in which higher education institutions and quality assurance organizations in different countries would make individual judgments about quality and affiliate with each other on this basis—a multiple standards approach to quality in an international setting.

Core Commitments and National Leadership
Whatever the decisions about how to organize an international quality culture and how to approach standards for quality, three core commitments stand out as essential to sound and effective conduct of quality review in an international setting.