

Book Review

Hans de Wit, editor, *Strategies for Internationalisation of Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Australia, Canada, Europe, and the United States*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education, in cooperation with IMBE, (the Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the Association of International Education Administration, 1995. 175 pp.

Barbara Burn

THIS COLLABORATIVE effort of OECD and the European Association for International Education together with the Association of International Education Administrators is in part based on a seminar held October 10-12, 1994, in Washington, D.C. The report comprises a background essay by de Wit and Jane Knight of the Ryerson Polytechnic Institute, Toronto, and the papers on internationalization strategies in Europe, the United States, Canada, and Australia. Rounding out these major papers are the reports of the three conferences rapporteurs; and of its final summarizing speaker, Ralph Smuckler, and the impressively brief summaries of a dozen case studies, which were the focus of much of the two-day conference.

Hans de Wit was an internationally recognized administrator, leader, and advocate for the internationalization of higher education before *Strategies for Internationalisation of Higher Education* was published in 1995. A founding member of EAIE and its president in 1994, de Wit has also been on the boards of the Council for International Educational Exchange (CIEE) and World Education Services, and was visiting lecturer in spring 1995 at Boston College.

In their opening essay de Wit and Knight trace the internationalization of higher education from the medieval period to the present. They give an overview of the rationales for internationalization (economic, financial, cultural, political), and present several definitions of and approaches to internationalizing higher education. They describe four models and suggest as an alternative treating internationalizing as a continuous cycle which identifies phases or stages in integrating international dimensions into higher education systems.

Well referenced and comprehensive, the de Wit-Knight paper provides useful background for considering the many issues surrounding internationalization. However, some of the points made should be questioned. For example, the authors' claim that what they call "the activity approach" to internationalization "focuses exclusively on academic issues" and may not include "the organizational issues needed to ... develop and sustain the activities" (p. 16) is in sharp contradiction to the basic premise of the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA), namely, that an institution's commitment to internationalization calls for organizational measures which facilitate the coordination and mutual leveraging of different categories of international activities. Without appropriate organizational structures and strategies, activities can absorb enormous amounts of staff time and resources while only marginally advancing the internationalization of the institution. This issue is indeed addressed in the paper (P. 20) but not, in the view of this reviewer, with the emphasis it merits.

While the argument that internationalization should be considered as a continuous cycle is tempting in its orderly simplicity, rarely in my many years of working in the international field does internationalization conform to the sequential model set forth in which it progresses from awareness to commitment to planning to operationalization to review and, finally, to reinforcement. Would that this path of progression were typical, or even common! Instead this path all too often involves lurches forward and back, uneven advances frequently counterbalanced by slippage and regression, and periods of marking time.

Comprehensive as the de Wit-Knight essay is, two concerns that it only obliquely addresses are, first, the criteria to measure and identify it, or the extent to which a higher education institution is internationalized, and, second, any explicit analysis of the fact that many of the activities summarized as program strategies for internationalization (pp. 17-22), rather than contributing to the internationalization of a university, may instead diminish it by generating negative attitudes toward the foreign and internationalism. The discussion of research-related activities, such as the development of international communities and networks of scholars, may contribute

little to greater mutual understanding among different peoples and cultures, presumably an important objective of internationalizing higher education; it may result in a complacency that such understanding is not needed and may well not be produced by scholars from different countries and cultures collaborating on some transnational research problems and probably using only the English language-and e-mail-to communicate.

The de Wit-Knight paper's concluding observations that relatively little research has been undertaken on internationalizing education, especially outside of the United States, is all too true. Their paper and the concern of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development for the field, will, one hopes, help to encourage more research.

The several other major papers in the volume tend more to be factual accounts of the situation regarding internationalization in the United States, Europe, Canada, and Australia with relatively little discussion of what it is or what is effective in achieving it. The Holzner-Greenwood paper, or report as they call it, basically maps the landscape: the characteristics of higher education in the United States; leading agencies and organizations that help shape, fund, or otherwise impact internationalization efforts; and components of internationalization strategies and means of implementing them. These last two subsections well convey the depth of experience of the cowriters, which, however, I feel it necessary to fault in their listing as members of APSIA (Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs), not the schools but their parent universities, as with Princeton and Tufts when it should be the Woodrow Wilson School and the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy.

The paper on internationalization in Europe by Hans de Wit and Hilary Callan, executive director of EAIE, similarly maps the environment for and chief actors in the internationalization effort, including especially the European Commission's programs and instrumentalities, initially ERAS- MUS and others and now SOCRATES and LEONARDO. An issue facing EC, now EU, member countries is whether the EU efforts aim at internationalization or at encouraging a regional European identity-and, little discussed, are these antithetical? The Europe paper suggests the wealth of information on program

developments and policy trends available in the case studies prepared for the October conference.

Canada and Australia, both increasingly active in and committed to the internationalization, are well chosen foci for their two chapters. In Canada several national organizations, including the Canadian Bureau for International Education and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), have been strong advocates of internationalization, broadly conceived as essential to the quality of higher education and Canada's economic, scientific, and technological competitiveness. Internationalization has also been a priority with the Association of Canadian Community Colleges. Findings of a 1993 survey confirmed the universities' commitment to internationalization, although activity level often lagged because of resource problems. As in many fields, Canada's active role in advancing important causes, such as the internationalization of higher education, is underappreciated south of the border. The paper on Australia candidly admits that while not long back the priority to importing foreign students was tuition-driven, internationalization is far broader than this implies, involves curricular, research, and international cooperation programs. From an apparently narrow motivation and plan, Australia has moved or is moving to a conceptualization and strategy now more broadly gauged and meriting wide recognition as an important model.

The brief summaries of case studies and of Ralph Smuckler's concluding overview of the conference do not do justice to the quality of the work involved but are understandable in order to keep the volume reasonable in size. Smuckler's points included the growing professionalization of international higher education, the problems of costs and constituencies, and how the critical mass of institutional commitment by now achieved can assure continued growth.

A recent publication of the Association of International Education Administrators, *A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education*, should contribute importantly to future research on internationalization as it sets forth the many issues involved and suggests the data collection and research needed in order to more effectively internationalize higher education in the United States and define the role of the federal government in this.¹

Barbara Burn

¹ Association of International Education Administrators Working Group, Burn, Barbara B., and Smuckler, Ralph H., co-chairs, *A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States*. Pullman, WA: AIEA Secretariat, 1996.