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Abstract:
Different modalities of academic globalization are analyzed in the light of their objectives and their adaptations in different parts of the World. This analysis views academic globalization as part of the globalization phenomenon in general. In this context academic globalization has two different stakeholders, namely the providers of academic services in a global context and consumers of the academic services in a global context. The objectives of academic globalization are different when analyzed from the provider perspective versus the consumer perspective. The academic globalization is most beneficial when there is maximum overlap between these two sets of objectives, and it can be useless when these two sets of objectives are mutually orthogonal. In the case when the two sets of objectives point in opposite directions, the academic globalization can be used as an instrument of subversion.

1.0 Introduction
In its modern context the foundations of the phenomenon of globalization were established at the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference at Bretton Woods that took place in July 1944 when the Allied Nations conferred to regulate the International monetary and financial order. Agreements were concluded to set up the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and the International Monetary Fund. The banking, trade, and monetary policies still remain the essence of Globalization today.

‘Academic Globalization’ needs to be understood in this context, namely its relationships with banking, trade and finance. These relationships make it imperative to view academic globalization as a trade activity because the forces and motives that have so far advanced academic globalization have done so largely in the context of trade and profit [1]. This view is also affirmed by the General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) that was concluded in 1995 as a treaty of the World Trade Organization. The GATS treaty extends the multilateral trading system to service sector, in the same way the GATT provides such a system for merchandise trade. The GATS presumes that knowledge is a commodity like any other and should be freely traded around the world. In order to execute GATS type programs on a global scale there is a need for International agreements and frameworks, for example the Trade Related Intellectual Property (TRIP). Altbach [1] dis-
cusses these considerations, and Ales [2] provides a very comprehensive analysis.

In any trade activity there are providers and there are consumers. The goals and objectives of the two groups, namely the providers and the consumers, may be substantially overlapping (supportive), or they may be mutually orthogonal (non supportive), or they may even be at odds with one another (detrimental).

The analysis presented in this paper provides a taxonomy of different modalities of academic globalization incorporating these variables, and evaluates them with respect to their goals and objectives.

2.0 What is Academic Globalization?

Before analyzing the subject, it is necessary to define what is meant by academic globalization. For the purpose of this paper, academic globalization is taken to mean the phenomenon whereby the academic institutions are globalized by offering the services of the institutions to students of multiple countries rather than the more conventional scenario where these services are offered to the members of a campus or a set of distributed campuses but still within the same country.

Those institutions that have several campuses within a country, or offer distance learning within the country, or offer self-paced learning, or on-line courses are not regarded as globalized. The Open University model, if the university operates within a country, is also not an example of a globalized institution. However, some of the results of the analysis in this paper may still apply to these universities, even though they are not deemed to be instances of academic globalization.

In the context of the definition of academic globalization, there are cases that might be regarded as ambiguous with respect to their being instances of globalization. One of them is the globalization of the results of academic research for which the following observation is noteworthy:

“… the idea of what is ‘international’ in this field has been occupied by the hegemonic discourses of Anglo-American geography and journals. This paper takes this lively debate as an indicator of the global challenges facing higher education and research and provides an analysis of the changing conditions of knowledge production, characterized by internationalization and competition. Knowledge production is governed to an increasing degree through practices based on market-like operations.” [3]

Another example is the knowledge and information sharing using the internet and academic journals. Some observers see the internet and other manifestations of globalization as bringing knowledge equality to the world, but the evidence is mixed. Globalization opens access and makes it easier for students and scholars to study and work anywhere, but it reinforces many existing inequalities and erects some new barriers [1].

A third example comes from the role of the individual academicians who work in a global context, for example through employment, exchange programs, and international collaborations. In general, such individual contributions are understood based on the associations that they have with the institutions. This is because academic globalization is defined using the modalities of the institutions.

It seems that academic globalization activities are increasingly converging to the trade-in-services paradigm as is envisaged in the GATS [2]. This is because academic globalization is driven by the same motives as globalization in general. However there exists a continuing debate to assess the applicability of the market-like business paradigm to education. Education is often a not for profit public service, especially in the developing countries, which differs in its motivation and goals from the GATS type paradigm [2].
3.0 Modalities

With the above definition of academic globalization in mind, one needs to examine the different modalities that have been implemented in the world. All these modalities are based on a provider and a consumer, with the providers generally being the Euro-American institutions and the consumers being the non Euro-American institutions. It being a trade, the consumers are those entities that have the ability to pay. Further, the consumers are those entities that are rather susceptible to the socio-political impacts of academic globalization, and the occasional unfair practices of the trade (see reference 1). With these general parameters understood, following are the modalities of academic globalization that have actual implementations in the world.

Colonial Model: This modality of academic globalization has its roots in the colonial history [4]. The establishment of schools and colleges in the colonies was led by missionaries. Also, institutions in the colonial countries often had their affiliated branches in their colonies, though these affiliated institutions never equaled their prototypes. Using the same modality the American missionaries established universities in Lebanon, Egypt, and Turkey. More recently, American sponsored universities have arisen in Kyrgyzstan, United Arab Emirates, Armenia, and Bulgaria.

Cold War Model: This model has its roots in the cold war legacy [1]. The battle for the hearts and minds of the people of the World drove the super powers to institute exchange programs, book translations, text book subsides, and institution building. Higher education was a key enabler for political and economic goals. Foreign students absorb the values of the host country, often stay in the host country or return home desiring to change the home institutions in ways that are unrealistic or irrelevant for the environment of their home countries.

The cold war impacted also the education within the United States in terms of its view of the other side [5] as well as the evolution of its universities under the military-industry-academia complex [6].

Campus Extension Model: This model is rooted in the GATS philosophy that regards education and research as services that can be globally traded for profit. According to this model an institution in Euro-America regarding itself as a business, sets up a remote offshore campus to extend the business to other countries. Thus there is a Westminster University (UK) in Tashkent, Uzbekistan; a University of Chicago (USA) in Spain; a George Mason University (USA) in Rasal-Al-Khaimah; a Preston University (USA) in Ajman; a British University in Dubai; a University of Wollongong (Australia) in Dubai; a Temple University (USA) in Japan; and a Monash University (Australia) in Malaysia.

This model is cleaner than the Colonial or Cold War models but requires a caveat against profit-making ventures that advance the hegemony of powerful academic institutions and systems. This is because some economists see globalization as inevitable, but argue that it works against the interests of developing countries by reinforcing international inequalities: for details please see reference 7. Another substantial analytical consideration comes from the fact that the GATS trade model does not apply symmetrically in the sense that the developing countries are always on the receiving end of the trade.

Twinning Model: The twinning model establishes a relationship between a university in Euro-America and a university in a developing country, sometimes facilitated by the UNESCO program for International Universities Cooperation which endeavors to meet the challenges of the globalization era.

Twinning cooperation is more selective than the Campus Extension model which provides full fledged academic services. Twinning cooperation can be for a variety of purposes; to recognize courses taken by exchange students at either university; to recognize degrees offered by either university;
often the university in the developing country can issue degrees on behalf of the university in Euro-America, under controlled circumstances governed by the mutual agreement; to offer recognized courses in support of a study abroad program; or to offer recognized courses using distance learning.

Examples of university twinning agreements are those between: the Western Michigan University (USA) and the Sunway University College (Malaysia); the Akamai University (USA) and the San Juan de la Cruz University (Costa Rica); and the University of Cambridge (UK) and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (USA) cooperating for the Carbon Reduction project in support of reducing global warming.

The university twinning model is widely used because of its flexibility and adaptability with respect to the goals of twinning, the size and scope of the cooperation, and the terms of engagement. However, in cases involving institutions in Euro-America and the developing countries it remains a union of unequal parties [1]. The commercial motives for such arrangements also deserve a caveat for the developing countries: for details please see reference 7.

### Franchise Model

This model is commercially driven and is stipulated by the GATS. Usually a teaching program and associated services are provided to the franchisee institution in a developing country by a franchiser institution in a Euro-American country. The franchiser university lends its name and curriculum to the franchisee academic institution, but provides limited supervision and quality control. Because of the dominance of commercialism in this model there are many ethical issues, as discussed in reference 8, that should be carefully considered.

### 4.0 Objectives

Having clarified the meanings of academic globalization and the modalities of implementing it, the next logical step is to analyze the goals and objectives of academic globalization. These vary with the model used to implement academic globalization, as well as the provider and consumer perspectives. Therefore there is no single goal behind the academic globalization. Rather, there are a large number of goals, separate goals for each modality and separate goals for providers and consumers within each modality. These are depicted below in tabular form.

#### Table 1: Academic Globalization Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Provider Objectives</th>
<th>Consumer Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colonial</td>
<td>The goal of the colonial provider is to perpetuate his hold on the colonized through an education that redefines their values and encourages a psychology that accepts the superiority of the colonial power. The goals of the American Universities around the world can be seen similarly, notwithstanding their claims at benevolence.</td>
<td>The colony has no say in the process, and hence can not entertain goals for this model. As regards institutions like the American Universities around the world, there is obviously some level of consent from the consumer side. However, such consent is often the result of American persuasion rather than any specifically designed objectives of the host country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold War</td>
<td>The objectives of the superpowers were to win the hearts and minds of the people of the consumer countries. This winning of the hearts and minds was not unlike the efforts of the Colonial powers at being liked by those whom they colonized.</td>
<td>The consumers in this model do willingly participate, though they seldom or never have well deliberated objectives. The activity is driven by the superpower’s objectives, with little or no allowance for the objectives of the consumers. Under that scenario it is helpful to the superpowers if the consumer countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality</td>
<td>Provider Objectives</td>
<td>Consumer Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Extension</td>
<td>The provider objectives in this model are similar to those of a corporation. This aspect emphasizes trade versus education and thus potentially puts the providers at odds with the consumers.</td>
<td>The consumer objectives in this model are explicit if rather amorphous. The host countries allow the Euro-American universities to establish their extension campuses because their educational needs exceed what the indigenous universities can provide. Because the extension campuses are commercial enterprises, students who can pay can get admission even if they could not be admitted into the indigenous universities because of merit competition. However, the extension campuses sell the reputation of their parent universities and that of Euro-America as a region, even if the service standards are often found wanting. Because of this aura built and carefully maintained around the extension campuses, their graduates often find better job placements than those of the indigenous universities, which in turn further advances the commercial objectives of the providers [9].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twinning</td>
<td>Twinning objectives are also commercial. However, the objectives of the UNESCO program for International Universities Cooperation are clearly not commercial; rather they seek to promote the planned objectives, often socio economic and political, of the donor countries from Euro-America. These objectives of the donor countries usually do not serve the objectives of the consumer countries.</td>
<td>The consumer objectives are similar to those for the campus extension model, though in rather selective areas of academic activity. The drawbacks and caveats are similar to those for the campus extension model. There is however an additional caveat for twinning when UNESCO is involved. The usual criticism applied to the World Bank and IMF applies also to International Universities Cooperation because the same overarching UNO objectives apply in this instance as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise</td>
<td>The provider objectives of the franchise model, as might be understood from its name, openly and aggressively seek commercial profit. The motives are very similar to those of a corporate enterprise.</td>
<td>The openly commercial nature of the franchise model, and the relatively unregulated way in which it operates, often attracts profit seeking elements in the consumer countries as well. So the consumer objectives in this case are more closely aligned with the provider objectives because they are both profit driven. However the objectives of the user community of the resulting academic services in the consumer country are seldom served because the providers of these services are often of low caliber. The selling point of this model is the reputation of Euro-America as a region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 Evaluation

The discussion above presents the five modalities of academic globalization that encompass almost all its implementations. All these modalities have their genesis in some historical epochs such as the colonial era, the cold war, the rise of corporations, and the emergence of GATS under WTO. As shown by the discussion on the objectives of academic globalization, the provider objectives diverge from the consumer objectives in all modalities but one. The exception is the franchise model in which the profit motives align on provider and consumer sides. This is because in all modalities it has been understood that the consumer objectives are also the objectives of the end users (students) of globalized academic services. This however is not the case for the franchise model where the end users’ objectives greatly diverge from the consumer (franchisee) objectives so that the end result is often exploitative.

The benefits of academic globalization are mostly for the providers who are mostly in the U.S. and Europe. Any benefits to the consumers are rather incidental and the consumers are at a great disadvantage. The reasons for this situation are also clear from the above discussion of the objectives of the providers and consumers. The provider’s objectives in all modalities are well formulated and carefully pursued, while the consumer’s objectives are never well deliberated and therefore are not pursuable. Hence none of the presently used modalities of academic globalization are beneficial to the consumers, though they are clearly beneficial to the providers.

A new model for academic globalization is therefore urgently needed to make it beneficial to consumers as well as providers. Such a model will not only serve the consumers and the providers, it will also enhance the credibility of some emerging efforts on the academic globalization. An example of such an emerging effort is provided by the on-line education experiment in Australia which seeks a future evolution that is desirable in the long-term for the consumer societies as well as the provider societies. It is unlikely that a GATS type paradigm can produce such a model because of the exploitative possibilities and ethical loopholes left open in this paradigm. Further research is needed to reveal the requirements, framework, and modalities upon which the academic globalization should be based in future.

6.0 Recommendations

As discussed above, one of the recommendations of this paper is to formulate a new model of academic globalization that meets the objectives of the consumers and providers. Such a model can not be standardized based on the input mainly from providers because it must maximize the overlap between the objectives of consumers and providers. This is not possible without active attention to consumer objectives, as the consumers want to formulate and achieve their goals, not as the providers want to enunciate them and implement them nominally on behalf of the consumers. What is equally important is that the presumptuous attitudes of the providers in Euro-America are rectified and the cultivated reputation of Euro-American institutions is corrected in the consumer countries through reality checks performed by the researchers in the consumer countries.

A corollary to the findings of this paper is that the current implementations of different modalities of academic globalization be reexamined. The purpose of this reexamination is to steer them towards the consumer objectives for each implementation. As discussed earlier, often the consumer objectives were not carefully deliberated at the time of those implementations so that it would need to be done post facto. This post facto reex-

---

1 In a similar way, distinction needs to be made between the providers and the Faculty. The individual academicians referred to in section 2.0 that serve on the faculty may have very good intentions but the franchiser/franchisee interests will often override such intentions.
amination would assess each implementation separately, or separately assess similar implementations within the same country. Implementations that fall way short of consumer objectives should be abandoned and those that are sufficiently close to consumer objectives should be systematically reformed, each implementation separately on its own.
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