
At the Crossroads of Culture and Nation: International Education and Training in English

Susan Bridges & Brendan Bartlett

*School of Cognition, Language and Special Education
Centre for Applied Language, Literacy and Communication Studies
Griffith University*

Decreasing federal funding of the Higher Education sector has forced Australian universities to seek and secure critical funding elsewhere. Many have turned to international markets, hoping the fees paid by overseas students will help to match the funding shortfall. Yet, discursive shifts in the definition of internationalisation in Federal and institutional policy documents signal different messages about what the experience of internationalisation is to be in our universities. Current wording includes intercultural understanding and democracy as core elements. Is this happening, and what is the nation selling under the umbrella of internationalisation?

Internationalisation of Australian higher education as a broadly-spread phenomenon is relatively recent. Its current iteration has its origin in the Colombo Plan in 1950 and has evolved in a relatively ad hoc way (Trevaskes, Eisenchlas, & Liddicoat, 2003; Welch & Denman, 1997). Whereas the authors see the Colombo Plan as very much an "aid-out" program, the current notion of internationalisation is an "aid-in" phenomenon. In this review of internationalisation we argue that definitions of the term "internationalisation" and its historical development in Australia highlight disparities between what is publicly promoted or "sold" and its enactment in Australian higher education.

Defining internationalism

The breeding-house for our claim for disparity is in a literature uncertain of how to define the concept of internationalisation. Typically, Welch and Denman's (1997) attempt to establish a consensual view of internationalisation of higher education in the existing literature to 1997 was unsuccessful. Six years later, Trevaskes, Eisenchlas and Liddicoat (2003) fared no better. The latter group wrote that internationalisation was still a "slippery concept" (p. 1). In 2005, we remain in much the same position.

So, in the absence of consensus, where are the threads of understanding? An early and frequently cited definition of internationalisation came from the work of Knight and de Wit as they (Knight, 1994; Knight & de Wit, 1995) thought and wrote separately and collaboratively about the concept:

Internationalisation is a process of integrating an international, intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institution... distinct commitment, attitudes, global awareness, an orientation and dimension which transcends the entire institution and shapes its ethos (Knight & de Wit, 1995, p. 15).

We consider that this extended definition from Knight and de Wit's work promised far-reaching effects if internationalisation as higher education institutions embraced it were to be accommodated in the ideal. First, internationalisation was given agency as a process to be executed pragmatically by leaders and practitioners in the three domains of teaching, research and community service. Second, it was to underpin the mission of the institution. Third, it established place for an intercultural dimension to the university's teaching, research and service. Later critics (Trevaskes et al., 2003) recognised this promise as the significance of the definition, but were disappointed that it lacked guidance for institutions thinking to enact it.

More recently, Knight (2004) sought a refined, current and all-encompassing definition of internationalisation. She argued that an updated definition was needed in the contemporary context of higher education worldwide, which she saw as in an era of transformation (p. 2). This transformation is depicted as part of an evolutionary process with internationalisation as an "actor and reactor in the new realities facing education" (p. 28). In this context of changing methods of delivery and market demands, she also warned of new "players" in the market. These are commercial providers who focus on training rather than research or service – the two other domains in the "trinity" of higher education (p. 7). In seeking clarity in defining the phenomenon in its totality, she noted the problem of suiting multiple local, national and cross-border contexts and agendas. Knight's new work gave us the following definition:

Internationalization at the national/sector/institutional level is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education (p. 11).

The "process" view of the phenomenon, which is the thrust of the first of the definitions we have presented, is repeated here. Knight's use of the construct is about "integrating", an attempt to connote depth, breadth and sustainability. Adding the "global" dimension aimed to encapsulate the scope of the phenomenon. The terms, "purpose", "functions" and "delivery" sought to identify the overall roles and objectives, the core undertakings, and the modes of courses, respectively. We feel that Knight's definition provides important clarity that thoughtful institutions might use profitably when making sense of both the aid-in and aid-out elements of internationalisation, and in building policy and practice in infusing broad and fast-changing constituent elements of the internationalisation phenomenon into the service, research and teaching features of their work.

Knight (2004) has investigated internationalisation in terms of "actual policies, programs, and strategies that are used at the national/sector/ and institutional/provider levels" (p. 13). Rationales identified as driving the internationalisation imperative were of particular interest in this research. These were classified as a) existing and b) emerging rationales. The former encompassed both national and institutional levels and included "socio-cultural, political, economic and academic" rationales (p. 23). She separated the

latter into national and institutional levels. Emerging national rationales included "human resource development; strategic alliances; commercial trade and socio-cultural development" (p. 23). Emerging institutional rationales included "international branding and profile; income generation; student and staff development; strategic alliances; and knowledge production" (p. 23). In discussing international education and training in Australia, it is important to unpack how these emerging national and institutional rationales are enacted in the Australian context. We have done this through a brief analysis of selected national initiatives and policies along with an analysis of a sample institutional response.

To help in exploring these documents, it is useful to place Australia within a global framework. The International Association of Universities (IAU) surveyed institutional members from 66 countries on "the practices and priorities of internationalization at their institutions" (Knight, 2003). In her report entitled *Internationalization of Higher Education Practices and Priorities: 2003 LAU Survey Report* Knight identified 10 key issues for internationalisation of higher education:

1. Mobility of students and teachers is considered to be the most important reason for making internationalization a priority and is identified as the fastest growing aspect of internationalization.
2. Brain drain and the loss of cultural identity are seen as the greatest risks of internationalization.
3. Student, staff and teacher development; academic standards and quality assurance; and international research collaboration are ranked as the three most important benefits of internationalization.
4. Lack of financial support at the institutional level is identified as the most important obstacle for internationalization.
5. Distance education and the use of ICTs are noted as key areas for new developments.
6. Faculty are seen to be the drivers for internationalization, more active than administrators and students.
7. While two-thirds of the institutions appear to have an internationalization policy/strategy in place, only about half of these institutions have budgets and a monitoring framework to support the implementation.
8. Rationales based on academic considerations for internationalization ranked higher than rationales based on political or economic considerations.
9. Intra-regional cooperation is the first geographic priority for Africa, Asia and Europe. Overall, Europe is the most favoured region for collaboration.
10. Issues requiring attention include development cooperation, quality assurance/ accreditation, funding, and research cooperation (p. 3).

Point 8 is of particular interest to the argument we put in this paper. This self-reporting of the superiority of academic considerations over political or economic ones runs counter to discursive trends in the Asia-Pacific region as exemplified by the 2004

UNESCO/OECD Forum. This forum identified internationalisation in the Asia-Pacific as focussing strongly on trade capacity building, quality assurance and accreditation. In this regard, Larsen, Morris and Martin's (2001) research had indicated that internationalisation was estimated in 2001 as a \$35 billion business internationally with anticipated significant growth. In the light of global educational marketing, the self-reporting by institutions in the 2003 IAU survey becomes problematic.

The 2003 IAU survey results indicated that "a large majority (73%) of respondents believe that internationalization is 'very much' a priority at their institution" - a finding which was consistent across all regions" (Knight, 2003, p. 8). The 'top ten reasons for internationalisation' at the institutional level placed income generation as the lowest rationale. Academic and social justifications were at the top. The list of 10 was:

1. Mobility and Exchanges for Students and Teachers
2. Teaching and Research Collaboration
3. Academic Standards and Quality
4. Research Projects
5. Co-operation and Development Assistance
6. Curriculum Development
7. International and Intercultural Understanding
8. Promotion and Profile of Institution
9. Diversify Source of Faculty and Students
10. Regional Issues and Integration
11. International Student Recruitment
12. Diversify Income Generation (p. 8).

In the Australian context, the self-report reflected above paints a picture of internationalisation as a more social and cultural construct. Yet as will be seen in the following section, current institutional and national policies and initiatives reflect a stronger economic drive to internationalise. While Knight (2004) acknowledged different rationales and agendas at national and institutional levels, ways in which Australia is representing itself under the banner of internationalisation may offer some insight about the authenticity of our "reasons for internationalisation". We now turn to examine national imperatives more closely in the light of Knight's recent work. Additionally, a local institutional sample of the phenomenon is discussed.

Internationalism in Australia

Recent Australian national policies reflect movement towards realising Knight's (2004) definition of internationalisation. Federal policy-makers have described internationalisation in terms of "people-to-people links" by establishing international communities through student and staff mobility; "aid" to contribute to governance and capacity building in developing countries; and "education as an export earner" with international education situated as Australia's third largest export industry by 2002

(Downer, 2003). At university level, mission statements such as The Griffith Project (Griffith University, 2002) suggest a powerful influence of the definition on policy. This paper included internationalisation as one of five key commitments for the University "for the enrichment of Queensland, Australia and the international community" (p. 4). The adoption of internationalisation is depicted here with wide implications for universities as social institutions. Before examining this more closely in similar policy documents, let us first establish Australian national trends in internationalisation.

National directions

The presence of international students in Australia "began modestly, largely based on its significance in fostering regional goodwill and supporting Australia's developmental aid policy, largely within the Asia-Pacific region" (Welch & Denman, 1997, p. 20). Its most obvious beginning was in 1950 with the Colombo Plan that sponsored overseas students into Australian universities and moved to the current trend for private, full-fee paying students in the early 1980s (IDP Education Australia, 2003). According to Welch and Denman, by the 1980s and early 1990s there were three changes of particular significance. These were:

1. A redefinition of Australia's role with its subsequent increased integration into the Asia-Pacific;
2. The need to supplement incomes following federal budgetary constraints; and
3. A large surge in the growth of consumer demand for international study (p. 20).

These changes of gradual deregulation of the higher education industry and new global forces in economic markets have become imperatives driving Australian higher education institutions to internationalise (Knight & de Wit, 1995; Leask, 1999). Universities actively sought income additional to that which traditionally had come from government. Sensitivity to globalisation in economic markets reoriented universities to the economic potential of its "knowledge" product in markets searching for education and training (Tinkler, Lepani, & Mitchell, 1996). Combined, the two imperatives have resulted in Australian higher education institutions actively recruiting overseas students (Knight, 1994; Knight & de Wit, 1995; Trevaskes et al., 2003; Welch & Denman, 1997). In order to deliver appropriate and attractive packages of knowledge, the institutions have tailor-made programs reflecting what they have come to know of the international market (Griffith University, 2002).

Two main responses to internationalisation in Australian institutions were identified (Welch & Denman, 1997). The first was a reluctance to change much of what had been traditional operation. Thus, curriculum, pedagogy and the selection, placement and professional development of staff were largely untouched as institutions raked through what they might offer. This response was more typical of the "older institutions" that "see themselves as academic standard bearers" and were "less affected by market swings" and were "more reluctant to change curriculum, staffing and training" (Welch & Denman, 1997, p. 22). The second response was from younger, more innovative institutions in need of attracting enrolments and alternative funding. These "newer, more enrolment-driven institutions were more responsive in determining their academic

standards and curriculum" (p. 22). Both "younger" and "older" academic institutions now seem to have decided on the latter pathway (Trevaskes et al., 2003).

Welch and Denman (1997) had foreseen such developments, considering them as a commodification of post-secondary education and predicted an increase in competition for overseas student enrolments. The prediction has been realised, "influenced by the fact that their financial security is increasingly influenced by tuition fees, institutional efforts to promote specialised educational packages and entice incoming students have become expensive, and at times risky ventures" (p. 21). Liddicoat (2003) described three main activities in internationalisation in Australian higher education:

1. internationalising the student body by recruiting students from overseas;
2. internationalising the curriculum; and
3. internationalising students' educational experiences through overseas exchanges (p. 14).

Liddicoat's (2003) three activities reflect on the teaching and service functions of universities. He has not listed applications in research and his conceptualisation is closely aligned with rationales reported in the 2003 IAU survey (Knight, 2003).

The "shift of policy focus from 'educational aid' that occurred post-World War II to 'educational trade' that happened in the 1970s and 1980s, relates to a current push for 'internationalisation' beginning in the early 1990s" (Trevaskes et al., 2003, p. 1). This trend has seen aggressive marketing and recruitment and a corresponding focus on regulation and quality control (IDP Education Australia, 2003). Towards the end of the 20th century all institutions seemed to have moved towards the profit-driven response to internationalisation:

all institutions have changed in response to increased competition between institutions, a recognition of the benefits of internationalisation and a reactive decrease in financial support from central government (Welch & Denman, 1997, p. 22).

"Educational trade" remains a strong focus in the execution of internationalisation initiatives, current debate and policy development. The recent UNESCO-OECD Australia Forum on trade in education services, held in October 2004 in Sydney, was the final forum in a series of three on the topic of educational trade. Issues for the Asia-Pacific region such as "trade capacity building" and "quality assurance and accreditation" were key themes (Department of Science Education and Training (DEST), 2005, p. 1). Of discursive interest was a shift to referring to the phenomenon as 'cross-border provision' or 'cross-border higher education' rather than as 'internationalisation', though some speakers retained it. A key issue arising was quality assurance in the Asia-Pacific region (p. 6). Student representatives from the National Liaison Committee (NLC) for International Students identified challenges in terms of 'risks associated with non-education sector institution partnerships, the increasing need for universities to diversify their funding sources and the implications of this for the quality of education and support for students that need to adapt to different learning cultures' (p. 3). Australian government legislation exists in the form of the Education Services for Overseas Students' Act (ESOS Act) (Attorney-General's Department, 2000) which set out requirements with which CRICOS-registered providers must comply. Quality assurance

is a key component of these. However, the 2004 UNESCO-OECD Australia Forum maintained the issue of quality assurance as a continuing area of concern.

Within the sphere of immigration regulation of international student enrolments, Australian laws for foreign students are considered highly liberal (Shinn, 1996). Administrative deregulation from the Department of Immigration, Local Government & Ethnic Affairs (DILEGA) to individual universities facilitated speedy enrolment at the local level. It included processes for accepting and evaluating applications, including aspects such as financial viability and medical fitness, in addition to checking on academic credentials (Industry Commission, 1991; Shinn, 1996). The devolution of such powers to university level increased the effectiveness of contracting both for a university and for its international recruits.

The Australian focus on educational trade centres on Singapore, Malaysia, Hong Kong, Indonesia and Thailand. More than 60% of recruitments are from the Asia-Pacific region (Back & Davis, 1995, p. 127). In 1993, The University Mobility of the Asia Pacific (UMAP) was established as a voluntary association of regional representatives of the higher education (university) sector. UMAP "aims to achieve enhanced intercultural understanding through increased mobility of university staff and students"(University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific (UMAP), 2004). The Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) "established APEC Study Centres, partnerships in post-secondary institutions to foster international cooperation and educational exchange for the mutual benefit of the region" (Welch & Denman, 1997, p. 16). Also, UNESCO has encouraged educational collaboration in the region through initiatives such as the Asia Pacific Programme of Educational Innovation for Development (APEID) (UNESCO Asia-Pacific Regional Bureau for Education, 2001). We consider that these initiatives reflect the social and cultural aspects of definitions of internationalisation. However, the market paradigm remains.

Market analysis is central to national delivery and competition in international trade. This is applicable to the social reality that is internationalisation. The market approach is evidenced by such reports as *Australia's Competitors in International Education: July 2005 Update* (Australia Education International (AEI), 2005). This 'provides a brief overview of the current market situation focussing on Australia's key competitor countries and smaller emerging ones' (p. 1) and updates earlier analyses in July 2004 and April 2003. It identified "Australia's major competitors are from English language countries including United States of America, United Kingdom, Canada and New Zealand, driven in part by concerns about recent declines in growth." While presenting the dominant market-oriented discourse of international education as a means to "maintain export earnings" (p. 4), it also warned that a downturn in internationalisation could result in "a potential loss of research capacity" (p. 4). While of discursive interest in exploring definitions of internationalisation, the main focus for these countries remained, however, on the dollar value of the international student market as "they recognise the increased benefits of international education on the productivity and growth of their economy" (p. 4). The AEI report concludes that:

Since 2003/04, there appears to have been a decline in demand for international education affecting the major Anglophone countries, particularly in the undergraduate sector. The

reasons behind the decline are unclear and are likely to vary from country to country but probably include:

- increased global security concerns inhibiting travel by students and providers;
- increased competition, particularly from new players such as Singapore and China; and
- more places becoming available as investment in domestic infrastructure in source countries grows.

It is also unclear whether the decline is temporary or is indicative of a longer term trend. From the above analysis, it is apparent that international education is an area of interest for an increasing number of countries. These countries are recognising the benefits international education brings, they are selecting their target markets, establishing national level bodies whose mission is to attract international students, and are increasingly emphasising the provision of courses taught in English. This increased interest is happening in a time of structural changes in the market such as increased in-country provision, the establishment of offshore campuses and the development of on-line delivery. (p. 10)

The AEI report supports Knight's (2004) argument that internationalisation is rapidly changing and evolving. However, in light of self-reporting by universities such as documented in the 2003 IAU survey, there is a mismatch between reported priorities and rationales and the reality of internationalisation as a significant part of Australian trade.

The 2003 Ministerial Statement on Education (Nelson, 2003) asserted that "international activities" at "Australian schools, training institutions, English language colleges and universities" were "critically important to Australia's economic and social development" (p. 1). A discursive shift in the description of internationalisation was evident in the statement with the move to include sociological domains as "international education gives Australians opportunities to experience and appreciate differences" (p. 1). This reflected the current movement towards a focus on educational implications of internationalisation for Australian students (IDP Education Australia, 2003; Leask, 1999, 2003; Liddicoat, 2003). The Ministerial Statement took this a step further to add a political dimension arguing that internationalisation also promotes democracy:

The benefits flow two ways. International students contribute intellectually to Australian education and society, and provide diverse social and cultural perspectives that enrich the educational experience of many Australian students. Engagement in international education strengthens Australian democracy and multiculturalism and the tolerance that underpins it (Nelson, 2003, p. 3).

The orientation had changed towards improving the intercultural competence of Australian students while enhancing the experience of international students. This extended to include internationalisation as an instrument for political stability in the Asia-Pacific region:

Australian competitiveness and national security is dependent on international and cross-cultural awareness on the part of Australians (Nelson, 2003, p. 3).

While the policy has made a discursive shift towards a political and humanitarian portrayal of internationalisation, the issue of market placement and competition in a global knowledge market is clearly the main priority. Additionally, the hegemony of English as the language of internationalisation is implicit (Liddicoat, 2003). Indeed, in provision of education programs for ESL/EFL teachers, English language is a

commodity to be traded. In the political focus reported above, Western principles of democracy are invested into the earlier definitions of internationalisation. These can be seen as reflecting discursive trends in the West that espouse democratisation as an instrument of peace.

Institutional directions

Policy documents from one Australian university are examined here in the light of current definitions and federal statements. While not generalisable throughout the higher education sector, Griffith University's conceptualisations are those of a large and growing 'gumtree' institution that is competing for national rankings with older 'sandstone' institutions (Marginson, 2004). Currently a middle-ranking university, Griffith has a strong and public agenda to compete.

The Griffith Project (Griffith University, 2002) established the mission and values for the university. The terms international or internationalisation occurred in 36 instances throughout the document. Internationalisation featured as a term in both the mission and values of the institution and is listed in Table 1 below.

Table 1
The Griffith Project – mission and values (p. 4)

MISSION	VALUES
<p>In the pursuit of excellence in teaching, research and community service, Griffith University is committed to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • innovation • bringing disciplines together • internationalisation • equity and social justice • lifelong learning <p>for the enrichment of Queensland, Australia, and the international community.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rigorous standards of scholarship • continuous quality improvement and accountability as befits a learning organisation • individual rights, ethical standards and social justice • participatory decision-making • personal growth and development including career preparation and life fulfilment • international responsibility • effecting a robust, equitable and sustainable Australian economy

The policy established an economic context for internationalisation in the light of federal funding:

When Griffith began, the overwhelming majority of its income flowed from Commonwealth teaching funds. No longer – for almost all Australian universities, direct federal grants account for less than half of income. Universities are now required to raise substantial funds through student fees, industry partnerships, competitive research grants and entrepreneurial activity, including the education of fee-paying overseas students (p. 5).

The impact of a reduction in federal funding is portrayed as affecting all facets of the university:

In just a few decades, universities have moved from an elite to a mass system, and so from a secure, insular policy world to market-driven enterprises... Though universities remain more than a business, they have been required to become more business-like (p. 6).

Setting a goal to establish itself in the "top-ten" Australian universities, Griffith listed the 2001 rankings by "sector indicators". Interestingly, the national indicator for ranking internationalisation was the number of on-campus international students. The paper concludes with the goal to commit "to a phased extension of internationalisation, with a target of doubling international education participation by the end of the decade" (p. 30). The section of The Griffith Project (Griffith University, 2002) dedicated to internationalisation has three categories: profile, competition, and transnational education. The first advocates many of the social and cultural aspects of Knight's (2004) definition but the opening statement reflects the competitive notion to the phenomenon. It states that "Griffith has proved a successful player in export education" (2002, p. 19). It also leans heavily into the social dimension:

International students are an important resource for the University. Their interaction with Australian students enriches the University experience for all, and creates links to the wider region. The presence of international students also encourages academics to think more broadly when designing and delivering their curriculum – we all learn to think globally when the world is represented in the seminar room (p. 19).

The relation between the themes of "exporter" and "intercultural catalyst" is prospective rather than explicit in the Project and the challenge for actualisation will depend very much on the extent to which local adjustments by academics and students are fostered, recorded, and incorporated into the evolution of the policy. How this will be resourced and its implementation incorporated into institutional strategy may be key issues for other universities seeking to climb the ratings table.

The "profile" sub-section of The Griffith Project addresses the issue of critical mass in terms of student numbers with the issue of strained resources raised:

With nearly 4,000 international students in 2002, the University faces important questions about the number and mix of students, capacity to maintain a quality offering with increasing numbers, incentives to enhance the number of outgoing students and staff and programs to enhance integration of students. The growth in international numbers has strained resources even while providing much-needed income (p. 19)

The "capacity question" is clearly an issue of concern:

It is worth asking, however, about the ideal number of international students. Currently, international fee-paying students comprise just over 14 percent of the total student body. The University would benefit, educationally and economically, by gradually increasing this percentage to around 25 percent by the end of the decade, lifting the number of international students to over 8,500. To do so however, the University will need to address difficult questions about borrowing capital to secure much-needed additional teaching facilities (p. 20)

Other sub-sections of internationalisation in the document are competition and transnational education. These focus on marketing and delivery. The former recognised significant local competition by other Australian universities establishing campuses in the area. The latter expressed caution with regard to offshore teaching and draining resources that may affect quality delivery at home:

Many sector analysts argue that transnational education, rather than on-shore provision of places to international students, is the best future source of additional university income. The IDP survey found Griffith a cautious but successful player in transnational education.

Prudence appears a sensible approach – there are serious costs to research, supervision and team spirit if too many staff are teaching abroad for extended periods (p. 20).

The Strategic Plan (Griffith University, 2003) established processes to enact the mission and values of The Griffith Project. Twenty references are made to the terms, "international" and "internationalisation". These range from a reiteration of the mission and values established in the Griffith Project to describing the qualities of a Griffith graduate (one able "to undertake employment or further study, nationally and internationally"). In terms of teaching and learning, internationalisation is referred to as:

The University seeks to internationalise the educational experiences of its students. It achieves this through the participation of international students, curriculum changes and provision of opportunities for domestic students. The interaction of international students with Australian students enriches the university experience for all, and creates links to the wider region. The presence of international students also encourages academics to think more broadly when designing and delivering their curriculum - we all learn to think globally when the world is represented in the seminar room. By creating a strong network of international links, Griffith also provides opportunities for its students to study abroad through the International Experience Incentive Scheme (p. 4).

The associated strategic priorities reaffirmed the earlier intention to double international enrolments but also expanded into the notion of "internationalising the curriculum and methods of teaching and learning" (p. 4). Internationalisation is also highlighted in research and research training with a focus on the international standing and reputation of research (p. 5). In community involvement, internationalisation is seen as a strategic target in "building international partnerships to broaden the education of students and to increase the University's international standing" (p. 6).

This document included international partnerships under the section entitled "community partnerships." It outlines as a strategic imperative to "Focus efforts in international partnerships to broaden the education of students and to increase the University's international standing" (p. 8). The issue of reputation is also highlighted in the desire for the University to hold national and international standing in the area of equity (p. 8).

Conclusion

Internationalisation is a phenomenon of our times. Australia's motives for internationalisation have shifted from "aid-out" to export for profit, an "aid-in" in our terms. Institutional initiatives and policies reflect this.

What remains clear as the grounding in economic and intercultural issues evolves is that internationalisation is critical for Australia's universities to maintain the funding base for their traditional and prospective activity. It also holds enormous potential for reshaping tertiary campuses, hopefully for elaborating and enhancing the academic experiences of visitors and locals as students and staff forge new meanings and outcomes in the intercultural dimension. Expansion of international exchange programs creates opportunities to remind Australian academics about universal values and frameworks for their socialisation and to help higher education students to consider their positions and potential globally. What is it that Australia is "selling" in building these prospects?

We consider that two issues are particularly significant for the current and future direction of Australian internationalisation. These issues relate to the intercultural and economic dimensions referred to in Knight's (2003) work, specifically:

How does internationalization deal with the intersection of international and intercultural? Is internationalization a vehicle for increased understanding and appreciation of cultural diversity and fusion, or is it an agent of cultural homogenization? How do the curriculum, teaching/learning process, research, extracurricular activities, and academic mobility contribute to intercultural understanding and cultural hybridization/ homogenization?

Is there a subtle but discernible shift away from the social and cultural rationales toward the economic and commercial interests of internationalization? Is this true in all regions of the world, and what are the implications for higher education policy in general—funding, access, quality, role in society, research, curriculum, and regulatory frameworks? (p. 29).

These questions are inherent in any solution we seek from reviewing how Australian national and institutional policies define and position tertiary institutions internationally. We argue that in advocacy through policy statements, Australia has boomeranged back from chasing economic benefits of internationalisation to an increasing alertness to social, cultural and political rationales. Our "speak" is of a healthy educational sector and of opportunity for worthy growth for all participants. Few would disagree with the potential that Australian universities offer for expanded intercultural understanding and awareness in the education of students—domestic and international. However, there is need to check viability scenarios for the sector in the advent that the economic pillar provided by a 25% international student constituency weakens or collapses. The blending of economic and intercultural benefits and futures in the mix of rhetoric about educational trade and university funding make for a special tar in our race for excellence and position as a nation providing education for an increasingly English-speaking and tertiary-stage learning world. What we are selling as internationalisation may grow to be a lasting and virtuous monument to innovation and enterprise in this race. Or, it may be a Tar Baby of disastrous proportion. Let us research our progress deliberately and broadly.

References

- Attorney-General's Department. (2000). *Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Australia Education International (AEI). (2005, July 2005). *Australia's competitors in international education: July 2005 update*. Retrieved August 11, 2005, from http://aei.dest.gov.au/AEI/PublicationsAndResearch/Publications/CompAnalysisJuly05_pdf
- Back, K., & Davis, D. (1995). Internationalisation of higher education in Australia. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Strategies for internationalisation of higher education*. Amsterdam: EAIE.
- Department of Science Education and Training (DEST). (2005, 01 July 2005). *UNESCO/OECD Forum on trade in education services*. Retrieved August 11, 2005, from http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/international_education/organisations_contacts/unesco/
- Downer, A. (2003). *Launch: Engaging the world through education*. Retrieved Jan 12, 2005, 2005, from www.foreignminister.gov.au/speeches/2003/031014_education_final.html
- Griffith University. (2002). *The Griffith Project*. Retrieved Jan 12, 2005, from www.griffith.edu.au/vc/pdf/griffithproject.pdf
- Griffith University. (2003). *Strategic Plan 2003–2007*. Retrieved 12 August, 2003, from www.gu.edu.au/ua/aa/plans/docs/strategicplan2003-2007.pdf
- IDP Education Australia. (2003, June 30). *Growing demand for Australian higher education*. Retrieved December 20, 2004, from www.idp.edu.au/aboutidp/mediacentre/june2003/article1036.asp
- Industry Commission. (1991). *Export of services* (No. 12). Canberra: AGPS.
- Knight, J. (1994). *Internationalisation: Elements and checkpoints*. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Knight, J. (2003). *Internationalization of higher education practices and priorities: 2003 LAU survey report*. Paris: International Association of Universities.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5–28.
- Knight, J., & de Wit, H. (1995). Strategies for internationalisation of higher education: Historical and conceptual perspectives. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Strategies for internationalisation of higher education*. Amsterdam: EAIE.
- Larsen, K., Morris, R., & Martin, J. P. (2001). *Trade in educational services: Trends and emerging issues*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation & Development.
- Leask, B. (1999, October). *Internationalisation of the curriculum: Key challenges and strategies*. Paper presented at the Australian International Education Conference - International Education: The Professional Edge.
- Leask, B. (2003, October). *Beyond the numbers - Levels and layers of internationalisation to utilise and support growth and diversity*. Paper presented at the 17th IDP Australian International Education Conference, Melbourne.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2003). Internationalisation as a concept in higher education: Perspectives from policy. In A. J. Liddicoat, S. Eisenchlas, & S. Trevaskes (Eds.), *Australian perspectives on internationalising education* (pp. 13–26). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Marginson, S. (2004). National and global competition in higher education. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 31(2), 1–28.
- Nelson, B. (2003). *Engaging the world through education* (Ministerial statement on the internationalisation of Australian education and training). Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

- Shinn, C. (1996). Challenging the monopoly of student mobility: Comparing foreign student policies and practices in the USA and Australia. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Strategies for internationalisation of higher education*. Amsterdam: EAIE.
- Tinkler, D., Lepani, B., & Mitchell, J. (1996). *Education and technology convergence*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Trevaskes, S., Eisenchlas, S., & Liddicoat, A. J. (2003). Language, culture and literacy in the internationalisation process of higher education. In A. J. Liddicoat, S. Eisenchlas, & S. Trevaskes (Eds.), *Australian perspectives on internationalising education* (pp. 1–12). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- UNESCO Asia-Pacific Regional Bureau for Education. (2001). *Asia Pacific programme of educational innovation for development*. Retrieved Jan 12, 2005, from www.unescobkk.org/education/aceid/index.htm
- University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific (UMAP). (2004, December 12). *University mobility in Asia and the Pacific*. Retrieved January 12, 2005, from www.umap.org
- Welch, A., & Denman, B. (1997). Internationalism of higher education: Retrospect and prospect. *Forum of Education*, 52(1), 14–29.

