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Chapter Three

The international dimension of higher education in Europe

1. Introduction

In presenting Europe as a case study, we have to keep in mind that Europe is not a homogeneous region; still less is its education homogeneous, as the rationales behind the Bologna Declaration on the European space for higher education of 1999 make manifest. This implies that when analysing internationalisation and globalisation of higher education in Europe, one has to take account of several important issues, such as national and regional differences, diversity of language, different educational traditions and systems, diversity of stakeholders, and the co-existence of universities and a strong non-university sector. In the previous chapter similar remarks were made for higher education in the United States. In Europe, the heterogeneity is even greater, with more systems than countries and little convergence. It would be difficult to make a classification for Europe such as the Carnegie Classification for the US. For an overview and analysis of European higher education systems and structures, see Haug et al., 1999: ‘Trends in Learning Structures in Higher Education’.

It is also important to realise that international dimension of higher education in Europe is still in development. In comparison to the characterisation by Elaine El-Khawas (1994, 90) of the environment in which higher education operates in the US and its effect on internationalisation as presented in the previous chapter, one has to be aware that for Europe, until recently, one could posit the opposite of these four characteristics to a large extent:

- Institutional strategies and actions have been initiated mainly by support provided by the European Commission and – although in a more limited way – by national governments
- Private initiative and support for internationalisation is almost negligible in Europe
- The role of institutional leaders in the process of internationalisation has been less pro-active and more reactive than in the US
- Internationalisation of higher education in Europe has been developed more on the basis of financial support by the European Commission and national governments on the basis of self-financing mechanisms, which were and in many cases still are absent, both at the institutional level and individually.

But a shift is taking place in the direction of:

- More autonomous institutional strategies for internationalisation, which are less dependent on governmental support
- A growing involvement of private support in addition to public subsidies for internationalisation

---

14 See also De Wit (1995 b, and Callan and de Wit, 1995). Elements of these two articles are used in this chapter. Although reference will be made to countries outside the present European Union, the emphasis of my analysis will be on the European Union and its member states.
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- More active institutional leadership instead of reactive policies
- The creation of more self-financing mechanisms, at both the institutional and individual level.

The shift in higher education and its internationalisation, driven by market forces and privatisation of higher education, goes hand in hand with attempts from governments and the EC to Europeanise higher education. Terms used are ‘Europeanisation’, the ‘European dimension’ and creating a ‘European education space’.

Although reference will not be made exclusively to the EC policies for internationalisation and Europeanisation, the historical analysis presented coincides with the phases noted by Brouwer (1996, 516):

- 1951–1972, the phase of incidental co-operation;
- 1972–1977, the preparatory phase of European co-operation in education;
- 1977–1986, the first phase of implementation of educational programmes, mainly based on intergovernmental co-operation;
- 1986–1993, the second phase of implementation, mainly based on action by the EU; and
- 1993 onwards, the first phase of implementation of the EU Treaty for EU co-operation.

These phases are more or less the same as those presented by Field (1998, 25-26), who speaks of four stages: 1957–1973, when education and training received relatively little interest; 1974–1985, development of some interest but mainly in vocational training; 1986–1992, education becomes a significant area of policy for the EU; 1992 onwards, development of a more radical approach seeking to promote the concept and practice of the learning society.

Brouwer stops in 1995, but one can extend his last phase until 1998. In 1999 a new phase started, in which co-operation and harmonisation will meet in a more coherent European education policy, stimulated by the intergovernmental declarations of Sorbonne and Bologna.

During the first three stages, between 1951 and 1992, the role of the European Commission in education was limited by claims of sovereignty of the member states, and the growth of its role was slow, although steady. After 1992, with the inclusion of education in the Maastricht Treaty, its role could become more pro-active.

Here the historical development of the international dimension of higher education in Europe before 1950 will not be treated, given that in Chapter One Europe has been the centre of my historical analysis for that period. But it is important to note here that further study of the international dimension of higher education in different European countries is needed to make the picture complete. At present the overall picture is that, in Europe, this international dimension was marginal, mainly foreign policy driven, and as far as there was a more active organised presence it was mainly in Germany (DAAD) and the UK (British Council). If we look into the membership of the ‘Academic Co-operation Association’ (ACA) which brings together the major agencies in Europe responsible for the promotion of international academic co-operation, we note that, with the exception of the two agencies mentioned, all the other nine were founded after the Second world War, and, with the exception of NUFFIC in The Netherlands and The Swedish Institute in Sweden, which were founded in the post-war period, all are from the 1980s or 1990s. (ACA, 1998) Guy Haug (2000, 25) explains this on the basis of the catalyst role of the EU programmes
on the development of national agencies.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, bilateral links and exchanges between countries as Belgium and Germany with the United States did exist between the two world wars, as well as between certain European countries, for instance France and Germany. The creation of the ‘Confédération Internationale des Étudiants’ (CIE) in 1919 in Strasbourg, that had as its objective to strengthen ties of respect and to cultivate solidarity, is an indication of lively international student travel and contacts. These initiatives resulted in, for instance, the Student Identity Card and the development of student travel companies. These student travel companies, which emerged in most European countries and, after the Second World War, also in Australia, Canada and the USA, and are organised worldwide in the ‘International Student Travel Conference’ (ISTC), have played an active role in the mobility of students as well as faculty. The ‘International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation’ of the ‘League of Nations’ is also an indication of active academic links in this period. Although the Committee, such as the CIE was not exclusively European, it was European dominated, which resulted in a lively debate on the notion of ‘universal culture’ in connection to this European dominance (see Kolasa, 1962, 57-66).

It is clear that in older comprehensive universities in particular have a long tradition of organised international linkages, such as the University of Tübingen in Germany with an international office dating from 1928 (Markert, 1997, 62), but these are more the exception than the rule. But little is known about the size and impact of these activities nor about the role of institutions of higher education in these activities.

Of course that does not mean that national governments, foundations and/or institutions of higher education have not been active, as the Tübingen example indicates, but from the material available one gets the impression that their activities to stimulate the international dimension of higher education were marginal and ad hoc. Further research is needed to identify specific actions in different countries, agencies, foundations and institutions.

2. The 1950s and 1960s: Laisser–Faire

To understand the present European situation, it is essential to place current developments in a historical perspective. As described in Chapter One, macro-historical changes affecting the international dimension of Europe’s higher education were: the emergence of nation-states in the nineteenth century and earlier; Europe’s historical role in the world, in particular its role in colonisation and in the process of de-colonisation; the impact of higher education in countries such as France, Germany and the United Kingdom on higher education in the rest of the world; recent trends in European integration; the collapse of the former Soviet Union and associated East–West rapprochement; recession and financial constraint; ‘massification’ of higher education; the dissolution of some structures and blocs and the emergence of others.

Institutions, as they participate in these events, bring with them their own micro-histories: i.e. their individual histories which may stretch back many centuries, or reflect a far more recent

\[16\] For a short history of the Dutch Student Travel Company, NBBS, and its relationship with the Dutch Student Council, the Confédération Internationale des Étudiants, the International Union of Students and the International Student Travel Conference, see NBBS, 1982.
foundation. An institution's response to the 'push' and 'pull' factors for internationalisation will always reflect the intersection of these micro- and macro-level histories.

Confining discussion to the macro-level and the post Second World War period, the 1950s and 1960s in Europe are not seen today as a period of internationalisation, but it would be entirely wrong to believe that international student mobility was absent then. In general, the period 1950–1970 was, according to Baron (1993), characterised by a 'foreign policy' among receiving countries of 'benevolent laissez-faire': of open doors to foreign students – students, who to a large extent, came from the former and, at that time, still existing French and British colonies. Some elements of this are still seen in the pattern of student flow to these countries, although (in the British case especially) the impact of more recent policies has largely transformed the picture. According to Baron, in the period 1950–1970, "promoting academic mobility was predominantly seen as an element of foreign policy. From the point of view of the receiving countries, provision and care for foreign students were perceived as connected to foreign policy objectives, such as maintaining political influence with future elites in other countries and preparing useful contacts for international relations in commerce and industry."

As we have seen in Chapter One, Guy Neave (1992 a) sees massification of the student flow and its bipolar nature (i.e. the dominance of the United States in the Western bloc and of the former Soviet Union in the communist bloc), as the main characteristics of the international dimension of higher education in the 1960s and 1970s. The open door and laissez-faire policy and the one-way dimension were the other characteristics of the process of internationalisation of higher education, at a global level and in Europe in particular. The universities themselves played a mainly passive role as receivers of foreign students.

Gisela Baumgratz-Gangl (1996) gives the following characteristics of internationalisation in Europe before the introduction of the European programmes: historical ties with former colonies (usually combined with cultural and linguistic ties); political considerations; presence of political refugees; economic considerations; research co-operation in the natural sciences; top-level postgraduate study; migration of 'guest workers'; increasing foreign language competence at school level; traditional links between disciplines (mainly philology); traditional mobility of elites; improvement of transport and communication and expansion of tourism; co-operation at postgraduate level between Western Europe and the US; mobility of Third World students and staff to Western Europe (brain drain).

Although this list looks impressive, the effects of these factors on higher education co-operation within Europe were marginal. International activity was mainly oriented towards the co-operation of European higher education with the US (outward mobility) and with the Third World (inward mobility). A European policy for internationalisation did not exist, and the same applies to the institutional level. At the national level, international co-operation and exchange was included in bilateral agreements between nations and in development co-operation programmes, driven by political rationales. Institutions were passive partners in these programmes.
3. The 1970s: the first steps to policies of Europeanisation in education

In the 1970s, this changed. In 1972, Sweden set up a programme emphasising internationalisation as a means to promote international understanding, co-operation and peace, a programme in which the universities should play an active role as change agents. The programme included measures to internationalise the curriculum; credit transfer and exchanges (see for instance Hans Löwbeer, 1977). Germany also shifted around that time from a foreign affairs policy of internationalisation to a more regulative and differentiated approach. Outgoing mobility was given more emphasis than the previous open door policy for foreign students. The establishment of an ‘Integrated Study Abroad’ programme, administered by the DAAD, is an illustration of that change. A change in pattern from South-North mobility to North-North mobility accompanied these changes (see for instance Baron, 1993, and Kehm and Last, 1997).

In 1976, the Council of the European Communities adopted an action programme for education. This was the first such move, since the Treaty of Rome did not mention education as an area for community action. The 1963 Treaty of Rome (Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxemburg and The Netherlands) only included the principles of common vocational training, not other areas of education. Action was limited mainly to information exchange and exchange of young workers. Other initiatives, such as the creation of European schools, cultural and scientific co-operation, the creation of a European University, scientific and technological co-operation and mutual recognition of diplomas, were – although linked to and inspired by the co-operation among the six countries that signed the treaty – not a formal part of the treaty, owing to political motives and related delays in decision making, (Brouwer, 1996).

The Commission therefore had to justify its action programme by non-educational, mainly economic criteria. As Field (1998, 85) notes, the European Community and also later its successor the European Union tends to use other areas of activities to pursue its plans when its policy thinking exceeds the limits of the competency of the Treaty.

Brouwer (1996, 58) gives four reasons why the European Community was reluctant to give priority to actions in the field of education until 1972: its emphasis on economic integration; a legal dispute on the limitations of the EC for actions in the field of education; the political context that limited the role of the EC in areas that the member states saw as their own competency; and the differences in national educational systems and the national orientation of these systems.

The action programme of 1976 was a result of the first meeting of Ministers of Education of the European Community, November 16, 1971 in Brussels. The basis for that meeting was laid at the conference of heads of states of the European Community in December 1969 in The Hague, where co-operation in the area of education was advocated as part of further political integration. The 1971 meeting recognised the importance of broadening European action from vocational training to other areas of education, in particular higher education, because of its economic significance.
The extension of the EC from six to nine countries with the inclusion of Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom as of January 1, 1973\(^{17}\) coincided with a period of stagnation due to economic and political problems. For education, though, new initiatives were taken as a follow-up of the 1971 meeting of ministers of education. In 1973, the creation of a Directorate for Education, Research and Science (DG XII) under the responsibility of the first Commissioner for Science and Education, Ralf Dahrendorf, not only institutionalised education within the Commission structure but also linked EU policies for education and research. With this, the Commission was able to move away from having to base its rationales for an education and research policy on non-educational arguments – economic rationales primarily – to a pro-active and integrated policy in these fields.\(^{18}\)

Brouwer (1996, 86) gives seven rationales for the legitimisation of European co-operation in the area of education:
- the importance of training and education for the process of European co-operation and integration (both from the perspective of quality improvement of education and from the point of mutual understanding);
- the need for more harmonisation between the different national systems;
- the need for the creation of solutions resulting from the free movement of persons (foreign languages, education for children of immigrants, recognition of diplomas and qualifications);
- closer co-operation between national policies for education and actions of the EC in other fields;
- more involvement of European youth in the building of Europe;
- the need for a systematic exchange of information; and
- the need for linking European actions with other intergovernmental bodies, such as UNESCO, OECD and Council of Europe, as well as incorporation of education in development co-operation.

In these rationales we recognise the first signs of issues that are still dominant in the European policy for education: harmonisation, Europeanisation and globalisation.

In 1974, the ministers of education of the European Community adopted the principles for an ‘Education Action Programme’ that was launched in 1976. It was composed of three main categories: mobility in education, education for children of immigrant workers and the intention to implement a European dimension in education. The action programme included three measures for higher education: ‘Joint Study Programmes’, ‘Short Study Visits’ and an educational administrators programme.

Although important in itself, the impact of the action programme was marginal (see also Field, 1998, 32). In that sense, the period 1972–1985 can be seen as a period of stagnation. In comparison to the ‘Integrated Study Abroad’ programme of Germany, the scope of the European programmes was limited. But for other European countries who lacked a national policy and

\(^{17}\) In 1981, Greece would become the tenth member. In 1986, Spain and Portugal were included; in 1990, the former DDR, as part of Germany; and in 1995, Sweden, Finland and Austria.

\(^{18}\) See for instance Wächter et al. (1999, 62) and Brouwer (1996, 74).
action programme, at least it was something. The reasons for this stagnation, according to Brouwer, (1996, 121) were the financial crisis of 1971, the energy crisis of 1973 and the resulting global economic crisis of the 1970s that stagnated economic and political integration and focused attention on national solutions.

4. The 1980s: the great leap forward

The 1980s produced four distinct changes: first in the open door mobility of individual students; second in the development of a research and development policy for the EC; third in student mobility as an integrated part of study; and fourth in the widening of scope to other regions: third countries in Western Europe, Central and Eastern Europe, third countries outside Europe, and development co-operation.

4.1. Individual mobility

With respect to the individual mobility of students, the European nations and universities began changing their benevolent laissez-faire policy to a more controlled reception and in some cases the active recruitment of fee-paying foreign students. Alice Chandler (1989) stated: "What has changed in recent years is the balance of motives. Humanitarianism and internationalism still exist as rationales for foreign student enrolments. But they have been overshadowed in both rhetoric and reality during the 1980s by the increased emphasis on pragmatics: by the monies to be derived from foreign student tuitions, by the purchases and expenditures made by foreign student tuitions, by the purchases and expenditures made by foreign students as tourists, and by the less measurable but ultimately even more important contribution to be made by foreign graduates as future financial and diplomatic allies."

At first, this applied nearly exclusively to the case of the United Kingdom: the British decision in 1979 to introduce full-cost fees for foreign students. Higher education as an export commodity quickly became dominant in the UK. For the UK this created a conflict with the development of the European mobility programmes. Gribbon (1994, 24) refers in that respect to the dilemma of British institutions in reconciling their interest in these programmes focused on European partners and their interest in export, mainly outside Europe.

For most people on the European continent, considering the education of foreign students as an export commodity was still an anathema at that time. On the European continent, the reception of foreign students was and in most cases still is based more on foreign policy arguments than on considerations of export policy. Often, it can be claimed in all fairness that foreign students cost more than they bring in, owing to the subsidisation of higher education. This is also the case in the former communist countries such as the Soviet Union, where students were received for ideological reasons but after the collapse of communism were no longer welcome for a number of years because of the high costs to their hosts' faltering economies.

At the end of the twentieth century, the international movement of students as an export commodity had spread over the European continent and became a more important element of higher education policy than it had been in the past, both at the national and institutional level. Examples of this new focus can be seen, for instance, in The Netherlands. Policy documents of
the Dutch government declare the recruitment of foreign students to be a policy issue. This is a remarkable difference to the previous two decades, when national policy aimed at discouraging foreign students from study in the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{19} Other examples can be seen in Germany, France, and also Central and Eastern Europe, where universities develop programmes for foreign students in order to attract the foreign currency that is so important for their infrastructure because of lack of sufficient national support. (See also Bremer, 1997) One market is the children of former emigrants to the US, who see the relatively cheap training in their countries of origin as an alternative to the high costs of academic training in the U.S.

Similar trends can be observed in France, Germany and Scandinavia, although in these cases the rationale of status and indirect, long term economic effects is more important than direct income which is the driving rationale in the United Kingdom.\textsuperscript{20} The shift to higher education as an export commodity over the European continent results in a reaction from the leading Anglo-Saxon countries in this market (United States, Australia, United Kingdom, Canada). They realise that they have to defend their markets and more actively compete with each other and the continental Europeans as well as some Asian countries such as Singapore.\textsuperscript{21}

4.2. The Research and Technological Development Programmes

Internationalisation of research is a phenomenon that is generally accepted. International joint ventures of research groups are not exceptional, and there is a long tradition of conferences, seminars, workshops and congresses for academic exchange of ideas and findings. In addition the technological needs of modern society demand very expensive research projects that individual research groups, institutions of higher education, companies or even national governments cannot finance alone. Therefore a logical role exists for the European Commission in stimulating international co-operation in science and research in the Union: to stimulate those activities in which European co-operation offers major advantages and generates the maximum of beneficial effects. Another rationale was the challenge posed by new technologies and related competition with the USA and Japan.

An R&D stimulation policy was in existence several years before the moves took place to establish a general education policy in the EC. In the period between the 1960s and 1983, co-operation in this field was mainly intergovernmental and the role of the EC was still marginal and concentrated on coal, nuclear energy, and steel. In 1974 it expanded to other areas. In 1974 a Committee for Scientific and Technical Research (CREST) was established, which formed the

\textsuperscript{19} With the exception of students from developing countries, provided with fellowships to be trained at specialised International Education Institutes.

\textsuperscript{20} The change from political to economic rationale as the dominant rationale in Northern European internationalisation strategies is clear from the reports in Kalvermark and Van der Wende (1997), although less for Southern European countries as the Greek report illustrates.

\textsuperscript{21} The government of Tony Blair based on market shares of 63% for the US, 17% for the UK, 10% for Australia and 5% for Canada and a trend to sliding shares for the UK, has recently presented a plan to raise its share from 17% to 25% in 2005 by streamlining immigration procedures, fewer regulations for work permits, 5000 extra scholarships and better marketing. Costs: £5 million (The Times Higher Education Supplement, February 11, 2000).
basis for the involvement of the EC in this area. In 1979 a stimulus towards an R&D policy was given with the establishment of the European Strategic Programme for Research and Development in Information Technology (ESPRIT), followed by programmes such as RACE (communication technology), BRITE (industrial technology), SPRINT (innovation and technology transfer) and ECLAIIR (linkages between agriculture and industry).

The objectives of the European R&D policy were (Preston, 1991):
- to establish a European research and technology community;
- to increase the capacity of European industry to develop its own technological capability through research and innovation;
- to strengthen the international competitiveness of the European economy;
- to establish uniform rules and standards where these were needed; and
- to improve the quality of life and living.

As is clear from these objectives, Europeanisation, harmonisation and globalisation are central elements in this policy.

Since 1984 most of the programmes have taken place within so-called Framework Programmes, the first running from 1984 to 1987, the second from 1987 to 1991, the third from 1990 to 1994, the fourth from 1995 to 1999. In 1994, a programme for ‘Training and Mobility of Researchers’ was approved. Larédo (1997) sees the development of public–private networks of research institutes with industry, based on the public initiative of the European Union, as an extremely valuable result of the Framework Programmes. These programmes promoted a new structural arrangement whereby large European firms gained access to new technologies; stimulated industrial competitiveness; and were geared towards innovation in ‘collective goods’.

R&D funding, though, is still seen by universities as just one additional resource for large research projects, in a area that is already so global that individual, institutional and even national research projects are more the exception than the rule. The complexity of procedures and the extremely low success rate of submitted proposals have reinforced the resistance to get involved. Gradually, though, one can observe a more active and systematic attention to EU tenders in R&D, following the experience of the more successful universities in the United Kingdom.

There is a remarkable difference in emphasis on the R&D programmes and the educational programmes between the United Kingdom and the continent. For reasons explained earlier, in the UK there is strong hesitation towards active involvement in the educational programmes. But the number of submissions and the success rate of these submissions is higher. Two possible and related explanations can be given for this phenomenon, based on personal observations of some UK universities. In the UK, national research funding is less than on the continent and more complex in procedures, so the need for EU funding is higher. Second, the investment in R&D liaison officers to guide the tender process is greater than on the continent. The opposite applies to educational programmes.

Although the R&D programmes are more substantial in terms of quality and funding than the educational programmes of the European Commission, they are considered in most institutional policies – with the exception of the UK and some of the newly entered members, in
4.3. The EC mobility programmes

In the late 1970s and early 1980s the notion of ‘study abroad’, in the sense of sending students to foreign institutions of higher education as part of their home degree programme, became an issue on the continent that overshadowed the developments in individual mobility of students. Since the 1980s, student mobility as a one-way, individual process stimulated by political and/or economic considerations, has (with the exception of the United Kingdom) lost prominence as a policy issue. It has been marginalised by the greater attention given to student mobility in the framework of exchange programmes, which have been among the top priorities in higher education policies of the 1980s and 1990s.

Before this period, organised programmes for the exchange of students and staff did exist, such as the Fulbright Program in the US and the bilateral cultural and academic agreements of European countries. But these programmes were limited in both funding and scope, stimulating mainly unrelated exchanges at post-graduate level. As we have seen, in the 1970s more structural exchange-stimulating programmes were established, first in Sweden and the Federal Republic of Germany. These programmes were inspired by the development of study abroad programmes at American universities in Europe in the same period, but the German and Swedish schemes distinguished themselves from their American examples by the fact that they were much more focused on integration of their own students into the foreign host universities, while the American programmes were more isolated satellites of the American home institution.

The 1976 ‘Joint Study Programmes’ scheme of the EC aimed at the promotion of joint programmes of study and research between institutions in several member states. The focus of this experimental programme was primarily the stimulation of academic mobility within the EC. The programme grew gradually from 32 projects in its first year, 1976/77, to 200 in 1983/84, with a budget of 700,000 ECU. In 1984, the Commission added a budget line for student grants into the Joint Study Programmes Scheme. This scheme was replaced in 1987 by its successor, the ‘European Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students’, ERASMUS.

The action programme of 1976 was the basis for future activities in academic co-operation and exchange within the European Community. The member states limited the role of the European Community in the field of education, however, to complementary measures, decided only with the authorisation of the Council of Ministers. Education would remain the exclusive task of the national governments, although from 1982 onwards social and economic factors gave the Commission more room to extend its role in this area (Brouwer, 1996, 202-205). The objectives of the EU policy for education in that period were: a pluricultural Europe; a Europe of mobility; a Europe of education for all; a Europe of expertise; and a Europe open to the world (Ibid., 252). One can observe in these objectives a more pragmatic and less ambitious approach. Pluralism and complementarity are more dominant than harmonisation and Europeanisation.

Ironically, the lack of a legal basis for action in the field of higher education gave the European Commission a great deal of freedom for creative programmatic action in the field of
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education in the period after 1982: a freedom and creativity that would have been less within a
more formal legal structure. The launch of COMETT, a programme for co-operation between
higher education and industry, in 1986, and of ERASMUS, a programme for co-operation within
higher education, in 1987, took place in this period, followed by several other education
programmes: EURTECNET, a scheme for the development of professional education and
information technology, in 1985; PETRA, a programme to promote co-operation and exchange in
further education, in 1987; DELTA, a scheme for learning technologies, in 1988; IRIS (later
NOW), a scheme to promote professional education for women, in 1989; LINGUA, a scheme for
the promotion of the learning of European languages, in 1989; and FORCE, a scheme for
continuing education of workers, in 1990. (Brouwer, 1996; Wächter, 1999)

The development of the European mobility schemes influenced the creation of a new
profession of international relations officer, both at the institutional, intermediate and European
level. In 1988, this resulted in a plan to create a European professional organisation of university
staff involved in international affairs, forty years after the creation of their American sister-
association NAFSA. The letter of invitation for this new organisation, July 6, 1988, makes the
strong link with the mobility programmes of the EU clear: "European action programmes like
ERASMUS and similar schemes being developed make the foundation of a professional
organisation mandatory." (European Association for International Education, 1999, 5) The
creation in 1989 and further development of the ‘European Association for International
Education’ (EAIE) with a membership and conference participation of over 1500, went hand in
hand with the further expansion of the European mobility schemes and institutional responses to
the internationalisation of higher education in Europe. The European programmes and broader,
the internationalisation of European higher education, also became more dominant on the agenda
of the European Rectors’ Conference (CRE, later renamed Association of Universities in Europe).
In 1993, the major national agencies in Europe responsible for the promotion of international
academic co-operation, such as British Council in the United Kingdom, DAAD in Germany,
NUFFIC in The Netherlands and CIMO in Finland, created the Academic Co-operation
Association to support, improve, manage and analyse academic co-operation in Europe and
between Europe and other parts of the world (Academic Co-operation Association, 1997, 29).

Wächter et al. (1999, 63) call ERASMUS "the Community’s flagship programme", which
although it might be perceived as such in the higher education community, it is an exaggeration of its
importance. Since the implementation of the ERASMUS programme in 1987, however, significant
results have been achieved in co-operation and exchange within higher education in the European
Union. To give an idea of the impact of the programmes, the following is an overview of the
results of the ERASMUS programme, based on a number of sources.

Thanks to ERASMUS, in the period 1987–1993, more than 200,000 students and 15,000
faculty have been exchanged. This took place in the framework of 2200 Joint Study Programmes,
in which 14,000 departments of 1300 institutions of higher education worked together. In
addition, 700 intensive courses and 800 joint curricula have been established; 20,000 short visits
of faculty and administrators have been supported; and 100 European faculty and 30 student
organisations have been given a subsidy to stimulate their activities. In the year 1993–1994 almost
48,000 students have been exchanged, and more than 8000 lecturers have participated in staff
mobility programmes, illustrating the rapid growth of this programme. In 1991, the EFTA
countries were allowed to take part in the ERASMUS programme, and when Austria, Finland and Sweden joined the EU in 1995, Norway, which stayed out of the EU, was allowed to continue its participation.\footnote{In 1989, the Nordic countries, Norway, Sweden, Finland and Denmark, created their own programme for cooperation and exchange in education: Nordplus. This programme continues to be active, even after the inclusion of Sweden, Finland and Norway in the European programmes in 1991.} Switzerland, which had also decided not to join the EU, did not get that privilege, because of disagreement on other issues. This country established a separate budget to continue participation in ERASMUS activities on bilateral basis. In 1998/1999, the SOCRATES programme was gradually opened to countries from Central and Eastern Europe: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia, as well as the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania) and Cyprus.

In the 1990s, the creative and informal period of educational policy of the European Community came to an end. The Maastricht Treaty, signed in 1992 and ratified on November 1, 1993, included education for the first time. This decision was, according to Brouwer, \cite{Brouwer:1994} influenced by the following factors: the existing practice of co-operation in education; a recognition of the importance of the contribution of education to the realisation of the objectives of the treaty and related policies; existing jurisprudence of the Court of Justice in Luxemburg since 1985 in the field of education; the need to expand the responsibilities of the community as a result of the decisions on European Monetary Union (EMU) and European Political Union (EPU); and changing opinions on the role of the European institutions and national governments among the member states.

In preparation for the changing role of education under the Maastricht Treaty, the European Commission presented two memoranda, one on open distance education and one on higher education. The first one expanded the role of the Commission to a new important area of education; the second confirmed the new role of the Commission with respect to higher education.

In 1991, the EC published the ‘Memorandum on Higher Education in the European Community’. This document was the basis for an intensive debate on the role of the European Union in education and on the future of the educational programmes. The ‘added value’ of EU action in the sphere of education is, according to the Commission and in the words of its president, Jacques Delors \cite{Delors:1994}: ‘The mutual integration and opening up to each other of general education and professional training systems are an economic issue, in terms of maintaining competitiveness, and a political issue, in terms of defending democracy and human rights.’\footnote{Delors, Jacques (1994), Interview in Le Magazine. European Commission, Summer 1994, Issue 2, Brussels.}

Although in general it was well received, critical comments were made by the educational sector on the one-sided focus by the EC on economic and political criteria at the expense of a broader cultural and academic approach. The European Association for International Education (EAIE) \cite{EAIE:1992}, in a comment on the Memorandum on Higher Education in the European Community, acknowledges the positive role of the EC in stimulating internationalisation of higher education within Europe, but also questions the confusion of internationalisation with Europeanisation: ‘For
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the European Commission, the main focus of internationalisation is Europeanisation: achievement of European excellence; strengthening of Europe's position in the global economy; safeguarding and strengthening Europe's cultural heritage; strengthening the basis for further political development and for European Political Union; a European Community dimension in higher education; the European dimension of curricula." The EAIE points to the danger of a Eurocentric view of internationalisation and (citing Peter Scott, 1992) sees a potential contradiction between Europeanisation and internationalisation: "Intra-European exchanges cannot be regarded as fully 'international'. Indeed, as the European Community deepens and widens, they will increasingly be seen as 'internal' rather than 'external' exchanges. Nor can they be regarded as a substitute for wider global relations." Others have a more optimistic view on the European programmes, for instance Rob Kroes (2000, 12), who calls the ERASMUS programme "a shining example of Europe producing Europeans."

The importance of strengthening the European dimension in education was placed high on the agenda. The programmes should contribute to the realisation of this dimension and its four objectives (Ibid., 262):
- preparation of young people for their involvement in the economic and social development of the European Community;
- improvement of their knowledge of the historical, cultural, economic and social aspects of the union and its member states, the European integration process, daily life in other member states, and the relation of the union with third countries;
- improvement of their opinion in the advantages of the union, the challenges of its greater economic and social space, the European identity, the value of European civilisation and the foundations for its present development; and
- strengthening of their image of Europe as a Europe of citizens and improvement of the knowledge of its languages.

For higher education, the EC was of the opinion that the existing programmes (COMETT, ERASMUS and LINGUA) were not sufficient to realise these objectives, and for that reason introduced in 1989 the action JEAN MONNET, to support initiatives for the development of research and education on European integration.

While the European Commission has played an active role in stimulating and supporting intra-Community educational mobility and co-operation for a number of years -recognised as we have seen as a part of a new Directorate for Education, Research and Science with Ralf Dahrendorf as first Commissioner – its legal competence in the educational field dates only from the adoption of the Treaty of Maastricht in 1993. The EC, confronted with the fast-growing interest in its educational programmes, conscious of the new role for education under the Maastricht Treaty and aware of a positive change of attitude in the institutions of higher education towards its educational programmes, prepared for the follow-up to the mobility programmes, as December 31, 1994 was the expiry date of the first phase.

In 1993 Antonio Ruberti, Commissioner for education and research, published a new discussion paper, in which he stressed the importance of a more coherent continuation of the existing programmes (combining ERASMUS and LINGUA in one programme) and a closer link between
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these and the research and development programmes of the European Union. The Commission decided to consolidate the existing individual programmes into two large framework programmes:

- **LEONARDO DA VINCI** in the area of vocational training and replacing COMETT, EUROTECNET, PETRA, FORCE, and a part of LINGUA; and
- **SOCRATES** in the area of general and higher education, with three chapters: ERASMUS for higher education, COMENIUS for secondary education, and a third chapter directed to transverse measures (promotion of linguistic skills, open and distance learning, information promotion education and adult education).²⁴

For higher education, ERASMUS continued as the programme for promoting mobility of students and staff. Disciplinary and institutional networking are the basis of this phase of ERASMUS. An important element of the new ERASMUS scheme is that institutions, instead of departments as hitherto, are the main actors working together in curriculum development and staff and student exchange. Institutions are eligible to receive a contract from the Commission, based on concrete proposals for mobility of staff and students, joint curricula, intensive courses, credit transfer, distance education and language preparation. Under the new scheme institutions have to prove that they have a well-defined policy before being awarded a contract: the European Policy Statement.

This shift of responsibility for the administration of the partnerships from the academic coordinator to the institutional administrator was intended to make it possible for the faculty to concentrate on the academic aspects of internationalisation while the administrator handled the administrative part. This change recognised the new role of the institution, its rights and obligations in internationalisation. It can also be read as a recognition of the growing professionalism of the institutional administrator in internationalisation. At the same time, it has been criticised by both academics and administrators for its top-down approach, a shift from what was perceived as a bottom-up approach in the first phase, the emphasis on the departmental joint study programmes. Also new within SOCRATES was the possibility of the creation of ‘thematic networks’ with the primary objective of creating fora to analyse and study the status of development in the different fields of education in Europe, the promotion of the European dimension and improvement of the quality of training.

According to Barbara Khem (Barblan et al., 1998, 10; Kehm, 2000) the managerial change of the SOCRATES programme challenged institutions of higher education to reflect and place a strong emphasis on the coherence of goals, to strengthen the responsibility of the central level of the higher education institutions, and to develop and reinforce strategic thinking. A study of the first round of applications and their policy statements (Barblan et al., 1998) does show indications of the success of this strategy, but also that the impact was still marginal and reactive, and needed more time to become systematic and pro-active (see also Teichler, 1999, 15-17).

Related issues that were also given attention were the development of a European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) as part of ERASMUS/SOCRATES, recognition of diplomas, and the development of an open European space for co-operation in higher education. All together, these new measures redirected step by step the scope of the debate to harmonisation, integration and

²⁴ Adult education in the second phase of SOCRATES became a separate chapter, called GRUNDTVIG.
Europeanisation, moving gradually away from the previous direction of pluralism and complementarity, but without stating that explicitly as such.

The end of the 1980s also saw the development of an involvement of the EC in relation to other parts of the world.

4.4. The involvement of the EC with the rest of the world

The role of the European Commission in higher education has not been limited to educational mobility and exchange within the European Union. Four other regions can also be mentioned. The first group, composed of the other European countries that were not hidden behind the iron curtain during the Cold War (the EFTA countries, Switzerland, Cyprus, Malta and Turkey) were, with the exception of the last three, allowed to take part in the R&D and educational programmes in preparation for their future membership of the EC. In the 1990s, Austria, Finland and Sweden indeed became members of the EU. Norway and Switzerland decided not to become a member state. Norway was allowed to continue to take part in the EU programmes, but Switzerland, because of disagreement on other matters, was excluded and had to establish separate bilateral relationships with their former partners in SOCRATES. Cyprus was allowed participation in 1998, Malta and Turkey have to await further decisions in relation with their negotiations on future membership of the EU. As we will also see for Central and Eastern Europe, this is a clear example of a foreign policy rationale: using education as a test case to prepare for strengthening political relations.

The relationships with these countries can be seen as a natural process of widening European integration. Although this is also true for Central and Eastern Europe, this took more time and a transition period was created to make that integration process possible.

4.4.1. Co-operation with Central and Eastern Europe

The opening-up of Central and Eastern Europe has had an enormous impact on higher education in this region and on co-operation between institutions of higher education in Western, Central and Eastern Europe. As Denis Kallen (1991) makes clear, academic co-operation and exchange already existed before this opening-up and was developing rapidly in the 1980s, in particular with Poland and Hungary. Co-operation concentrated mainly on staff exchanges and far less on student exchanges. From the point of view of the regimes in these countries, academic co-operation was mainly a political issue and little institutional or personal autonomy was possible.

Although, as Ladislav Cerych (1996) states, the opening-up of Central and Eastern Europe had a global effect, the increase in academic mobility with Western Europe was quantitatively greater than with any other area. Regional proximity and the political push by national governments and the European Commission formed the basis for this strong inner-European academic co-operation. The EC, through its so-called PHARE programme, opened the way in 1989 for several forms of co-operation, both in R&D and in education. An example is the 'Trans European Mobility Programme for University Studies', the TEMPUS scheme. Its general objective was to contribute, as part of the overall PHARE programme, to the general economic,
social and humanitarian reforms in Central and Eastern Europe, and to their transition to a market economy and multiparty system. Its specific objectives were:
- to simplify the co-ordination of support in the area of exchange and mobility of students and staff;
- contribution to the improvement of the quality of higher education; to stimulate co-operation with EC partners;
- extending opportunities for foreign language study; and
- extending opportunities for study and internships (Brouwer, 1996, 300).

In summary, the programme provides support for the development of education by way of mobility grants for students and faculty and infrastructural support. In the second phase, 1993–1996, the specific objectives were more oriented to national needs and strengthening of the development of higher education systems than to mobility and economic aid.

In 1994 TEMPUS covered most countries in Central and Eastern Europe. Originally Hungary and Poland (July 1, 1990), but on September 1, 1990 directly expanded to Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Romania. In January 1993, Czechoslovakia was split into the Czech Republic and Slovak Republic. In January 1994, the programme was extended to Albania, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and Slovenia. (Brouwer, Ibid., 301) Owing to the split in the former Yugoslavian Republic and the political conflicts that followed that split, other members of that republic stayed out of the programme. Also excluded were the republics of the former Soviet Union, for whom a new scheme, TEMPUS-TACIS, was established in 1991.

Thanks to TEMPUS and other programmes supported by national governments and other international private and public organisations, a rapid improvement in the educational infrastructure and of the quality of education in Central and Eastern Europe has been achieved. One of the main problems still to be solved is the brain drain of qualified faculty and students. But although this and many other important problems remain to be solved, an important step forward in bridging the gap between higher education in Western and Central and Eastern Europe has been made. In the field of R&D also, the situation in Central and Eastern Europe is better than it was 15 years ago, thanks to the support of the EC and national governments.

It is important to add that other OECD countries could also join the PHARE and TEMPUS activities, but their involvement has been minor. With the exception of Russia, most Central and Eastern European countries were more EC-oriented (Bremer, 1997, 215) and for institutions of other countries it was also difficult to get access to the TEMPUS structure, which was so closely related to experiences with ERASMUS and COMETT.

It is also important to add that, in addition to the European programmes, many national governments had their own educational programmes for Central and Eastern Europe, such as the CEEPUS programme of Austria with six neighbouring countries: Bulgaria, Croatia, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia.

Based on this successful development, most countries taking part in TEMPUS have been given access to the regular R&D and educational programmes of the European Union, in preparation for future full membership of the union. There is still ground, however, for some concern in the lack of co-operation between the institutions of higher education in the Central and Eastern European countries themselves, and, related to that problem, a tendency to national instead of regional approaches. Another cause of concern is a tendency to give almost exclusive priority to the natural sciences, economics and law in programmes for Central and Eastern Europe, seen as directly related to economic development, at the expense of the ‘vulnerable sector’ and disciplines in higher education. Further concern lies in the one-way direction of mobility and co-operation. Only recently has a small but growing stream of students begun to move from West to East. If higher education in Central and Eastern Europe is to escape from its dependence on support from Western Europe, then a relationship of two-way exchange and co-operation must prevail. Although countries from Central and Eastern Europe have gradually been allowed to participate in the European R&D and education programmes since 1998, a move from aid to co-operation, it will still take quite some time to get on equal terms (see also Barblan and Teichler, 2000, 9).

4.4.2. Co-operation with third countries

Timothy Light (1993, 263), questioning the American supremacy in higher education, argues that there is a shift from a one-way relationship of higher education in the US to the rest of the world, into a two-way, ‘twinning’ relationship. He, like many other authors, considers the European programmes to be important contributors to this development. The ERASMUS programme has been the example for similar projects between the European Community and the rest of the world.

These include the already discussed extension of the Framework programmes for R&D, and the ERASMUS, LINGUA and COMETT programmes to the so-called EFTA countries (Norway, Sweden, Finland, Austria, the last three now member states of the European Union) and Switzerland (later withdrawn), and the co-operation between higher education in Western Europe and Central and Eastern Europe through the PHARE and more specifically the TEMPUS and TEMPUS-TACIS programmes.

But the extension goes beyond Europe. In 1990, a programme was started to promote co-operation in higher education with the Maghreb countries around the Mediterranean Sea (MED-CAMPUS).26

In 1994 a programme called ALFA was set up to stimulate co-operation with Latin American universities. The activities funded by this programme include the development of academic and administrative management, measures to facilitate recognition, development and adaptation of curricula, co-operation between institutions of higher education and companies, innovation and systematisation of education, institutional assessment, joint research projects and the mobility of students (Wächter, 1999, 65).27

26 In 1996 this programme was frozen, but it is in the process of a restart.

27 The Association of European Universities (CRE), that already had a programme, Columbus, with its counterpart in
In Asia, the EU started several bilateral projects and programmes, of which the most important are the EU–China Higher Education Co-operation Programme of 1996 and the EU–India Cross-Cultural Programme of 1997, which were intended to stimulate the development of European Studies degrees and centres and to provide professorships, fellowships and grants for study and training.

In Northern America, the introduction of a programme for co-operation in higher and vocational education between the European Union and the USA in 1993 (exploratory phase, formalised in 1995, see Chapter Two); and a similar programme for co-operation with Canada in 1995, were intended to confirm to the transatlantic partners that the process of ‘Europeanisation’ is not intended to create a ‘Fortress Europe’.

In October 1995, the official EC/US scheme for co-operation in higher education started. The counterpart of the EC for the pilot phase and the final programme is the ‘Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education’ (FIPSE). One month later a similar EC/Canada programme was launched. The Canadian counterparts of the European Commission DG XXII are ‘Human Resources Development Canada’ (HRDC) and the ‘Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade’ (DFAIT). Both schemes were approved for a period of five years.28

The early fear on the part of some governments and academics outside Europe of the emergence of a ‘Fortress Europe’ in international education has been proved to be unfounded by a booming number of exchange agreements and programmes of co-operation linking institutions of higher education in Europe with counterpart institutions all over the world. Guy Haug (2000, 28) predicts that, in the future, when the European internal market is more or less established, there will be an even stronger emphasis on exchange and co-operation between Europe and the rest of the world.

These initiatives may have been launched by EC or national governments, but in most cases have developed independently of such funding, and are based rather on the growing awareness in higher education that the world of science is not limited to Europe (see for instance Laureys, 1992, 110).29

4.4.3. Development aid programmes

Support to the Third World in general, and to higher education in the South in particular, has received much attention in Western Europe. In the Netherlands, for example, internationalisation of higher education in the 1970s and 1980s, was almost exclusively oriented

---

28 See also Chapter Two.

29 ERASMUS has also been the inspiration for similar regional plans without involvement of the European Union, for instance in Asia and the ‘Program for North American Mobility in Higher Education’ between the USA, Mexico and Canada, in the framework of NAFTA. See also Chapter Two.
to co-operation with higher education in developing countries, with financial support from both the national government and the institutions themselves.

This situation changed in the course of the 1980s. As Alan Smith states: "When it comes to the role of the academic community in the context of providing development aid, however, the current situation appears to be much less encouraging. In so far as figures are available, it would appear that support for such activities has tended to stagnate or even recede, and even in the more positive cases growth-rates have tended not to keep pace with those in the area of co-operation between industrialised countries." 30 The orientation towards support for higher education in Central and Eastern Europe, and the policy shift of major education funders such as the World Bank away from higher education and towards the primary education sector, are among the factors that explain this development. For some parts of the developing world, notably countries of sub-Saharan Africa, the picture is exacerbated by the displacement effect of the transformations in the former Soviet Union and the consequent loss of formerly available study opportunities there.

But in the 1990s, development aid to higher education in the Third World received new attention. Ismail Serageldin (1994), vice-president of the World Bank, states: "Europe, which has given so much to the world, both good and bad, must remain engaged with the rest of the world at this time when the end of the Cold War brings both crises and opportunities. It is important that the next generation of Europeans should continue to look beyond their own frontiers, not motivated by dreams of empire or domination, but by the individual and collective enrichment that will come to Europe and the Europeans in recognising our common humanity in the billions of the poor beyond their borders as well as in the peoples of the competing industrial economies across the world". The European universities have an important role in this process, "as the defender of core values of humanism, tolerance, rationality and reason", he claims.

The European Commission in the 1990s became one of the international funding organisations for development co-operation in the educational field, alongside national governments, international organisations such as the World Bank, foundations and institutions of higher education themselves. One fact becoming clear is that institutions of higher education in Europe wishing to be active in development co-operation will increasingly need to work together in European consortia – a requirement of the European Commission – instead of acting alone.

Although, co-operation in education with the developing world was already mentioned in the early 1970s as a potential area for the EC, the role of the EC remained marginal as development co-operation was seen as a national responsibility. In the so-called report–Janne of 1973 on an EU policy for training, co-operation with developing countries is mentioned as one area. In the same year Commissioner Dahrendorf confirmed this in his work programme (Brouwer, 76, 78). Activities in this area took place mainly in the scope of R&D action programmes (such as Life Sciences and Technologies for Developing Countries).

Complementarity is one of the main objectives of the EC in this area, together with the strengthening and development of democracy; durable economic and social development; integration in the world economy; and the fight against poverty. In 1994, the role of the EC in

---

education and development co-operation was recognised. But given the sensitive relation between national and EC responsibilities, the activities of the Commission in this area are developing only gradually (Brouwer, 475-477).

5. The present decade: towards harmonisation of systems and structures

Above, an overview of the development of Europeanisation of higher education in the period between the 1960s and the 1990s has been given. It explains how these developments have culminated in the 1990s in a broad range of programmes and activities to stimulate a European dimension in higher education. The main focus lay on the Europeanisation of higher education with an emphasis on R&D, mobility of students and staff, curriculum development and network building.

At the turn of the century, Europe is preparing for a big step forward in Europeanisation. It manifests itself in the Bologna Declaration on the European Higher Education Area.

On June 19, 1999, in Bologna, Italy, the ministers of education of 29 European countries signed the Declaration on the ‘European Higher Education Area’. The joint declaration was based on the understanding that “a Europe of Knowledge is now widely recognised as an irreplaceable factor for social and human growth and as an indispensable component to consolidate and enrich the European citizenship, capable of giving its citizens the necessary competences to face the challenges of the new millennium, together with an awareness of shared values and belonging to a common social and cultural space. The importance of education and educational co-operation in the development and strengthening of stable, peaceful and democratic societies is universally acknowledged as paramount, the more so in view of the situation in South East Europe.”

(Bologna Declaration, 19 June, 1999)

The wide support for this declaration beyond the member states of the European Union is unique and has attracted broad international attention.

In the declaration, the ministers aim to reach the following objectives:
- adoption of a system of easily to understand and comparable degrees, including the adoption of a Diploma Supplement;
- adoption of a system essentially based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate
- Establishment of a system of credits – such as the European Credit Transfer System, ECTS – as a means of promoting student mobility;
- promotion of mobility by overcoming obstacles to the effective exercise of free movement;
- promotion of European co-operation in quality assurance; and
- promotion of the European dimension in higher education.

The groundwork for what is already widely known in higher education as the ‘Bologna Declaration’ was laid by the ‘Sorbonne Declaration’, signed on May 25, 1998 in Paris by the ministers of education of France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom on the occasion of the anniversary of the University of Paris. In this ‘Joint declaration on harmonisation of the architecture of the European higher education system’, the ministers of the four dominant countries of the European Union foresee that Europe is “heading for a period of major change in education and working conditions, to a diversification of courses of professional careers, with
education and training throughout life becoming a clear obligation. We owe our students, and our society at large, a higher education system in which they are given the best opportunities to seek and find their own area of excellence. An open European area for higher learning carries a wealth of positive perspectives, of course respecting our diversities, but requires on the other hand continuous efforts to remove barriers and to develop a framework for teaching and learning, which would enhance mobility and an ever closer co-operation." (Sorbonne Declaration, May 25, 1998)

The Sorbonne Declaration was a French initiative based on the Attali report, ‘Pour un modèle Européen d’enseignement supérieur’, which compares the French system with other European systems of higher education as the basis for a reform of the French system. The declaration came as a surprise – not only to the higher education community but also to the European Commission and the ministers of education of the other member states. It seemed rather unlikely that four countries with fundamentally different higher education traditions would be willing to lead the way to harmonisation. In 1993, in the Maastricht Treaty, education did become an area in which the European Commission could take action, but only as a subsidiary focus. Thus, joint European action on higher education was not high on the agenda of the European Council of ministers.

It appears that the ministers of education of the four countries acted deliberately as representatives of their national governments, outside the context of the European Commission. Perhaps they saw this as a way to maintain control over the necessary process of harmonisation. Such a proposal would have been far more difficult to sell if presented by the Commission, by one of each of the four larger countries, or by the smaller countries.31 Thus, the UK needed France, Italy and Germany to convince the British public of the advantages of a joint initiative to harmonise European higher education with the British system. The Germans, for their part, needed the support of the other countries to sell a plan at home to introduce the bachelor’s and master’s degree structure.32 And the French and Italians needed the others to convince their peoples of the need for reform of their higher education systems, something that had previously been blocked by massive protests.

Of course, intensive debates followed, complicated by discrepancies between the French and British versions of the declaration. However, the Sorbonne Declaration was surprisingly well received, both in the political arena and in the higher education community of the four countries and in the rest of Europe. Andris Barblan, Secretary General of CRE, gives the following explanations for this positive reception:

- The process was initiated from unexpected quarters, the European role of the Commission being taken over at the national level by ministers of education, “Four Ministers were calling the European tune”.

---

31 In reality, some smaller countries such as Denmark were already further on their way towards accomplishing what the Sorbonne Declaration intended.

32 A structure that was introduced into Germany in 1998, parallel to the present structure.
- Political decision-makers were urging the development of a process they had entrusted earlier to those people first responsible for higher education, academics. "As if there was no time left for further university hair-splitting."
- The discussion at the Sorbonne was an extremely rare constellation of users, providers and political leaders. "The declaration was itself part of a learning process aiming at a long-term goal, the European space of higher education – still to be defined."

This positive reception of the Sorbonne Declaration set the stage for a broader initiative. On the invitation of the Italian minister of education, a meeting took place in Bologna, Italy. The debate was based on the Sorbonne Declaration and on a study prepared by the ‘Association of European Universities’ (CRE), and the ‘Confederation of European Union Rectors’ Conferences’ on ‘Trends in European Learning Structures’ (Haug et al., 1999). The study showed the extreme complexity and diversity of curricular and degree structures in European countries. Whereas the Sorbonne Declaration spoke of harmonisation, both the study and the resulting Bologna Declaration avoided this word – owing largely to the potential negative interpretations. Instead, the study speaks of "actions which may foster the desired convergence and transparency in qualification structures in Europe."

What effect will the two declarations have on higher education in Europe? First of all, they reconfirm trends under way in Germany, Austria and Denmark to introduce a bachelor’s and master’s degree structure. Second, they have stimulated similar movements in countries such as the Netherlands, where several universities had already started to develop bachelor’s and master’s degrees and where the minister of education has now paved the way for allowing them to do so. But most of all, a strong incentive has been given to the realisation of an open European higher education environment. The declarations, in themselves an attempt to keep a political grip on developments in the higher education sector, will work as a catalyst for reform of higher education throughout Europe. There is still a long way to go, in particular in countries such as Germany, France and Italy, three out of the four countries that initiated the declaration. The reason is that radical reforms in higher education in these countries traditionally spark massive protests, and even more so when such a reform is perceived as an import from the United States of America, even though the reform can be seen also as an adaptation to the British model of higher education.

The creation of a European space for higher education, the prime objective of the Bologna Declaration, should be completed in 2010. A set of specific objectives has been formulated to make this possible:

- a common framework of understandable and comparable degrees
- undergraduate and postgraduate levels in all countries
- ECTS-compatible credit systems
- a European dimension in quality assurance, and
- the elimination of remaining obstacles to mobility.

The Bologna Declaration not only looks at the internal implications for higher education,

---

33 Andris Barblan, Secretary General of CRE, in a presentation to the XII Santander Group General Assembly, April 17, 1999 on 'The Sorbonne Declaration – follow-up and implications, a personal view'.
but also explicitly refers to the need to increase the international competitiveness of European higher education and to make it more attractive to students from other continents (see also van der Wende, 2000). In that sense, the declaration follows the pattern visible everywhere, with competitiveness becoming a driving rationale for the internationalisation of higher education. The fact that the Bologna Declaration was signed not only by the ministers of education of the member states of the European Union, but also of other European countries, is also a sign that education is at the forefront of Europeanisation beyond the Union.

6. The impact of the programmes on internationalisation of higher education

The European programmes for exchange and co-operation described above have transformed international mobility from a purely one-way flow, involving very small numbers of unrelated movers, to managed flows involving large numbers within directly related multilateral exchanges at all levels of higher education. With the ERASMUS programme, the international dimension, already present in research, also entered education in a systematic way (Laureys, 1992, 109). One could call this development the external democratisation of the international mobility of students, giving students from the lower and middle classes and of middle-level qualifications access to study abroad that had once been restricted to the upper classes and a limited number of highly qualified students.

Gisela Baumgratz-Gangl (1993, 250) stresses the different road internationalisation has taken thanks to the European programmes: “Compared with traditional mobility patterns in Europe and the United States, the programmes have introduced a new pattern: limited periods of study abroad forming part of the study course at undergraduate level; educational co-operation and staff exchange alongside the traditional research co-operation; and highly selective postgraduate programmes for free movers.”

The response of the institutions of higher education to the EC initiatives was positive but at first rather reactive: ‘as long as Brussels is giving us money, why should we oppose the idea’. As Ladislav Cerych (1993) has said, “Community funds are not and never will be a manna available to European higher education to solve its financial problems; they will never cover more than a very small proportion of needs. Misunderstandings and overexpectations in this respect have been and probably remain common among European universities, their staff and their students.”

Soon it became clear that participation in the European programmes did not generate income but demanded active involvement and investment on the part of the institutions and departments. This involvement has created in turn, however, a shift from passive response to active involvement. Institutions of higher education, departments, faculty and students have had to decide what would be the positive effects of participation in ERASMUS and other schemes and what price they were prepared to pay. Such decisions were traditionally made from the point of view of academic and personal experience. Now, under the schemes, instead of being something extra and exceptional, a study abroad experience had to be an integral part of the curriculum. For that reason, exchange of information on the courses being offered and levels of study became crucial, as was the development of mechanisms of recognition of courses taken abroad through systems of credit transfer.
For varying reasons and to differing extents, the sending of students and faculty abroad was generally seen as the most important aspect of the exchange programmes. That this also entailed the reception of foreign students and faculty at first seen by many institutions as more a drawback than an advantage. The reception of foreign students in large numbers confronted institutions of higher education with unforeseen problems, both in the classrooms and in support facilities. Language barriers, different academic backgrounds and academic calendars, housing and insurance, were among the many problems to be solved. The problems with which institutions of higher education are faced differ by country and type of institution. An example are the problems of institutions of higher education in the UK. This country is confronted with a high demand from students wishing to spend their study abroad period in the UK, mainly for language reasons. In a survey, students of the different countries of the European Union, when asked for their first preference for study abroad – with the exception of UK and Irish students (first preference: France) and students from Luxembourg (first preference: Germany) – mentioned the UK as their first choice. At the same time, for financial reasons higher education in the UK is less keen to receive large numbers of non-fee-paying students from the continent and also has problems to stimulate its own students to participate in the exchange programmes with the continent.

Despite these problems, we can say that ERASMUS and the other EC programmes have placed internationalisation high on the priority lists of national, institutional and departmental strategic plans. Several national governments, private funds and regional entities have established funds alongside the European programmes to stimulate international co-operation and exchange. Since the creation of ERASMUS in 1987, one can state that institutions of higher education in Europe have largely learned to cope with its demands and those of the other European programmes. In many institutions of higher education offices of international relations, smaller or larger, have been established at institutional, and frequently also at departmental, level.

The European Commission, despite its crucial and dominant role, is not the only stakeholder influencing the development of internationalisation in Europe. In general, any common view among stakeholders about the ‘what’, the ‘why’ and the ‘how’ of internationalisation is lacking. Within Europe, a great diversity of arguments, social, economic and educational, are deployed to support the internationalisation of education. Some of these arguments have their origin in the needs of society and/or the economy; some in the needs of education itself. Together they constitute a set of overlapping rationales for the process and activities of internationalisation. In turn, they form the basis of the incentives for internationalisation that are perceived by stakeholders; and the justifications that are made internally and externally. And there is potential overlap, but also conflict, between the interests of the different stakeholders: (inter)national governments, the private sector, institutions, departments, faculty and students.

Teichler (1999, 18) identifies four different types of approaches towards internationalisation of higher education in Europe:
- ‘Would-be internationalisation’. This applies to academics and institutions that want to be involved in internationalisation, but face problems in being considered on equal terms. Southern European academics and institutions (in particular in Greece and Portugal) face this,

\[\text{34 For an overview of these arguments see Callan and De Wit (1994).}\]
as do Central and Eastern European institutions now that they are entering the European programmes.

- ‘Life or death-internationalisation’. This applies to countries and their academics and institutions, which view international co-operation as indispensable for their status and role in Europe and beyond. Teichler gives the example of Sweden and Israel. Perhaps better examples are countries such as Finland and Cyprus.

- ‘Two areas’. In these cases academics and institutions have the option of striving for either more national or more international status and orientation. Teichler gives the example of Germany, but one could say that this still applies to all European countries and beyond, and will vary by academic field.

- ‘Internationalisation by import’. This refers to countries and institutions that treat internationalisation only as coming from outside, by hosting foreign students and considering research only if published in English. Teichler gives the example of the United Kingdom.

This typification of national approaches towards internationalisation of higher education is too simple, and mixes rationales, approaches and historical developments into a structure that does not contribute to explaining the diversity in European approaches to internationalisation. But it illustrates clearly its diversity.

With due regard to variation and exceptions, the trend is for institutions to give internationalisation a central place in their mission statements, strategic plans and budgets. From a move imposed by the outside world, internationalisation is becoming an integral part of higher education policy, though still as a separate strategy. Institutions of higher education, faculty and students are increasingly placing international education at the centre of their strategies.

For the beginning of the 1990s, Karl Roeloffs (1994, 31) describes the impact in the following way: “The intra-Community programmes sponsored from Brussels did not, as was feared, exhaust the potential of systems and institutions for international co-operation on the level of individual member states and their higher education system. One can rather say that initiatives and financial support from Brussels have stimulated motivation and have provided experience and infrastructure for increased activities on the national level and outside the scope of the Community programmes.” It is, however, important not to over-state the uniformity of this trend. To quote Peter Scott (1992), international education is “regarded as an optional activity, an add-on at the periphery of higher education and research,” where it should be “at the core of the curriculum.”

At the end of the decade, the situation is seen as slightly more positive. An analysis of European Policy Statements (Barblan et al., 1998, 133; see also Kehm, 2000) concludes that the majority of higher education institutions state clear goals for Europeanisation and for internationalisation, although only few can be identified as consistent and many others as not more than an enumeration of extremely varied activities. The fact, however, that most statements did not distinguish between Europeanisation and internationalisation and referred to linkages beyond Europe is an indication that institutions have moved away from a reactive approach to initiatives from the European Commission, to a more pro-active internationalisation strategy.
Ulrich Teichler (1999, 5) calls internationalisation, together with institutionalisation, as one of the two major changes in higher education in Europe in the last two decades. He identifies (Ibid., 9-10) three quantum leaps in internationalisation of higher education in Europe:

- from a predominantly ‘vertical’ pattern of co-operation and mobility, towards the dominance of international relationships on equal terms,
- from casuistic action towards systematic policies of internationalisation, and
- from a disconnection of specific international activities on the one hand, and (on the other) internationalisation of the core activities, towards an integrated internationalisation of higher education.

Comparing these three leaps with my account above, moving from North-South orientation in individual mobility and emphasis on development co-operation – from the 1960s into the 1980s – to co-operation and mobility on equal terms (individual mobility, EU programmes for R&D and ERASMUS) in the 1980s, coincide with the first leap. The second leap takes place in the 1990s, when institutions of higher education move from a reactive and casuistic approach to internationalisation to a more pro-active, systematic and strategic approach, clearly marked at the EC level by the change from ERASMUS to SOCRATES. At the turn of the century, we are facing a third leap towards connecting the specific international activities with the core functions of higher education, teaching and learning, and research. It is important to repeat that these leaps do not take place equally and at the same time among all countries and institutions of higher education in Europe. Some countries and institutions are still in the first leap, others in the second. There are countries and institutions that have bypassed the first and/or second leap and made a direct leap from a local/national orientation to a more systematic and strategic approach to internationalisation.

The third leap is the most complex and substantial one. Ulrich Teichler might have been too optimistic in his judgement that this third leap is already taking place. The CRE study ‘Implementing European Strategies in Universities: The SOCRATES Experience’ (Barblan and Teichler, 2000) does not show a snowball effect in internationalisation, more a sustainment and, in reaction to globalisation, a shift to commercial recruitment of students. As Machado dos Santos (2000) shows, as a consequence of the need for continuing and lifelong learning and related expansion of education markets, there is also a move to more transnational education – higher education activities in which the learners are located in a host country different from the one where the awarding institution is based – in Europe, in particular in southern European countries such as Greece, Italy and Spain, but certainly not only there. It is more realistic to state that where most European institutions have developed a more targeted approach to internationalisation as a result of SOCRATES (Kehm, 2000), the fast majority of institutions of higher education have not yet moved beyond the second leap.

The third leap implies a move away from internationalisation as a separate strategy towards internationalisation as a natural element of the overall strategy of the institution. The role of national governments – already diminished by deregulation and privatisation of higher education – is becoming more concentrated on removing barriers and obstacles and creating facilities. The same applies to the European Commission. This does not imply that the role of the European Union is completely disappearing. Guy Neave (1997, 113) states: “The loosening of ties

For further analysis of transnational education see Chapter Eight.
between State and university and the paradoxical creation of new bodies to recouple market and higher education should not cause us to lose sight of the fact that there is now a superordinate level of operation which has its own legal, administrative and revenue-raising powers above the Nation-State.” The involvement of the European Union in higher education, via its research and education programmes, and the resulting programme and organisational strategies, have had an impact on and continue to affect higher education institutions in all facets, forging a higher education space in Europe. The Bologna Declaration can be interpreted as part of this changing role of the national governments and the Commission. Although issues such as exchange of students and staff and curriculum development will continue to play an important role in European policies for higher education, the European Commission and national governments will increasingly shift their attention to issues such as harmonisation of structures, accreditation of degree programmes and equivalency of degrees and diplomas, in order to create a European higher education area.

It is still too early to assess the speed and impact of this third leap. Again, there will be regional and institutional differences. It is not difficult to predict that only a small number of institutions will be able to make that third leap in the coming decade and by doing so will not only become a major player in Europe but in the global arena.

In summary, the internationalisation of higher education in Europe in the 1980s can be described as ‘piecemeal and limited’, (Callan, 2000) and ‘on equal terms’ (Teichler, 1999), and in the 1990s as ‘striving for strategy’ (Callan, Ibid.) and ‘systematic’ (Teichler, Ibid.).

7. Concluding remarks

Because of the complexity and diversity of the European situation with regard to higher education, and the systemic changes in progress at all levels, some of whose long-term effects are hard to predict, it is not possible to draw a simple model of uniform progress towards ‘internationalisation’ for Europe in the last two decades of the twentieth century. Some broad trends, however, can be discerned with respect to internationalisation of higher education in Europe in the 1990s.

1. A broad tendency for strategies for internationalisation that used to be tacit, fragmented and ad hoc to become explicit, managed and co-ordinated. This tendency is more marked in ‘Northern’ than in ‘Southern’ Europe. In Central and Eastern Europe, this process manifests itself more in a reform of the old highly centralised and controlled central policies, and their transformation into a more open and autonomous structure.

2. The gradual development of a more interactive model of internationalisation, with policy decisions, support systems and organisational structures located both at central and decentralised levels, and with flexible connections between these levels.

3. A gradual change from a reactive response to EC and national programmes and funds for internationalisation to a more autonomous, pro-active policy of internationalisation, both at the institutional and departmental level.
4. Alongside the above, a gradual diversification of resources for internationalisation, combining EC and national with institutional and private funds.

5. More attention to networking on a multilateral and structural basis, in research, curriculum development and delivery.

6. An increasing professionalisation of those with responsibility for international activities in institutions. This is again more marked in the North than the South of Europe, and may have negative as well as positive results, since there is a danger that international activity may become ‘ghettoised’ rather than integral to the life of the institution.

7. An increasing priority being given by European institutions to strategies for co-operation with the rest of the world: globalisation of international co-operation, in response and in addition to the process of Europeanisation, as stimulated by the European Commission.

8. A growing awareness of the importance of the academic aspects of internationalisation, such as curriculum development, credit transfer and research training.

9. A growing recognition of the value of effective procedures for evaluation, monitoring and quality assurance with respect to international activity.

Set against these trends, certain counter-pressure and tensions should also be noted.

1. The tension between incentives to internationalise and the rationales for cultivating a distinctive institutional and national identity; resistance to what may be called the ‘de-nationalising’ effect of internationalisation.

2. Linked to the above, the emergence within Europe of a new ‘localism’: an assertion of local and regional identities in other spheres as well as education. Cross-border co-operation at institutional level, which is an emerging pattern in some areas, combines elements of ‘internationalism’ and ‘regionalism’. At present it is impossible to predict what accommodations there will be between these new groupings and the centralising forces in Europe, such as the competencies of the EU. 36

3. The cost–benefit balance of international activity, with regard both to the institution and the individual.

4. The proliferation of different types of institutions, the expansion of new sectors and specialisms, and the growth in numbers of private-sector institutions seeking an international presence in Europe. These developments present challenges to the more established institutions, authorities and policy-making structures, whose outcome cannot be clearly foreseen.

36 This relates to inter-regional co-operation, a fast growing trend in higher education in Europe.
5. The emergence of competitiveness as a more decisive factor, both at the institutional and national level and in the policy of the European Commission.

It is important to emphasise that it is extremely difficult to make generalisations in the analysis of internationalisation that are valid for Europe as a whole. General overviews of developments in Europe do not give sufficient credit to the complexity of Europe, in particular its regional and national differences. This analysis itself has a certain Western European, even North-Western European bias, giving insufficient attention to the specific conditions in Southern, Central and Eastern Europe. There is still a long way to go before studies on internationalisation of higher education truly are able to reflect the diversity and cultural pluralism in Europe.

Secondly, any analysis of internationalisation is faced with the lack of a research tradition in this area in Europe, in particular with respect to the institutional aspects and to the effects of internationalisation. Many reports have been published about the programmes for internationalisation in the European Union, but few about the processes of internationalisation as institutional and national strategies.\(^{37}\)

\(^{37}\) Exceptions are Kälvermark and Van der Wende (1997) on national policies, and Barblan et al. (1998) on institutional strategies.
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