

## Chapter 2

# What Is Internationalization?

**Abstract** I review the standard definition of internationalization and show that it is restrictive because it emphasizes the inward-looking aspects of the process, ignoring its outward-looking dimensions. I argue that the outward-looking dimensions are essential and provide an alternative definition that captures them. I then examine the international rankings of universities and business schools to illustrate the limitation of the standard inward-looking definition and conclude by calling for the development of outward-looking indicators and the establishment of a new international ranking methodology. Based on the evidence from current rankings, I state two principles: ‘The De Novo Internationalization Principle’ according to which it is easier to build a truly global institution from scratch than transforming an existing institution into a global one, and ‘The Top-Down Internationalization Principle’ according to which internationalization is more likely to succeed if it is an institution-wide process rather than a collection of uncoordinated initiatives at the level of courses and programs.

**Keywords** Global educational institutions • Global university • Transnational university • Cosmopolitan university • Ecumenical university • Global knowledge economy • Inward internationalization • Outward internationalization • Comprehensive versus international rankings of universities and business schools • The de novo internationalization principle • Global talent competitiveness ranking • Internationalization of specific academic units (universities vs. schools vs. programs vs. courses) • The top-down internationalization principle

The internationalization of higher education institutions is the subject of numerous reports, articles, and books.<sup>1</sup> It is also an issue of great interest to policymakers because economic performance is affected by the growing cross-border flows of knowledge, knowledge-workers, and students.<sup>2</sup> The subject has also moved to the

---

<sup>1</sup>See Stearns [26], Spring [25], Wildavsky [31], AACSB [1], De Meyer [3] and OECD [21].

<sup>2</sup>See OECD [20], ACE [2] and NAFSA [17].

top of the agenda of leaders of higher education institutions who want to internationalize their institution and connect their organization, their students, and their faculty to a world that has been globalizing at an accelerating pace.<sup>3</sup>

Scholars researching this phenomenon recognize that it cannot be easily conceptualized because it is a complex and multifaceted process.<sup>4</sup> In practice, many higher education institutions, particularly business schools, are launching a variety of international initiatives while announcing their ambition to become ‘global educational institutions.’ But a closer look at what is actually happening post-announcement shows that many of these initiatives have a marginal impact on the institutions that launched them and often fail to deliver what has been announced.

## 2.1 Defining Internationalization

How should we define and conceptualize the process called the internationalization of higher education institutions? What is its rationale? Why do many of these initiatives fail to deliver? Do labels, such as global university,<sup>5</sup> transnational university,<sup>6</sup> cosmopolitan university,<sup>7</sup> and ecumenical university<sup>8</sup> that academic leaders use to describe their institutions, refer to the same or different models of internationalization?

The standard and widely cited definition is that<sup>9</sup>:

Internationalization is the process of integrating an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institution.

More recently, in a study published by the European Parliament, this definition was restated as follows:<sup>10</sup>

Internationalization is the intentional process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions, and delivery of postsecondary education, in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society.

---

<sup>3</sup>See NASULGC [19], NAFSA [18], Royal Society [22] and European Parliament [5].

<sup>4</sup>See Knight [12–14], van der Wende [29].

<sup>5</sup>See Levin [16], former president of Yale University.

<sup>6</sup>See Lehman [15], former president of Cornell University.

<sup>7</sup>See Tilghman [27], former president of Princeton University.

<sup>8</sup>See Sexton [23, 24], former president of New York University. According to the Webster dictionary [30] ecumenism means “promoting cooperation or better understanding among differing religious faiths.” John Sexton, a former president of New York University, referred to the principle of ecumenism when discussing NYU’s internationalization drive “not as a theological doctrine but ecumenism as a kind of progressive doctrine of social order.”

<sup>9</sup>See Knight [10] and Knight and de Wit [11].

<sup>10</sup>See European Parliament’s Committee on Culture and Education [5].

A more comprehensive definition is provided by the Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement<sup>11</sup>:

Internationalization is a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate international policies, programs, and initiatives, and positions colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally connected.

Although these definitions capture the initial and fundamental steps that are required to become international, they nevertheless describe the process somewhat narrowly by emphasizing the ability of an institution to introduce an international dimension into an existing structure and mode of operation, be it the student body, the curriculum or the teaching and research activities of the faculty. They do not capture the essence of a process whose ultimate goal should be to integrate the institution into the emerging global knowledge economy rather than integrate an international dimension into the existing institutional setting. The process should be both inward-and outward-looking, emphasizing enrichment through international exchange, and networking. It should enhance the institution's capacity and ability to become an integral part of the world's growing knowledge and learning 'ecosystem' not only to benefit from it but to also contribute to its development.

With that view in mind, I propose the following broader definition:

Internationalization is an ongoing process of change whose objective is to integrate the institution and its key stakeholders (its students and faculty) into the emerging global knowledge economy.

This definition goes beyond the specific dimensions of teaching, research, and service. It calls for changes in the institution's existing structure, operating modes, and mindset in order for the institution to join and contribute to the shaping of the global knowledge economy. It is dynamic in nature because it demands that the institution transforms itself and simultaneously contributes to the development of the global knowledge economy through its activities. It requires much more than injecting an international dimension into an existing static structure. It calls for breaking the ivory towers and building two-way bridges to other educational and research institutions around the world.

## 2.2 The Internationalization of Universities

The limitation of the inward-looking definition of internationalization is highlighted by a recent ranking of universities based on their international outlook. The Times Higher Education [28] ranks universities around the world along three dimensions:

---

<sup>11</sup>See ACE, the American Council for Education at [www.acenet.com](http://www.acenet.com).

research (with a total weight of 62.50 %), teaching (with a total weight of 30 %), and international outlook (with a total weight of 7.5 %).<sup>12</sup>

The international outlook is based on three *inward-looking* measures of internationalization (each assigned a weight of 2.5 %):

- (1) The ratio of a university's international students to its local students which is an indicator of the capacity of the institution to attract foreign students
- (2) The ratio of a university's international staff to its local staff which is an indicator of the capacity of the institution to attract foreign faculty and administrators
- (3) The proportion of a university's total research journal publications that have at least one international co-author, a measure that is probably highly correlated with the second one to the extent that foreign faculty members are more likely than local faculty to have established a network of co-authors in their country of origin prior to joining the institution that recruited them

Exhibit 1a reports two ranks of universities around the world: a rank based only on the international dimension, shown in the first column for the 24 universities with the highest international outlook (out of 200 universities), and the corresponding comprehensive rank based on the three dimensions of research, teaching, and international outlook shown in the last column for the same 24 universities (out of 800 universities).<sup>13</sup>

We can make several observations based on the data compiled in Exhibit 1a:

- (1) There is very little correlation between the two rankings despite the fact that the same international dimension is in both rankings (albeit at 100 % in the international one compared to only 7.5 % in the comprehensive one). Only two universities are listed in the top ten in both rankings: The Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich and Imperial College London.
- (2) Even though US universities dominate the comprehensive ranking, they are conspicuously absent from the international one. A look at Exhibit 1b shows that 67 % of the top 24 universities according to the comprehensive ranking are based in the US but the first US university to appear in the international ranking is the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) ranked 90 (see the last column) compared to a rank of 5 in the comprehensive ranking (see the first column). Only nine US universities appear in the list of the world's 200 universities with the highest international outlook (the first five are shown in Exhibit 1b: MIT, Princeton University, Harvard University, Stanford University and Columbia University).
- (3) But the most striking fact in Exhibit 1a is the characteristics of many of the top-ranked international universities. They are typically based in small

---

<sup>12</sup>The research and the teaching dimensions are measured along several criteria. For example, the research dimension includes research reputation, research income, research productivity and research citations. See: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/2016/world-ranking#!/page/0/length/25>.

<sup>13</sup>Only the first 200 universities are ranked individually; the remaining ones are ranked in groups of 50 (from 201 to 400) followed by groups of 100 (from 401 to 800). See: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/200-most-international-universities-world-2016>.

**Exhibit 1a** University ranking: ‘International Outlook Rank’ versus ‘World University Rank’ (2016)<sup>1</sup>

International outlook rank	Higher education institution	Country	World university rank
1	Qatar University	Qatar	601–800
2	University of Luxembourg	Luxembourg	193
3	University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	44
4	École Polytechnique Fédérale-Lausanne	Switzerland	31
5	University of Geneva	Switzerland	131
6	University of Macau	Macao	401–500
7	ETH-Zurich <sup>2</sup>	Switzerland	9
8	University of St Gallen	Switzerland	351–400
9	National University of Singapore	Singapore	26
10	Imperial College London	United Kingdom	8
11	University of Innsbruck	Austria	301–350
12	Auckland University of Technology	New Zealand	601–800
13	American University of Sharjah	United Arab Emirates	601–800
14	Maastricht University	Netherlands	88
15	United Arab Emirates University	United Arab Emirates	501–600
16	University of Basel	Switzerland	101
17	Nanyang Technological University	Singapore	55
18	University of Oxford	United Kingdom	2
18	University College London	United Kingdom	14
20	King’s College London	United Kingdom	27
21	University of Essex	United Kingdom	301–350
22	London School of Economics	United Kingdom	23
23	Queen Mary University of London	United Kingdom	98
24	Queen’s University Belfast	United Kingdom	200

<sup>1</sup>Source of data: The Times Higher Education (<https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/200-most-international-universities-world-2016>)

<sup>2</sup>The Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich

countries (Qatar, Luxembourg, Hong Kong, Singapore, and United Arab Emirates) that have relatively younger institutions that are not highly ranked according to the comprehensive ranking shown on the last column (Qatar University, University of Macao, American University of Sharjah, and United Arab Emirates University). Switzerland, with four universities in the top ten, is

**Exhibit 1b** University ranking: ‘World University Rank’ versus ‘International Outlook Rank’ (2016)<sup>1</sup>

World university rank	Higher education institution	Country	International outlook rank
1	California Institute of Technology	United States	Not in top 200
2	University of Oxford	United Kingdom	18
3	Stanford University	United States	141
4	University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	36
5	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	United States	90
6	Harvard University	United States	134
7	Princeton University	United States	123
8	Imperial College London	United Kingdom	10
9	ETH-Zurich <sup>2</sup>	Switzerland	7
10	University of Chicago	United States	Not in top 200
11	John Hopkins University	United States	Not in top 200
12	Yale University	United States	Not in top 200
13	University of California, Berkeley	United States	Not in top 200
14	University College London	United Kingdom	18
15	Columbia University	United States	156
16	University of California, Los Angeles	United States	Not in top 200
17	University of Pennsylvania	United States	Not in top 200
18	Cornell University	United States	Not in top 200
18	University of Toronto	Canada	128
20	Duke University	United States	Not in top 200
21	University of Michigan	United States	Not in top 200
22	Carnegie Mellon University	United States	Not in top 200
23	London School of Economics	United Kingdom	22
24	University of Edinburgh	United Kingdom	52

<sup>1</sup>Source of data: The Times Higher Education (<https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/2016/world-ranking#!/page/0/length/25>)

<sup>2</sup>The Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich

the exception to that phenomenon. It is a relatively small country but its universities have been established long ago. Switzerland, Luxembourg, and Singapore, however, share one additional common feature: they happen to be the three countries at the top of a list of 108 countries that are the most desirable destinations for highly skilled workers according to the Global Talent Competitiveness Index compiled in 2014 and 2015. Not surprisingly, the United Arab Emirates and Qatar also rank high in the Global Talent Competitiveness Index, occupying the 23rd and 24th place, respectively.<sup>14</sup>

We can draw three conclusions from the above observations. The first is that it is easier to internationalize a newly created university than to internationalize an established one. We refer to this phenomenon as ‘The de novo internationalization principle.’<sup>15</sup> A corollary of that principle is that de novo internationalization is easier to achieve when measured with inward-looking criteria (the percentage of nonnational students and faculty), as exemplified by newly established universities in smaller countries, such as Qatar, Luxembourg, Hong Kong, and the United Arab Emirates that have a limited number of national students and faculty, a relatively large number of expatriates and significant financial resources. And relatively smaller countries such as Switzerland, which have a long history of excellence in higher education, have universities that rank highly on internationalization partly because it is an attractive destination for talented individuals, a pool of people that includes faculty and postsecondary students.<sup>16</sup>

The second conclusion is that the inward-looking criteria used to measure internationalization do not fully capture an institution’s capacity to connect with the world’s knowledge economy and contribute to its development which, as claimed earlier, is the more relevant measure of internationalization. One could also argue that most of the top, well-established US and UK universities listed in Exhibit 1b (and not highly ranked in the Internationalization Outlook Ranking) are more deeply connected to the global knowledge economy than the newly established universities listed in Exhibit 1a.

The third conclusion is that the standard, inward-looking definition of internationalization may have some deleterious side effects on higher education institutions because most internationalization rankings use inward-looking metrics to measure this phenomenon. This sends the wrong signal to institutions seeking to internationalize because it induces them to raise the percentage of foreign students and faculty in order to be judged international without having to embark on the more challenging process of transforming themselves to become active partners in the growing global knowledge economy. Inward internationalization is an important element of the

---

<sup>14</sup>The Global Talent Competitiveness Index for 2015 can be downloaded from the following site: <http://global-indices.insead.edu/gtci/gtci-2015-16-report.cfm>. The 2014 edition can be downloaded from <http://global-indices.insead.edu/gtci/gtci-past-reports.cfm>.

<sup>15</sup>See Hawawini [8].

<sup>16</sup>In this respect it should be pointed out that 27 % of Switzerland’s population is born outside the country. See Global Talent Competitiveness Index for 2015.

internationalization process but it must be combined with outward internationalization and an internal transformation program in order to achieve deeper and lasting internationalization.

### 2.3 The Internationalization of Business Schools

According to AACSB International there were 16,484 educational institutions offering postsecondary business degrees in 208 countries in October 2015.<sup>17</sup> In comparison, there were 23,729 higher education institutions worldwide in July 2015 (<http://www.webometrics.info/en/node/54>). Ten percent were located in the United States (1624 institutions), 6 % in Western Europe (1095 institutions) and 50 % in Asia and Mexico.<sup>18</sup> However, only 920 institutions (5.6 % of the total) were accredited by at least one of the three major international accreditation agencies which are the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the European Foundation for Management Development (which awards the Equis accreditation) and the Association of Master of Business Administration (AMBA).<sup>19</sup> At the end of 2015, India had 3902 institutions offering postsecondary business degrees but only 14 of these were accredited internationally.<sup>20</sup>

The Financial Times (2016) publishes an annual ranking of the top 100 global MBA programs delivered by schools that have been accredited by AACSB or Equis (about 850 schools met this criterion in 2015). The ranking is based on five criteria: salary progression 3 years after graduation (with a 40 % weight), research output and doctoral program (with a 20 % weight), value of the program to students (with a 15 % weight), gender diversity (with a 5 % weight), and internationalization (with a 20 % weight).<sup>21</sup> Internationalization is measured with the following six metrics: (1) *International students* (the percentage of students whose nationality differs from the country in which they study, assigned a 4 % weight); (2) *International faculty* (the percentage of faculty whose nationality differs from the country in which their school is based, assigned a 4 % weight); (3) *International board* (the percentage of board members whose nationality differs from the country in which their school is based, assigned a 2 % weight); (4) *International mobility* (calculated according to whether alumni worked in different countries pre-MBA, on

---

<sup>17</sup>See AACSB International: <http://www.aacsb.edu/knowledge/data/frequently-requested/membership/institutions-offering-business-degrees>.

<sup>18</sup>India had 3902 institutions (24 % of the total), the Philippines 1259 (8 %), China 1082 (6 %), Indonesia 992 (6 %) and Mexico 1000 (6 %).

<sup>19</sup>As of December 2015, 740 institutions were accredited by AACSB International, 160 by Equis and 235 by AMBA. Some institutions have double or triple accreditations. See the websites of AACSB International ([www.aacsb.edu](http://www.aacsb.edu)), Equis ([www.efmd.org/accreditation-main/equis](http://www.efmd.org/accreditation-main/equis)), and AMBA ([www.mbaworld.com](http://www.mbaworld.com)).

<sup>20</sup>The list of accredited schools is available on the websites of AACSB, Equis and AMBA.

<sup>21</sup>See <http://rankings.ft.com/businessschoolrankings/global-mba-ranking-2015>.



graduation, and 3 years after graduation, assigned a 3 % weight); (5) *International course experience* (calculated according to whether the most recent graduating MBA class completed exchanges, research projects, study tours, and company internships in countries other than where the school is based, assigned a 6 % weight); and (6) *International languages* (the number of extra languages required on completion of the MBA program, assigned a 1 % weight).

The resulting data on internationalization are summarized in Exhibit 2a for the top 101 programs grouped according to the country (United States, Canada, United Kingdom, and Australia) or the region (Europe and Asia) in which the school's campus is located. For each one of the five dimensions of internationalization shown in the first column, the exhibit reports the highest, the average, and the lowest value of the corresponding measure (a *percentage* for international students, faculty, and board members, and a *rank* for international course experience and international mobility).

We can make several observations based on the data compiled in Exhibit 2a:

- (1) Graduate business programs with the highest scores on internationalization are mostly offered by schools located in the United Kingdom and the rest of Europe followed by schools based in Asia and Australia. One reason most European and UK programs have higher scores on international students, faculty, board members, and courses is that many of these programs have been designed from the outset to cater to foreign students. They are not programs first established for local students that internationalized later to become more competitive in a globalizing world. Why not? Because there is no strong domestic demand for *graduate* business programs in these countries. (The most successful business programs in Europe are *undergraduate* programs that were established by some of the oldest business schools in the world.<sup>22</sup>) To be sustainable over time, *graduate* business programs had to be designed to attract large numbers of foreign students taught by an international faculty.
- (2) MBA programs in the United States, and to some extent in Canada, have some of the lowest ratios of international students and faculty compared to programs offered in Europe. This phenomenon may at first appear puzzling given the fact that the United States is an attractive destination for international talent (it ranks fourth in the Global Talent Competitiveness Index after Switzerland, Luxembourg, and Singapore). The explanation is similar to the one regarding European programs. While Europe created and developed the first *undergraduate* business programs to train its local students who completed their secondary education, the United States created and perfected the *graduate* business programs to prepare its local undergraduate students for managerial

---

<sup>22</sup>The world's oldest business school is ESCP (Ecole Supérieure de Commerce de Paris) established in 1819 in Paris followed by schools established in Belgium (1855), in Hungary (1857), in Italy (1857) and in France (outside Paris in 1871). The first US business school was founded in 1889 (The Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania) and the first UK business school in 1902 (The Birmingham School of Commerce). See [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Business\\_school](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Business_school).

**Exhibit 2a** Internationalization of business schools (Based on the Financial Times Global MBA Ranking 2016)<sup>1</sup>

	United States	Canada	United Kingdom	Europe <sup>3</sup>	Asia <sup>4</sup>	Australia
Number of schools <sup>2</sup>	47	5	15	15	13	3
Percentage of International Students <sup>5</sup>						
Highest (%)	73	77	100	100	92	94
Average (%)	39	55	90	86	36	90
Lowest (%)	21	31	81	30	0	84
Percentage of International Faculty <sup>6</sup>						
Highest (%)	59	78	90	95	66	69
Average (%)	31	67	61	55	34	66
Lowest (%)	1	49	39	14	3	63
Percentage of International Board Members <sup>7</sup>						
Highest (%)	68	75	71	87	79	75
Average (%)	16	39	43	62	42	47
Lowest (%)	0	15	15	12	0	25
International Course Rank (101 schools) <sup>8</sup>						
Highest	15	19	7	2	6	20
Average	69	56	49	22	31	43
Lowest	101	90	97	69	85	84
International Mobility Rank (101 schools) <sup>9</sup>						
Highest	44	30	4	1	9	10
Average	73	42	27	16	47	23
Lowest	99	67	47	49	101	40

<sup>1</sup>See <http://rankings.ft.com/businessschoolrankings/global-mba-ranking-2015>

<sup>2</sup>There is a total of 101 ranked schools of which 98 are reported in the exhibit. The 3 missing schools are located in South Africa, Mexico and Costa Rica

<sup>3</sup>The countries are France (4 schools), Spain (3 schools), Germany and Switzerland (2 schools each), Italy, Ireland, the Netherlands and Portugal (1 school each)

<sup>4</sup>The countries are China (4 schools), Hong Kong (3 schools), India (3 schools) Singapore (2 schools) and Korea (1 school)

<sup>5</sup>The percentage of students whose citizenship differs from the country in which they study

<sup>6</sup>The percentage of faculty whose citizenship differs from the country in which their school is based

<sup>7</sup>The percentage of board members whose citizenship differs from the country in which their school is based

<sup>8</sup>The school's rank (out of 101 schools) according to whether the most recent graduating MBA class completed exchanges, research projects, study tours and company internships in countries other than where the school is based

<sup>9</sup>The school's rank (out of 101 schools) according to whether alumni worked in different countries pre-MBA, on graduation, and three years after graduation

positions in business.<sup>23</sup> Today, the objective of these programs is not to attain deep internationalization but to attract enough foreign students to provide some international diversity in the classroom. A similar but more acute phenomenon is happening in India, a country with three schools listed in FT Global 100 that have the lowest ratios of foreign students, foreign faculty, and foreign board members. The explanation here is that the need to train local students is so great that it does not leave enough resources to train foreigners. Furthermore, higher education institutions in India are highly regulated and prohibited by the authorities to enroll foreign students in order to devote all their resources to educate the large number of local students.

- (3) As in the case of universities discussed earlier, US business schools have a low score on internationalization but they crowd the top comprehensive ranks as shown in Exhibit 2b where seven of the top ten schools are based in the United States. The other three schools are located in France and Singapore (INSEAD), the United Kingdom (London Business School) and Spain (IESE).

The conclusions we can draw from the examination of the degree of internationalization of business schools are similar to those we drew from the examination of universities:

- (1) Inward internationalization is more prevalent for schools located in Europe than schools based in the United States. Lower degrees of internationalization for US schools can be explained by two primary factors: the first is the large size of the US domestic market that supplies large numbers of candidates to business schools, and the second is the historical mission of US schools that is primarily focused on developing domestic talent.
- (2) Inward internationalization is more prevalent for schools located in Europe than schools based in the United States. Most European schools—and some Asian schools—with a high degree of inward internationalization have achieved this outcome by designing programs that appeal primarily to nonlocal students. It should be emphasized that most of these programs are imbedded in schools that remain focused on their national or regional markets with no evidence that these programs are helping these institutions to internationalize across the board.
- (3) A consequence of the preceding point is that one must be specific when discussing the institutional unit that is being internationalized. Is it the entire university? Is it a school within the university (such as a business school)? Is it a program within a school (such as the Master of Business Administration)? Or is it a course within a program? Given the challenges encountered when internationalizing (which I review in Chap. 4), it should be easier to internationalize a smaller academic unit than a larger one, that is, easier to internationalize a school than a university, a program than a school, a course than a

---

<sup>23</sup>The first graduate business program (a master degree in commerce sciences) was offered in 1900 in the United States at the Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth College. It was followed in 1908 by the founding of the Harvard Business School at Harvard University, the first institution in the world to offer an MBA degree. See [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Business\\_school](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Business_school).

**Exhibit 2b** Business school ranking: Comprehensive rank and international criteria (Based on the Financial Times Global MBA Ranking 2016)<sup>1</sup>

Top ten MBA programs (comprehensive rank)	Country	International criteria <sup>2</sup>				
		Students (%)	Faculty (%)	Board (%)	Course (Rank)	Mobility (Rank)
1. Harvard Business School	United States	34	38	27	57	51
2. INSEAD	France SGP	95	93	81	5	3
2. London Business School	United Kingdom	93	85	65	7	4
4. U. of Pennsylvania: Wharton School	United States	32	35	50	54	45
4. Stanford Graduate School of Business	United States	36	39	15	15	62
6. Columbia Business School	United States	47	47	34	68	44
7. MIT: Sloan	United States	48	39	53	32	54
8. U. of California at Berkeley: Haas	United States	43	45	13	33	52
9. U. of Chicago: Booth	United States	42	36	43	67	61
10. IESE Business School	Spain	57	80	86	3	8

<sup>1</sup>See <http://rankings.ft.com/businessschoolrankings/global-mba-ranking-2015>

<sup>2</sup>Students: The percentage of students whose citizenship differs from the country in which they study  
Faculty: The percentage of faculty whose citizenship differs from the country in which their school is based

Board: The percentage of board members whose citizenship differs from the country in which their school is based

Course: The school's rank (out of 101 schools) according to whether the most recent graduating MBA class completed exchanges, research projects, study tours and company internships in countries other than where the school is based

Mobility: The school's rank (out of 101 schools) according to whether alumni worked in different countries pre-MBA, on graduation, and three years after graduation

program, and a lecture than a course. But internationalizing some courses will not produce an international program. Likewise, creating an international program will not internationalize the school that offers it. And internationalizing a school will not internationalize the university that hosts it. The implication is that the process of internationalization must be top-down rather than a bottom-up, that is, it should begin at the university level and cascade down the structure of the university rather than start at the course level and

brought up through the units that make up the university. I refer to this phenomenon as the ‘top-down internationalization principle’.

## 2.4 A Search for More Comprehensive Measures of Internationalization

I have argued so far that internationalization is defined too narrowly with too much emphasis on its inward-looking dimension, a view that may limit the ambition of higher education institutions in their drive to internationalize.

If current (inward-looking) measures produce unsatisfactory or incomplete outcomes then they should be supplemented with outward-looking metrics. We need to devise more comprehensive indicators of internationalization that include outward-looking elements as well as measures of an institution’s ability to connect and contribute to the global knowledge economy. Some examples of these indicators could include items such as<sup>24</sup>:

1. Reference in the institution’s mission to outward internationalization
2. The proportion of students studying abroad as part of their home degree
3. The proportion of students engaged in international projects that involve foreign institutions
4. The number of double and joint-degree programs
5. The number of academic joint-ventures, alliances and partnerships
6. The proportion of faculty involved in international research projects
7. The proportion of international research projects and funding
8. The proportion of faculty who spend time abroad to collaborate with foreign-based faculty
9. Number of research centers located in foreign countries and academic activities carried out abroad, including campuses, and their degree of integration with the home institution.

The list needs to be refined and operationalized. Systematic data collection should be organized. And new international rankings, based on these extended measures, should be developed.

## References

1. AACSB (2011) The globalization of management education. The Association for the Advancement of Collegiate Schools of Business, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, United Kingdom
2. ACE (2009) Sizing up the competition, The future of international postsecondary student enrollment in the United States, American Council on Education ([www.acenet.edu](http://www.acenet.edu))

---

<sup>24</sup>See de Wit [4] and Hazelkorn et al. [9].

3. De Meyer A (2012) Reflections on the globalization of management education. *J Manag Dev* 31(4):336–345
4. de Wit H (2016) Measure of internationalization? Inside Higher Education, 17 January 2016 ([www.insidehighered.com/blogs/world-view](http://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/world-view))
5. European Parliament's Committee on Culture and Education (2015) Internationalisation of Higher Education ([www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/.../IPOL\\_STU\(2015\)540370\\_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/.../IPOL_STU(2015)540370_EN.pdf))
6. Global Talent Competitiveness Index (2016) <http://global-indices.insead.edu/gtci/gtci-2015-16-report.cfm>
7. Global Talent Competitiveness Index (2015) <http://global-indices.insead.edu/gtci/gtci-past-reports.cfm>
8. Hawawini Gabriel (2005) The future of business schools. *J Manag Dev* 24(9):770–782
9. Hazelkorn E, Gibson A (2016) Another year, another methodology: are rankings telling us anything new? *International Higher Edu* 84:3–4
10. Knight J (1994) Internationalization: elements and checkpoints. Research Monograph, No. 7, Canadian Bureau for International Education, Ottawa, Canada
11. Knight J, de Wit H (1997) Internationalization of higher education in Asia Pacific countries. European Association for International Education Publications, Amsterdam
12. Knight J (2003a) Updated internationalization definition. *Int Higher Educ* 33: 2–3
13. Knight J (2003b) Internationalization of higher education practices and priorities. IAU Survey Report (<http://www.unesco.org/iau/internationalization/pdf/Internationalisation-en.pdf>)
14. Knight J (2015) International universities: misunderstandings and emerging models? *J Stud Int Educ* 19 (2):107–121
15. Lehman J (2004) Social engagement and the transnational research university. Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars
16. Levin R (2010) Yale and the world ([www.yale.edu](http://www.yale.edu))
17. NAFSA (2010) The economic benefits of international education to the United States for the 2008–2009 academic year: a statistical analysis
18. NAFSA (2011) Comprehensive internationalization
19. NASULGC (2004) A call to leadership: the presidential role in internationalizing the university. National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C.
20. OECD (2004) Internationalization and trade of higher education: challenges and opportunities. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris
21. OECD (2015) The state of higher education in 2014. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris
22. Royal Society (2011) Knowledge, networks and nations: global scientific collaboration in the 21st century. RS Policy Document 03/11: London
23. Sexton J (2010a) Interviewed by Charlie Rose on PBS, July 23. <http://www.charlierose.com/view/interview/11134>
24. Sexton J (2010b) Global network university reflection, <http://www.nyu.edu/about/leadership-university-administration/office-of-the-president/redirect/speeches-statements.html>
25. Spring J (2009) Globalization of education. Routledge, New York, NY
26. Stearns, Peter (2008) Educating global citizens in colleges and universities: challenges and opportunities. New York, NY: Routledge
27. Tilghman S (2007) Education without borders: internationalizing American universities. [www.princeton.edu/president/speeches/20070711/index.xml](http://www.princeton.edu/president/speeches/20070711/index.xml)
28. Times Higher Education (2016) World University Rankings 2015–2016
29. van der Wende M (2007) Internationalization of higher education in the OECD countries: challenges and opportunities for the coming decade. *J Stud Int Educ* 11 (3/4): 274–289
30. Webster's New College Dictionary (2015) Cleveland. Wiley, Ohio
31. Wildavsky B (2010) The great brain race: how global university are reshaping the world. Princeton University Press

The Internationalization of Higher Education and  
Business Schools

A Critical Review

Hawawini, G.

2016, XIII, 85 p., Softcover

ISBN: 978-981-10-1755-1