Responses to Yang Rui's "China's Strategy for Internationalization of Higher Education: An Overview"

Few decisions of the 20th century have had as profound an impact on the 21st century world as Deng Xiaoping's announcement of the open-door policy in late 1978. Deng was prophetically ambitious: He wanted to bridge minds by sending Chinese students to study overseas and encourage Chinese universities to exchange and cooperate with their counterparts worldwide. Three decades later, China's rise is becoming increasingly clear. The rate of returnees rises every year. Those coming to China to learn have outnumbered Chinese people studying abroad, and this is a historic change. The new administration of Xi Jinping has pledged to rely on the people and bring benefit to the people in achieving the "Chinese Dream" and with this a fresh phase of the internationalization of higher education has begun. The new phase requires a more balanced two-way flow of knowledge and culture between China and the outside world. On preparing for its global roles, internationalization has an even more significant place. Its development in this new era requires a similar mixture of vision and boldness.

It is now high time to reflect on the experience of internationalization in the previous era and look to what the future has in store. Against such a backdrop, *Frontiers of Education in China* presents an overview of China's strategies for the internationalization of higher education by Professor Yang Rui. To enter into further debate on this theme, we have invited four scholars of both Chinese and non-Chinese cultural backgrounds who work in various parts of the world, to offer their comments on Professor Yang's viewpoints. They are Professor Ruth Hayhoe from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto in Canada, Professor Simon Marginson from the Institute of Education, University of London in the United Kingdom, Professor Yuzhuo Cai based at the Higher Education Group of the School of Management at the University of Tampere in Finland and Associate Professor Jiang Kai from the Graduate School of Education at Peking University. We hope our readers will find their discussions helpful in providing rich food for further thoughts on the internationalization of higher education in China.

—From the Editor of *Frontiers of Education in China*

Ruth HAYHOE

Internationalization and Indigenization

Yang Rui has focused his research on issues of internationalization in China's higher education since the time of his doctoral thesis and thus is able to probe this issue at a profound historical and philosophical level. In many ways, China is a dramatic example of how differently internationalization is experienced by countries which adopted Western models of the university in processes of self-strengthening or indeed colonization and had little time or opportunity to incorporate into them elements of their own rich indigenous traditions of higher learning. Ali Mazrui's haunting article on "The African University as a Multinational Corporation" (1975) opened up an early debate around this issue. It is a totally different situation from that experienced by universities in major Western countries whose models held unquestioned global dominance throughout the 19th and 20th centuries.

I would thus agree with Yang Rui that the fundamental issue for Chinese universities in the face of internationalization is how far they have been able to uncover and assert features of their own values and traditions of scholarship such that the modern Chinese university has some degree of authenticity and connection to its indigenous roots. I would be a bit less pessimistic than Yang Rui on the degree to which this has been possible in the later 20th and early 21st centuries. It seems to me that one of the bright lights was the Southwest Associated University in Kunming during the Civil War, an institution that integrated American values and Chinese values from the tradition of the *shuyuan* in remarkable ways to create an atmosphere of scholarship that nurtured two future Nobel Prize winners in physics, that laid the basis for an authentic Chinese anthropology and fostered remarkable literary works, all under conditions of extreme poverty and isolation (Israel, 1998).

The next period of integration between Chinese and Western patterns came with the Soviet-inspired university model of the 1950s. While this was clearly

Ruth HAYHOE (✉)

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Toronto, M5S 1V6, Canada
E-mail: ruth-hayhoe@sympatico.ca

imposed from outside and resulted in significant clashes of value, some aspects of the model developed in the fifties have persisted, such as the creation of major specialized universities in the fields of agriculture and education, two extremely important areas for China's development. In many ways, this model was a combination of Burton Clark's continental model of the university and China's traditional civil service examination system with its clear hierarchy of merit and appointment.

Finally, with the reforms of 1978 under Deng Xiaoping, China's modern universities were exposed to an eclectic range of university models and opportunities for reform in cooperation with various Western countries, that opened up diverse possibilities in an era when university autonomy finally gained legal recognition with the *Higher Education Law* of 1998. One of the phenomena that interested me greatly in this process was the effort made by many universities to write their institutional histories and reflect on where they had come from, in terms of region, subject focus and international connections before 1949. Finally with the decision to massify higher education taken in 1999 and concomitant efforts to create a group of "world class universities" there has been a huge pressure to align the elite institutions with the model of the so-called "global research university" while expanding access from 5% of the age cohort to around 25%. In this phase, the danger has been again that the diversity and rich indigeneity that had been integrated into the Chinese model of the university should be lost, in the rush for standing in various global ranking systems.

However, a recent research project we carried out on China's move to mass higher education revealed an encouraging preservation of diversity which was being consciously fostered by the character of the international partnerships formed by several major universities. Here I will give three examples. Xiamen University in the southern city of Xiamen facing Taiwan had been a private university in its early history, with strong ties to Southeast Asia. After 1949, its geographical location was a disadvantage in terms of government investment but it had the freedom to retain a focus on its historic areas of strength including marine studies and economics. In the move to mass higher education, and world class status, Xiamen chose to strengthen its links with Southeast Asia and to join a consortium of eight universities around the world who share a common geographical location on the ocean and give considerable attention to marine studies. It did not try to follow the model of Peking University, China's

predominant global research university. Thus its internationalization strategy has served to strengthen its indigenous and historic identity (Hayhoe, Zha, & Xie, 2011).

The Northwest Agriculture and Forestry University was formed through a major merger of universities of agriculture and forestry as well as high level research institutes and given significant central government support and investment. While its curricular structure is clearly that of a major multiversity, with comprehensive subject coverage, it has chosen to partner with Wageningen University in Holland and Cornell University in the USA, to strengthen its profile in the areas of agriculture and food science. It has also hosted a series of world level food security conferences on its campus, which happens to be located in China's agricultural heartland, with traditions that go back thousands of years and a well-developed museum of agricultural history (Zha, Hayhoe, & Niu, 2011).

The third case of interest is the East China Normal University in Shanghai. A fully comprehensive university in its curricular offerings, it has nevertheless been historically shaped by the French and Soviet models of the normal university, which gave a high profile to education and the formation of excellent teachers for the nation. In the late 1990s, when it was striving to be accepted within the elite Project 985 for world class universities, there was a strong temptation to remove the term "normal" from its title, given the fact that this identity was widely misunderstood in the dominant Anglo-American world of higher education. However, its leaders in the end accepted a national policy that normal universities retain their identity, and made the strategic decision to partner with the famous *Ecole Normale Supérieure* in Paris, to develop joint graduate programs in the sciences as well as a range of other collaborative projects. It also gave its five colleges of education a high profile by keeping them on its attractive urban campus, along with programs for international students and a major partnership with New York University, while moving other disciplinary areas out to the new campus in a suburban region of Shanghai. This strategic choice of international partner strengthened its profile as a normal university, and enabled it to highlight the field of education, an area of core importance in China's indigenous scholarship (Hayhoe, Zha, & Li, 2011).

These three cases give some insight into how university leaders in China are strengthening indigenous features of their identity through their choice of

international partners. Yang Rui has also noted the huge flow of international students to China in recent years, reversing the trend of several decades, when a much larger number of Chinese students went abroad than those who came to China. This means an increasing number of students from all parts of the world are being exposed to Chinese university environments. More and more of them are also taking degree courses for credit in a wide range of fields, in contrast to the focus on Chinese language and cultural studies in the past. One of the significant innovations of recent years is the provision of graduate programs at the Master's level in English for students from around the world. One of the pioneering cases, that of Northeast Normal University, has been profiled in a recent article in *Frontiers of Education in China* (Zhu & Ma, 2011). This program receives about 30 students from developing countries in Africa, Southeast Asia, and Latin America, offering them full instruction in English, the opportunity to complete a Master's thesis with external examiners to assure quality, and broad exposure to Chinese culture and society. The article gave a most interesting account of how the informal pedagogy and group work fostered with these international students created an international core at the heart of the campus which attracted graduate students from across a range of disciplines to connect with this group of students from many different developing countries. While this program is now in its sixth year, Beijing Normal University has a new MA in Comparative Education for international students in its second year, with students drawn mainly from Western developed countries, and all teaching provided in English, thus also creating a situation of "internationalization at home" for its students.

Finally, the unique role and responsibility given to Chinese universities in China's recently launched program of cultural diplomacy is worth noting. While partners in various countries may be universities, school boards or a range of NGOs, on the Chinese side it is universities that are functioning as the main agents of cultural diplomacy as they help to establish Confucius Institutes, provide teachers and develop curricula. In the beginning, much of the focus has been on language studies alone, but gradually content is diversifying. Recent research on the Canadian response to the Confucius Institute program indicates that Canadian universities see this as an opportunity for a partnership with a Chinese university that has the potential to enrich their own programs and enable them to respond to China-related interests in their local communities (Kwan,

2014). For the Chinese universities responsible for supporting these Confucius Institutes, it is also a challenge to dig more deeply into their own cultural roots, and find ways to communicate core values of Chinese civilization to a wider world.

Thus it seems to me that there is evidence of efforts to reflect and build on indigenous knowledge and experience, including the significant experiments of the twentieth century. There are also unique new opportunities to introduce Chinese culture to the world that may further strengthen indigenous Chinese identity.

References

- Hayhoe, R., Zha, Q., & Li, M. (2011). East China Normal University: Education in the lead. In R. Hayhoe, J. Li, J. Lin & Q. Zha, *Portraits of 21st century Chinese universities: In the move to mass higher education* (pp. 192–220). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer & Hong Kong, China: Comparative Education Research Center, University of Hong Kong.
- Hayhoe, R., Zha, Q., & Xie, Z. X. (2011). Xiamen University: A southeastern outlook. In R. Hayhoe, J. Li, J. Lin & Q. Zha, *Portraits of 21st century Chinese universities: In the move to mass higher education* (pp. 162–189). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer & Hong Kong, China: Comparative Education Research Center, University of Hong Kong.
- Israel, J. (1998). *Lianda: A Chinese university in war and revolution*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kwan, C. (2014). Cultural diplomacy and internationalization of higher education: The experience of three Confucius Institutes in Canada. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 9(1), 110–126
- Mazrui, A. A. (1975). The African university as a multinational corporation. *Harvard Education Review*, 45(2), 191–210.
- Zha, Q., Hayhoe, R., & Niu, H. T. (2011). Northwest Agricultural and Forestry University: An agricultural multiversity? In R. Hayhoe, J. Li, J. Lin & Q. Zha, *Portraits of 21st century Chinese universities: In the move to mass higher education* (pp. 344–371). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer & Hong Kong, China: Comparative Education Research Center, University of Hong Kong.
- Zhu, H., & Ma, Y. P. (2011). New patterns in higher education cross-cultural learning. The case of a postgraduate English instruction program in China. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 6(4), 471–494. doi: 10.1007/s11516-011-0142-2

Simon MARGINSON

A Response from Simon Marginson

Yang Rui notes that, “the most striking feature of China’s strategy for internationalization” is its “vigorous engagement” with the outside world, particularly Western nations and mostly through the medium of acquired English (Yang, 2014). This engagement is especially striking in that it reverses centuries of cultural self-sufficiency and inward perspective and is a sign of China’s larger global influence to come.

We have to go back to the Tang dynasty of the seventh to ninth centuries CE to find a parallel time when China was broadly open to foreign influences while also being exceptionally active across its own borders (Gernet, 1996). Significantly, the Tang dynasty was perhaps the most successful dynasty in China before the present Communist Party dynasty. The Tang, now remembered mostly for the unsurpassed vitality of the ceramics and poetry of the era, reached across Asia simultaneously to East and West. Foreign goods, people and ideas permeated the capital Chang’an (modern Xi’an). While Europe was in disarray after the fall of Rome, Chang’an was the greatest city in the world. In the West the Tang dynasty intervened in the politics of Persia and northern India from its bases in Central Asia. In the East China held North Vietnam and conquered part of Korea. Via Korea, Tang ideas about religion, rulership, personal conduct, city-design and gardens patterned the emerging proto-state in Japan. Japan’s first capitals Nara and Kyoto were planned along the lines of Chang’an (Japan was never again to be so directly open to China but it has been part of the Confucian heritage ever since). The Tang dynasty was the time when Buddhism entered China from outside, and as Professor Yang remarks, permanently changed society and culture. This paralleled the impact of American and European influences today.

Now China is rapidly absorbing North American and Western European (Western) science and technology, language, higher education models, business models and organizational design. At the same time, China is not absorbing

Simon MARGINSON (✉)

Institute of Education, University of London, London, England

E-mail: s.marginson@ioe.ac.uk

Western political culture and systems of government, nor is it adopting Western educational cultures in the home. It remains China. International engagement fosters tensions and ambiguities of identity, though, raising questions yet to be answered.

China's integration with the world is an essential precondition if China is to take a leading role in shaping global society in the longer run. That is the strategic horizon of the party-state in China. It is hard to fault its sense of priority. And after all, why should world leadership be assigned solely to the United States? American hegemony disempowers the rest of the world. Plurality in world affairs is more attractive, not only for China but for all of us. China's upward educational trajectory, its Shanghai PISA scores and its world-class universities, and the extraordinary advance of research science, are signs of a more plural global system to come. The contents of internationalization in education and research are therefore important because today's practices in education are generating trends and path dependencies that will shape Chinese society and world society tomorrow. But *what is the China* that will play such a role in shaping the future, and so what will that future be? Is the emerging China a country that is Western with Chinese characteristics? Is it traditional China with an overlay of Western capitalism and technology? Is it fractured between two heterogeneous identities and doomed to faltering and incoherence? Or is it evolving into something new and potent, a hybrid of East and West, a new kind of civilization? This is the question ultimately raised by Yang Rui's insightful reflections.

Yang Rui identifies the zones where China's global engagement is taking place: outward mobility from China, inward mobility into China, science and technology, English language learning and bilingualism, university design, transnational education. He shows that internationalization is uneven. It is much stronger in the Project 985 universities than in most regional universities; and much stronger in the physical sciences and engineering than the national language-dependent humanities and social sciences. Research publication data also show that China's share of the world's journal papers in the physical sciences and engineering is much greater than its share of journal papers in medicine and the biological sciences (National Science Foundation, 2013). Still, most countries exhibit some disjunction in global engagement, between the disciplines, the balance of China's research output mirrors that of Taiwan and

Korea and is not very different from Singapore. What makes China distinctive and how is its global engagement different from, say, that of the United States or Sweden or Japan or Canada? In reality the specifics of China's internationalization can only be traced with precision through empirical research.

Here there has been more research on scientific production, transnational education, faculty behaviors, the returning diaspora, and student mobility—all areas that tell us how inner China is changing—than research on China's outward influence in the rest of the world. What about China's soft power strategy in the Confucius Institutes and elsewhere? Is it working, and how do we know? In research in higher education studies and comparative education, China's internationalization is still seen in terms of outside influences coming in, rather than inside factors flowing out. We lack analytical-empirical tools for understand what arguably is the most important issue called up by China's rise, i.e., the nature and extent of its worldwide influence.

This points to a larger lacuna in education studies. Yang Rui shows that the stock definition of internationalization, developed particularly by Jane Knight, one that has been exceptionally fecund in two decades of research on international aspects of higher education, is not sufficiently generic to include China's internationalization. The point has great theoretical importance for comparative higher education studies. Yang Rui notes that the standard definition is "internationalization as the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions, or delivery of higher education" (2014). He shows that this does not work when the "higher education" is itself non-indigenous and derived from prior and continuing international engagement, an engagement partly forced on China and other emerging countries while also partly chosen by them, it is very different to the voluntary internationalization of say, a university in Canada or Netherlands. "Modern universities are a foreign transplant to China," points out Yang (2014).

In China, international engagement is being layered onto something already both local and international at the same time, an empirically distinct process. Instead of enriching a pre-given national/local tradition with additional global connections and sensibilities, changing local education but only so far (the benign internationalization imagined by Knight), cross-border engagement in China is always deeply subversive of national/local tradition. Because internationalization is necessary and fraught at the same time the normative

issues are different. Knight's definition cannot generate comparable empirical data in, say, China and the UK. The meanings are too far apart. The Knight framework is brilliant in providing categories for tracking purpose driven activity in English-speaking universities but cannot be used for fully inclusive global research in comparative education. It is culturally bound and insufficiently objective. This weakness in the framework will become more important given the growing weight of higher education in Asia and elsewhere. A new definition is needed, one less normative and so less bound to particular cultures and politics, and more generic in empirical terms, allowing all countries to be studied on a common basis.

These issues can be taken further. Arguably, in mainstream scholarship in the English-speaking countries and Europe, internationalization is largely seen in terms of static models and one-way flows (change agent meets constant agent), rather than in terms of dynamic and relational models (all agents are continually changing and affecting each other). The fetish for static models reflects a complacency of outlook, as if Western education is a given and just needs a bit of tweaking to make it more conscious of, responsible for and respectful to the wider world; more "international and cross-cultural." For all its good intentions this framework reflects a sense of cultural superiority and is vulnerable to capture by neo-imperial projects. As Yang Rui explains, it cannot effectively model the neo-imperial effects of that same Western education in emerging countries, which are flows in the reverse direction, and invoke relations of power that are very different to the mutual respect between nations that Knight and de Witt (1995) rightly want us to achieve. In the internationalization literature there are few studies of this coercive international engagement to match the many studies of internationalization as a benign process of cultural exchange. We have to go to the post-colonial literature for acknowledgement of the problem that Yang Rui identifies. In short, we need truly comprehensive definitions, categories and analytical systems capable of identifying differing relations of power, and spanning real world phenomena identified in both the mainstream and post-colonial discussions. We need to be able to comprehend flows in all directions, and distinguish engagements that have mutual and balanced effects from more one-way systems.

In higher education in China all the elements are in play and the future is uncertain as Yang Rui suggests. It is often remarked inside China that the nation

is both poor and rich, developing and developed, subordinate to the West and an equal player, neo-colonized yet with a powerful sense of its own destiny and identity. All true, but the abiding question is how to put them together. “The central purpose of China’s internationalization of higher education is to combine Chinese and Western elements at all levels” (Yang, 2014). But what will that combination become? And while universities are a product of the strategy of global integration, they are also agents of it, and are themselves capable of affecting the project. China’s universities are potentially key sources of ideas, operating both inside and outside the party-state. What contribution can they make to charting the future and how can their role be optimized?

Yang Rui emphasizes that at this stage China has not reached “an appropriate combination of the ‘international’ and the local” (2014). Despite the remarkable developmental achievements of the last two decades “China is concerned about the potential loss of its educational sovereignty” (Yang, 2014). For example no-one in China knows what to do with transnational education. It is easiest to corral it and treat it as temporary, harder to foster it as a laboratory for cultural hybridization, not just in higher education but in the Chinese economy and society. Yet hybridization is what is needed. That is the way to transcend the binary split between foreign and national. Yang Rui shows that Chinese higher education could fall between the two stools and so remaining binary: “the development of Chinese modern universities is always confronted with the absence of both classical and modern ideas of a university” (2014). On a bad day it will achieve neither. On a good day it will achieve both. It will synthesize.

Hong Kong and Singapore might be instructive of future possibilities. These hybrid enclaves differ from each other, but both have successfully combined Anglo-American elements with Chinese elements. They draw on Anglo-American law and regulation, business systems, higher education and science, and (especially in Hong Kong) have formed an open civil order. They also have Chinese families, post-Confucian education, and forms of government that owe more to China’s tradition of the comprehensive long-term thinking state than to the limited liberal state of the English-speaking world. The Sinic state is obvious in Singapore. Hong Kong’s University Grants Commission has the kind of commitment to effective long term planning now out of favor in the English-speaking world. Is one or another Chinese-Anglo patterning a harbinger of the global society to be? Can a strategy of hybridization lead the way to a

Chinese Model of the University: China's Humboldt or Newman?

It is early days yet. Yang Rui concludes that the combination of Western and Chinese elements is still a long way off. The humanities and social sciences might be especially important, in remaking national identity, and combining science and society. The present partial eclipse of these disciplines is making the job more difficult. If China's universities are to take the place in the world that has been envisioned for them by the party-state, they will need to grow into something new, that the party-state has not envisioned and may not be able to envision by itself. To get there, they may need a capacity to experiment and pluralize. Is that possible? What is needed, in national system design and in the inner life of universities themselves, is a spirit akin to the cultural diversity of the confident high Tang period and the intellectual diversity of the time of Confucius and his successors, notably in the Jixia Academy (Hartnett, 2011). Such inspiration is less likely to emerge in universities run on the basis of New Public Management, which is the form of higher education institution now dominant in China just like everywhere else, one that originates from Anglo-American government and political cultures rather than those of China.

References

- Gernet, J. (1996). *A history of Chinese civilization* (2nd ed.) Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Hartnett, R. A. (2011). *The Jixia Academy and the birth of higher learning in China: A comparison of fourth-century B.C. Chinese education with Ancient Greece*. Lewiston, NY: Edward Mellen Press.
- Knight, J., & de Wit, H. (1995). Strategies for internationalization of higher education: Historical and conceptual perspectives. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Strategies for internationalization: A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States of America* (pp. 5–32). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: The EAIE.
- National Science Foundation. (2013). *Science and engineering indicators 2012*. Retrieved January 5, 2014, from <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/seind12/>
- Yang, R. (2014). China's strategy for internationalization of higher education: An overview. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 9(2), 151–162.

Yuzhuo CAI

Institutionalization of Internationalization of Higher Education in China

In Professor Yang Rui's overview of China's strategy for internationalization of higher education, he has incisively pointed out some ideological and cultural challenges that may obstruct China from gaining the best benefits from its efforts towards opening to the world. As mentioned by Yang Rui, for instance, the dilemma between the concern of losing China's educational sovereignty and the desire to import advanced educational resources from foreign, especially Western countries, has caused a series of policy and administrative problems in the practice of internationalization of higher education. In line with Yang Rui's argument, I also see that one intrinsic problem in China's internationalization of higher education is its inclination to a traditional reform philosophy: *zhong ti xi yong*, meaning to preserve the Chinese essence while adopting Western means (Cai, 2012). As such, the import of new educational concepts and ideas to China is constrained by ideological and cultural considerations (Cai, 2004).

As globalization shapes the world by the logic of capitalism (Held & McGrew, 2000), China faces inevitable dilemmas arising from its embrace of both socialist and capitalist ideologies. Issues concerning ideology and politics also become sensitive in the higher education sector. When China joined the World Trade Organization (WTO), the Minister of Education in that time stated, "we should distinguish the policy boundary for the openness of education and international cooperation after China's entry into the WTO, in case of the socialist education being undermined by the influence of Western culture and values" (Chen, 2005). As it is not easy to unravel Western ideologies from advanced Western education systems and educational ideas, in practice it is hard to find a clear boundary between what elements of Chinese higher education should be preserved and what advanced international experience should be imported. Such ideological concern may affect China's use of internationalization as a means to enhance the competitiveness of its higher education, and eventually hinder China's transition

Yuzhuo CAI (✉)

School of Management, University of Tampere, Tampere, Finland

E-mail: yuzhuo.cai@uta.fi

from “internationalization” to “becoming global.” In this response paper, I will further explore this issue by clarifying where China is in the course of internationalization.

Stages of Internationalization

Knight (2008) defines internationalization as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of higher education at the institutional and national levels” (p. 21). Such an understanding implies that internationalization is not an end but a means to improving the quality of research, teaching as well as other services of higher education. Following this definition, Söderqvist (2007) distinguishes five stages of internationalization of higher education, drawing on key literature in the field. These stages are:

- zero stage: internationalization as marginal activities,
- first stage: student mobility,
- second stage: curriculum and research internationalization,
- third stage: institutionalization of internationalization,
- fourth stage: commercializing the outcomes of internationalization (p. 120).

As described by Yang Rui, the internationalization of higher education in China takes three major forms: studying abroad, integrating an international dimension (with an emphasis on the strategic role of English) in teaching and curriculum, and cooperating with foreign higher education institutions (HEIs) on educational provisions in China. Though it is not detailed by Yang Rui in his paper, another important dimension of internationalization is concerned with research cooperation. For instance, the Chinese government not only encourages Chinese universities and research institutes to develop joint research projects with foreign partners by obtaining support from various sources, but has also been signing an increasing number of bilateral agreements with different countries/regions for establishing frameworks for research cooperation. All these show that China is mainly in the first and second stages of internationalization, where promoting student mobility and the international dimension of teaching and research has been set as an important goal of Chinese higher education reforms.

Yang Rui also observes an emerging strategy that has been oriented to “a much-improved balance between introducing the world into China and bringing

China to the world” (Yang, 2014). In addition to a fast growing number of international students in China and Confucius Institutes abroad, as mentioned by Yang Rui, China has recently engaged in establishing overseas branches. One campus project just started in Laos, and there are plans for building branch campuses in Malaysia and a joint campus with a British university in London (Tang, 2013). The new tendencies show that China has entered the stage of “commercializing the outcomes of internationalization.”

While the stages zero to three are about internationalization, the last stage can be understood as “becoming global.” Quoting the 1999 Monash University’s strategy document, McBurnie (2000) draws the distinction between “internationalization” and “becoming global”: “ ‘Internationalization’ is taken to mean a way of thinking and acting which is not constrained by national boundaries or traditions and which actively seeks inspiration, understanding, and input from outside [the country]. ‘Becoming global’ refers to the process of locating operations, either physically or virtually, around the world” (p. 63). The main forms of “becoming global” are exporting, franchising and joint ventures. While in Western countries “becoming global” is mainly driven by commercial reasons (McBurnie, 2000; Söderqvist, 2007), Yang Rui considers China’s movement in this direction as “an exercise of soft power.”

Institutionalization of Internationalization

China is certainly in the first, second, and fourth stages, though further improvement is still needed. However, the most crucial challenges for China are concerned with the third stage: the institutionalization of international education. Meyer and Rowan (1977) define institutionalization as a process “by which social processes, obligations, or actualities, come to take on a rule-like status in social thought and action” (p. 341). Regarding institutionalization of internationalization at the level of HEIs, Tossavainen (2009) sees it as the establishment of internationality in practice, meaning that “the mode of behavior, supportive structures, roles and responsibilities, and values are defined, described, agreed, and embedded” (p. 528), which leads to more internationalized HEIs. To achieve this end, she proposes an integration of three elements in the process of institutionalization, namely “pedagogy (learning and teaching),” “operative arrangements (practicalities)” and “decision-making and finance (strategy, agreements, finance)” (p. 537). Such conceptualization corroborates the

understanding that internationalization is not a goal in itself but is a means to pursue excellence in all functions of higher education (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011). And it moves further; such understanding must be internalized in academics and administrators' norms and values.

In general, the internationalization in Chinese higher education is a goal in itself, in spite of a clear policy intention to increase the international competitiveness of Chinese higher education through cooperation with foreign HEIs. Both the Chinese government and HEIs are heavily committed to achieving those objectives, which can be measured by quantitative figures, such as the numbers of mobile students and scholars, international partner HEIs, transnational programmes, English or bilingual courses, and international publications etc. Certainly, increasing internationalization activities help Chinese higher education institutions to understand the outside world and provide benchmarks for comparison and self-reflection. However, some things are still lacking: 1) deep integration of international activities into the core functions of higher education, such as teaching, learning, and research, 2) effective operational mechanisms facilitating international activities, and 3) corresponding supportive legal frameworks.

Next, I will further illustrate my argument with reported evidence as well as discussions from my perspective as both a researcher on the internationalization of higher education and a practitioner involved in international cooperation between Chinese and European higher education.

Examples of Challenges and Problems

One example of China's internationalization of higher education as a goal (often measured quantitatively) rather than a means to improve the functions of higher education can be seen in the implementation of the Thousand Talents Scheme, which was launched in 2008 with an aim to tempt 2,000 academics and industrial leaders back to China in the next five to 10 years for boosting the country's innovation capacity and international competitiveness. Within less than five years, some 3,000 returnees have already been recruited, but now the government has to carefully evaluate the outcomes as it has been realized that not all returnees are among the very best and many do not work in China on a permanent basis as expected (Sharma, 2013, May 25).

A recent case analysis of the Master's programme in Research and Innovation

in Higher Education (MARIHE), as the first Erasmus Mundus Master's Course with a Chinese university as a full partner that is responsible for hosting an entire semester of teaching for the students in China and is authorized by the European Commission to offer a joint or dual degree, reveals a number of barriers for substantial academic cooperation between the Chinese and European sides (Cai, 2013). For instance, China's recent reform strategies, specifically the *National Plan for Medium and Long-Term Education Reform and Development (2010–2020)* explicitly promotes mutual recognition of academic credits and joint degrees between Chinese and foreign universities, but the current legislation so far does not allow Chinese universities to offer joint degrees and nowadays the credit transfer among Chinese universities is still problematic not to mention the practices with foreign HEIs.

The final example is based on my practical work experience. As the Research Coordinator of the Chinese Education Research and Exchange Center (CEREC), University of Tampere in Finland, I have been involved in organizing Chinese higher education delegations to visit Europe and have also directly engaged in research cooperation between Chinese and European HEIs and individual scholars. In our center's academic cooperation with Chinese universities, we found that the cooperation is not simply between academics. Rather, some administrative staff may have an influence there, something which is seen as totally unnecessary from a European perspective. Certainly, European academics know that there are differences in administration traditions between Chinese and European HEIs and Chinese academics are not as independent in international cooperation activities as their counterparts in Europe. However, the real problem is that many Chinese administrators are too system-oriented in their belief systems. They feel that they have more power than academics, and therefore they are eager to lead the academic activities. Conversely, university administrators in Europe basically serve academics and their activities. The recent Chinese higher education reform emphasizes de-administration, but such reform is by no means easy. As the orientation towards the system has become deeply ingrained in the administrators' value systems, it may safeguard their authority and in turn inhibit the implementation of the reform (Hölttä & Cai, 2012).

Conclusions

The aforementioned problems partially show that pedagogy, operative

arrangements and national policies with respect to internationalization have not been integrated closely into one system. In other words, China has not yet reached the stage of institutionalization of internationalization. Rather, its internationalization tends to be “loosely coupled” (Weick, 1976) between rhetoric strategies and practical operations. As introduced in the outset of the paper, the causes of such situation are attributed to China’s traditional reform philosophy, which tries to borrow from the West what is useful without losing the essence of Chinese values.

The fact that the stage of institutionalization is missing is a significant flaw in China’s efforts at opening to the world and it will especially challenge China in its new strategy of “bringing China to the world.” Before “becoming global” one’s internationalization practices and values must be institutionalized at home.

Regardless of my critical voice throughout the paper, I agree with Yang Rui that deeper engagement in internationalization can be seen in some national flagship universities. Currently, the internationalization in these universities may well be more institutionalized than in the vast majority of other Chinese HEIs. I hope that the remaining universities will follow successful examples over time. In so doing, they also need to consider their own organizational characteristics and local environments.

References

- Brandenburg, U., & de Wit, H. (2011). The end of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 4(1), 15–17.
- Cai, Y. Z. (2004). Confronting the global and the local: A case study of Chinese higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10(2), 157–169. doi: 10.1023/B:TEAM.0000023840.93857.70
- Cai, Y. Z. (2012). Traditional reform philosophy and challenges of higher education reforms in China. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(6), 60–69.
- Cai, Y. Z. (2013). Erasmus Mundus joint programme and EU’s strategy on higher education cooperation with China: Lessons from the MARIHE Programme. *Journal of European Higher Education Area*, (2), 95–112.
- Chen, Z. L. (2005). 2001 年年度教育工作会议上的讲话 [Address at the 2001 annual education work meeting]. Retrieved December 31, 2013, from http://www.edu.cn/list2_622/20060323/t20060323_156772.shtml
- Held, D., & McGrew, A. (2000). The great globalization debate: An introduction. In D. Held & A. McGrew (Eds.), *The global transformations reader: An introduction to the globalization*

- debate* (pp. 1–45). Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Hölttä, S., & Cai, Y. Z. (2012). 芬兰人眼中的高等教育体制改革 [Governance reforms in Chinese higher education: A Finnish perspective]. In G. R. Yuan & X. Q. Zhang (Eds.), 外国人看中国教育 [Chinese education in the eyes of foreigners] (pp. 248–258). 北京, 中国: 高等教育出版社 [Beijing, China: Higher Education Press].
- Knight, J. (2008). *Higher education in turmoil. The changing world of internationalization*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- McBurnie, G. (2000). Pursuing internationalization as a means to advance the academic mission of the university: An Australian case study. *Higher Education in Europe*, 25(1), 63–73. doi: 10.1080/03797720050002215
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myths and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–363.
- Sharma, Y. (2013). “Thousand Talents” academic return scheme under review. *University World News*, 273. Retrieved January 5, 2014, from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20130524153852829>
- Söderqvist, M. (2007). *The internationalization and strategic planning of higher education institutions: An analysis of Finnish ESP strategies*. Helsinki, Finland: Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration.
- Tang, D. D. (2013). China setting up first university campuses abroad. *IRRAWADDY*. Retrieved January 5, 2014, from <http://www.irrawaddy.org/archives/37814#.UcOlhJwyiac>
- Tossavainen, P. J. (2009). Institutionalising internationalization strategies in engineering education. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 34(6), 527–543. doi: 10.1080/03043790903154457
- Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(1), 1–19.
- Yang, R. (2014). China’s strategy for internationalization of higher education: An overview. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 9(2), 151–162.

JIANG Kai

Inequality in Internationalization of Higher Education

Yang Rui has been a productive and distinguished scholar in the field of internationalization of higher education during the past decade (Yang, 2002, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c). Based on solid philosophical reflection, Yang Rui's recent article outlines the historical and current landscape of internationalization in higher education in China. Besides China's great achievements in internationalization of higher education, I fully agree with him that China has a considerable distance to go before its aspirations to create truly world-class universities are fulfilled, that there is huge gap between the internationalization of China's top national universities and that of local universities, and that it is highly necessary for Chinese higher education to strengthen its cultural and institutional establishments.

As Yang Rui indicated, China's internationalization of higher education has gained fruitful achievements. By dispatching students and scholars to industrialized countries, China has accumulated talent and acquired a strong academic diaspora. With the accumulation of returned scholars, China's universities have reduced disparities with their counterparts in the industrialized world, and are far ahead of their counterparts in the developing world. Yang Rui cites China's universities' academic performance in the latest Academic Ranking of World Universities released by the Graduate School of Education, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, which shows Chinese universities' great advantages over those of India. Actually, China's universities exceed India's in almost every international ranking. While becoming the world's largest sending country of international students, China has also become a major host country for international students. Moreover, the Confucius Institute program has the potential of exporting Chinese language and culture, and advancing institutional cooperation with foreign universities. Unlike most analysts, Yang Rui highlights the significance of the high priority given to English on the national agenda of educational development. The significant benefits of the priority given to this lingua franca include international communication, foreign trade, and economic growth.

I would like to discuss the issue of inequality in the internationalization of higher education between China and the major industrialized countries. In other words, there are still evident disparities in internationalization between China and its Western counterparts.

Altbach (1981, 1998) uses a center-periphery framework to analyze the relationship between universities in industrialized countries and those in the developing world. He focuses on ways in which universities in countries at different levels of economic and technological development relate to one another in the international knowledge system. According to him, the international higher education equation is divided into centers and peripheries. While centers give directions, provide models, produce research, and in general function as pinnacles of the academic system, peripheries emulate developments from the centers, produce little that is original, and are generally at a remove from the frontiers to knowledge. Altbach notes that higher education systems in the developing world are stratified and differentiated. For example, China and India are both “gigantic peripheries” in the world knowledge system. Using push and pull theory, Altbach analyzes the issue of brain drain in the developing countries in his other writings. We can say that push and pull theory is derived from his center-periphery framework. This model also has some explanatory power in the internationalization of higher education between industrialized countries and the developing world.

Although China has achieved considerable success in the internationalization of higher education, it has remained peripheral in the internationalization process in comparison to major industrialized countries. The peripheral status is especially embodied in the direction of international student mobility.

China is more a sending country than a receiving country in international student mobility. Yang Rui cited Su’s essay to show that in 2008, tertiary students coming to China to study (223,499) historically outnumbered those leaving China to study abroad (179,800), a historic shift. However, the numbers cover up the real gap in the movement of international students between China and abroad. While only a small number of students coming to China enroll in degree programs, the majority of students from China study abroad in degree programs. In 2008, the 80,005 degree students amounted to 35.8% of the total tertiary students coming to China, and the 143,494 non-degree students amounted to 64.2%. The academic level of overseas education in China is relatively low. Among the 80,005 international students in degree programs at China’s academic

institutions, undergraduate students accounted for 81.1%. Graduate students made up a comparatively low proportion, only 6.4% of the total international student body. The international degree students in China mainly come from Korea, India, Vietnam, Pakistan, Japan and other neighboring Asian countries. Of all the 80,005 degree students in 2008, there were only 1,191 from the United States, 736 from Canada, 667 from France, 388 from Germany, and 219 from the United Kingdom. Most non-degree students studied Chinese language in short-term programs (Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, 2009).

The United States is the biggest destination country for international students in the world. The structure of the international student group in the United States is completely different from that of China. Most international students coming to the United States enroll in degree programs, and half of them are graduate students. Furthermore, the biggest group of international students at American universities comes from China. According to the 2006 statistical data of the National Science Foundation, Tsinghua University (571 students), Peking University (507 students), and University of California, Berkeley (427 students) were the top three universities that supplied the 45,596 new Ph.D holders conferred by American academic institutions (Xinghua Net, 2008). Following Tsinghua and Peking, the University of Science and Technology of China, Fudan University, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Nankai University, Wuhan University and China's other top universities supplied hundreds of graduate students to American academic institutions. The US-based international journal *Science* named China the most fertile cultivation base at the undergraduate level for American Ph.D holders (Xinghua Net, 2008).

China has had to face severe challenge of brain drain since the mass dispatch of overseas students following the reform and opening policies. In order to make use of its overseas human resources, China has implemented many talent schemes to attract its sent students and scholars back to China. A series of national, departmental, provincial, and institutional programs has been initiated. The Program of Global Experts (Thousands of Talents Program) of the Organization Department of the Central Committee of the CPC, the Changjiang Scholars Program and the Chunhui Program of the Ministry of Education, a Project supported by the National Science Foundation for Distinguished Young Scholars of China, and the Hundred Talents Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences are regarded as the most important projects to recruit global experts

with an emphasis on overseas Chinese talents.

Certainly, China has benefited a lot from its brain gain. Both the rapid increase of SCI, EI, and SSCI articles and the fast enhancement of universities' international rankings prove China's talent gain through the internationalization of higher education. But, brain drain is much more striking than brain gain for China. China has the biggest brain drain in the world. The rate of overseas Chinese scientists and engineers who remain abroad is up to 87%. Accordingly, the United States is the biggest country that recruits overseas Chinese talent. The rate of Ph.D. degree holders from China who remain at United States academic institutions has exceeded 90% since 2000. The sharp contrast has totally different effect in China and the United States. According to the Essential Science Indicators database, while there were three highly cited researchers (mainly in sciences and engineering) in Chinese mainland in 2005, there were 3,410 highly cited researchers in the United States. Four years later, while Chinese mainland's highly cited researchers reached four, the United States' highly cited researchers rose to 4,214 (ISI Highly Cited, 2006, 2010). The US-Sino ratio of highly cited researchers was generally stable. As the number of Chinese mainland's highly cited researchers increased from three to four, the number of the US highly cited researchers increased much more. The most important reason is that while China remains the biggest country in terms of brain drain, the United States is still the biggest country in terms of brain gain. The latter recruits large numbers of doctoral and master degree holders originally from China, India, and many other countries every year (Altbach, 2007).

China attaches high importance to achievements in the internationalization of higher education. The achievements stretch far beyond higher education itself. As Yang Rui has pointed out, the internationalization of higher education in China has contributed to the current transformation of the Chinese system into one of the largest and arguably most promising ones in the world. In 2010, the Chinese central government for the first time stated that the level of the internationalization of education should be enhanced in the *National Medium- and Long-Term Educational Reform and Development Guideline (2010–2020)*. During the past three decades, the internationalization of education has been carried forward in the name of educational exchange and cooperation because internationalization was a relatively sensitive word in China. The word “internationalization” was often misunderstood as “being brought in line with an international (Western) trajectory” or even “Westernization.”

Now that China is embracing the internationalization of higher education with a more open mind, it must pay more attention to inequality in internationalization than ever before. Brain drain is of course a pivotal question of inequality that China has to face at present and in the foreseeable future. If inequality in general and brain drain specifically are neglected, the knowledge gap compared with the developed countries might appear to be reduced but in reality may be broadened. The leap of highly cited researchers located in the United States from 3,410 to 4,214 in four years displays the still existing advantage of non-peripheral countries in the internationalization of higher education (ISI Highly Cited, 2006, 2010). Without effective measures for improvement, peripheral countries might achieve a lot through internationalization, but countries in the center will achieve more.

References

- Altbach, P. G. (1981). The university as center and periphery. *Teachers College Record*, 82(4), 601–622.
- Altbach, P. G. (1998). *Comparative higher education: Knowledge, the university and development*. Hong Kong, China: Comparative Education Research Center, University of Hong Kong.
- Altbach, P. G. (2007). *Tradition and transition: The international imperative in higher education*. Chestnut Hill, MA: Sense Publishers.
- ISI Highly Cited. (2006). *Essential Science Indicators*. Retrieved January 31, 2010, from www.highlycited.com.
- ISI Highly Cited. (2010). *Essential Science Indicators*. Retrieved January 31, 2010, from www.highlycited.com.
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2009). 来华留学生简明统计 2008 [*Annual brief statistics of international students in China 2008*]. 北京, 中国: 高等教育出版社 [Beijing, China: Higher Education Press].
- Xinghua Net. (2008). 清华北大成美国博士预备学校 [*Both Tsinghua and Peking University become preparatory schools of American Ph.D holders*]. Retrieved February 9, 2014, from http://news.xinhuanet.com/politics/2008-09/09/content_9867265.htm
- Yang, R. (2002). *Third delight: Internationalization of higher education in China*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Yang, R. (2012a). Internationalization, regionalization and soft power: China's relations with ASEAN member countries in higher education. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 7(4), 486–507. doi: 10.3868/s110-001-012-0025-3
- Yang, R. (2012b). Scholarly publishing, knowledge mobility and internationalization of Chinese universities. In T. Fenwick & L. Farrell (Eds.), *Knowledge mobilization and educational research: Politics, languages and responsibilities* (pp. 185–167). New York,

NY: Routledge.

Yang, R. (2012c). Soft power and higher education: An examination of China's Confucius Institutes. In E. Hartmann (Ed.), *The internationalization of higher education: Towards a new research agenda in critical higher education studies* (pp. 65–76). New York, NY: Routledge.