# THE EMERGENCE OF TRANS-REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE SCHEMES (TREES) IN EUROPE, NORTH AMERICA, AND THE ASIA-PACIFIC

**BRIAN D. DENMAN**

*This article demonstrates that salient aspects of globalization have led to the emergence of trans-regional educational exchange schemes (TREES) in higher education. What sets these schemes apart from others is the proliferation of international university organizations that "go beyond region" and infiltrate other parts of the globe despite policy barriers. The article illustrates that the current globalizing efforts to establish regionalized free trade zones as evidenced in such organizations as the European Union (EU), the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and the Asia Pacific Economic Co-operation (APEC) have led to the creation of internationalizing processes in which national governments, higher education institutions, and other international university organizations vie for position. The article concludes with a discussion of select strategies and issues as these affect the development of international university co-operation as a whole and the impact they may have on higher education in the future.*

## DECONSTRUCTING GLOBALIZATION

The book, *Globalization in Question*, by Hirst and Thompson provides the backdrop concerning whether globalization should be perceived as myth, phenomenon, process, or outcome. Depending on context, the ambiguous, relativistic nature of globalization can and may take the form of all of the above. The conscious attempt to produce or reproduce a language of terms that embodies the evolutionary or revolutionary essence of change, continuity, or progress is somewhat problematic, given its interpretation and context.

Take, for example, the spelling of "globalization". The spelling of the term alone generally shows tell-tale signs of a cultural perspective, a particular educational upbringing, and possibly one's epistemological leanings. Yet, the digitalization of literary works is standardizing the way the word is spelled, particularly because Internet search engines, databases, and CD ROMs generally recognize only *correct* spellings. However, what is the correct spelling, "globalisation" or "globalization"? Clearly, this question becomes highly contentious, and for all of the non-English speakers in the world, it can be quite confusing. In addition, the proliferation of "-izations" and "-isms" in this so called post-modern world creates such a relaxing of fixed, more traditional, definitions that the relativistic nature of the abstraction gets lost.

The nominalization[1] of globalization, as a case in point, has become "nounified" to represent a "be-all-to-end-all" for articulating the abstract nature of whatever context globalization appears to influence. In addition, researchers are increasingly compounding the problem by branding their own concepts (*i.e.,* "glocalisation", "globaloney", "globalution", "international co-opetition", to name a few) in an attempt to legitimize their own interpretative stance and to take ownership for their suggested meanings.

---

[1] Halliday initially defined the term nominalization as "...the single most powerful resource for creating grammatical metaphor" (Halliday, 1994, p. 352). Bazerman further illustrates that "...nominalisation has served to create higher and higher order abstractions which provide conceptual objects that populate the intellectual landscape of scientific specialities" (Bazerman, 1998, p.19).

## THE FOUNDATION OF GLOBALIZATION-BUILDING

Nominalization aside, globalization is viewed as an all encompassing term void of specific context. Although most of the literature treating globalization appears to be predominately associated with economics, other forms are emerging (*i.e.,* the global emasculation of gender; trans-civilization, socio-cultural, and world system studies; future studies)[2], and as such, globalization is likely to take the form of several inter-disciplinary strands in academic discourse in the foreseeable future.

The convolution of different contexts makes it difficult to discern the appropriateness of analyzing globalization as either process or as outcome, hence the need for developing strands as suggested by Sklair (1998) and Bretherton and Ponton (1996). In addition, the ebb and flow process of "becoming global" also needs closer examination from a building effect of social experience. The ease of travel, the opportunity to communicate by various means, and the proliferation and increasing access of information from geographic-specific regions have led to a level of social stratification based on privileged, personal experience---a scaffolding effect---leading to one's personal foundation of globalization-building. Those with the financial means, interest, and concern for all things global will create an ever-deepening divide between the "haves" and "have nots" simply by their desire and pursuit of "global knowledge". In this instance, globalization is viewed as an outcome, albeit élitist, even though the process of attaining such knowledge is more or less a globalizing one.

## EXCLUSIVITY OR INCLUSIVITY?

The dilemma with 'becoming global' pertains to the age-old issues of exclusivity versus inclusivity as well as ideological representation. Which countries/cultures/peoples belong? Which do not? On another level, under whose guidelines and set of rules? Huntington warns that in current times, the paradigmatic form of European civilisation of the West is creating an intercivilizational clash with other parts of the world. As he points out, "The intracivilizational clash of political ideas spawned by the West is being supplanted by an intercivilizational clash of culture and religion" (Huntington, 1996, p. 54). The hegemonic struggle for inclusivity is a priority for nation-states which want to exercise their rights of historic interpretation. The emphasis on globalization in this context suggests an underpinning of social institutionalization in a top-down manner with the Western paradigm reigning over others by means of the new capitalism. This result suggests that global perspectives are shifting to meet the challenges of a higher level and perhaps even ideal, modern civilisation-building/global culture. The question posed is how long will the non-Western world submit to this global way of thinking, even at the risk of possibly being excluded?

## THE CURRENT GLOBAL CONTEXT

Globalization as a process of civilisation-building is dependent on political, economic, and socio-cultural contexts. It is usually construed as standardisation, economic integration, and cross-cultural-astuteness. However, within the specific context of comparative and

---

2  Globalization, according to Sklair, Bretherton and Ponton, is more or less a discourse containing several strands. Sklair identifies his four resource clusters in relation to the research interests of academicians, namely: 1) the world-systems approach; 2) the global culture approach; 3) the global society approach; and 4) the global capitalism approach (Sklair, 1998, p. 6). Bretherton and Ponton, alternatively, view the symptomatic effects of globalization as containing the following four elements: 1) technological change; 2) the creation of a global economy; 3) political globalization; and 4) a globalization of ideas (Bretherton and Ponton, 1996, p. 3).

international education, globalisation may infer an infusion of ideas, people, and resources with the aim of disseminating and advancing knowledge in, around, and throughout the world-at-large. In other words, the globalisation of higher education[3] suggests an ideological sense of collective consciousness and action, with the underlying pursuit of cooperation on a worldwide scale to foster, promote, and advocate *veritas (*truth). The pursuit of truth, particularly in a world arena with divergent values, beliefs, and customs within various contexts, is highly contentious and often produces skepticism, cynicism, and concerns about ulterior motives and unforeseen consequences. The collective action needed requires a concerted effort by all involved to converge, compromise, consolidate, and co-operate in order to successfully reconcile effectiveness, maintain diversity, and further the development of democratic responsiveness.

## THE INTERNATIONAL RESPONSE

The internationalization process may be more commonly defined as the relationship-building exercise of two or more nations which are bound by a common purpose. In higher education, however, its connotation oftentimes reflects the self-serving notion of becoming more internationally aware, more internationally-focused, and more internationally-recognized. Many higher education mission statements, as a case in point, are strategically designed to promote and enhance their internationalization efforts by encouraging international student and faculty exchange, internationalizing curricula, conducting international research, and, whenever possible, streamlining procedures by consolidating and sharing resources and staff. Internationalization, at the institutional level, may thus be construed as an outward-seeking, self-fulfilling initiative with incentive-based and competition-induced tendencies. It may also display little if any hint of co-operation unless the type of co-operation serves a tangible purpose. International co-operation may be viewed as a spin-off of the internationalization process, but it is not perceived as the over-riding goal or mission of the institution or institutions involved.

## THE RISING TENSIONS BETWEEN GLOBALIZATION AND INTERNATIONALIZATION

The underlying concern and need for co-operation in globalization, on the one hand, and the concern for creating and maintaining a competitive edge in an institution's internationalization efforts, on the other, generates an often indiscernible tension between co-operation as an idealistic hope and competition as a rationalistic reality. The question posed is whether or not international university co-operation can succeed in an increasingly competitive world. If so, what impact can international co-operation make, if any, in the shaping of institutional structures and decision-making procedures?

## NEO-ACTORS

During the middle and second half of the Nineteenth Century, a free trade era emerged as a liberating attempt to deregulate mercantilistic control (Hammar, 1986, p. 736). The term, *to liberate*, and its derivatives (specifically liberalism, neo-liberalism, and liberal institutionalism) have been used since in a plethora of applications to explain contemporary

---

[3] Distinctions need to be made here to differentiate between the globalisation of higher education and the globalisation of universities. Globalisation of higher education tends to concentrate on worldwide issues such as access, collaboration, and equity, with emphasis on knowledge distribution and labour division. Globalisation of universities pertains to the massification of universities in general; the reaching out further afield to increase their influence, visibility, and/or market share on the international scene.

phenomena on a worldwide scale and, like globalization, they suffer the same fate of being considered as a nebulous cloud of many meanings with unsettled foundations. In Australia, for instance, neo-liberalism is viewed as another term for economic rationalism. Neo-realism also is problematic, because many tend to confuse terminology and often contrast the "what was and what is" to the "what could and should be" (Baldwin, 1993, p. 10).

Currently, the liberalization of free trade has resulted in producing divisive points-of-view in the globalisation and internationalisation of higher education. Education has been positively associated with economic growth (O'Rourke & Williamson, 1999; 272), and new technologies have provided new modes of education delivery and innovation. Although descriptors such as neo-liberalism and neo-realism can be confusing, the labelling, defining, comparing and contrasting of terms help distill and deconstruct facts at face value, since historical interpretations may not necessarily apply. It is therefore necessary to understand the actors involved. Baldwin's composite of neo-liberalism and neo-realism typologies is useful in understanding various actor ideologies which influence change in higher education in a present-day, global context:

**Neo-Liberalism**
Commercial liberalism refers to theories linking free trade and peace.
Republican liberalism refers to theories linking democracy with peace.
Sociological liberalism refers to theories linking transnational interactions with international integration.

**Neo-realism**
Neorealism refers to the move beyond the nation-state by devising new international institutions or regimes, by reinterpreting the principles of sovereignty, or by challenging the validity of the "state as actor" model (Baldwin, 1993, pp. 3-4).

In addition but somewhat over-simplified, neo-realists are more likely to acknowledge conflict in the world and underlying factors associated with it, whereas neo-liberals concentrate on co-operation and windows of opportunity for further interaction. Neo-realists may also view international co-operation as "'harder to achieve, more difficult to maintain, and more dependent on state power" than neo-liberals (Baldwin, 1993, p. 5). They perceive international co-operation as offering relative gains as opposed to absolute gains as seen by the neo-liberals. Although both perspectives recognize the myriad of international regimes and institutions that have emerged since 1945, they differ with respect to the significance of such relationships. Such dualism suggests that both typologies are more complementary than polar, although political, economic, and socio-cultural forces may underpin various points-of-view. The main point to be stressed is that there are varying degrees of viewpoints regarding free trade and how free trade has influenced the development of international university cooperation.

**FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS**

The institutionalization of formalized free trade agreements in the latter part of the Twentieth Century also illustrates a long-standing argument concerning global economic integration---that economic cooperation fosters increased interaction in both economic and non-economic spheres of human activity[4]. It can be argued that free trade agreements in the current climate

---

[4] Historically, economic convergence precedes the establishment of free trade agreements. The institutionalisation of free trade agreements, like international consortia in higher education, are a post World

may have also spurred the proliferation of some international university organisations in higher education. At the very least, the shift from domestic localization to economic regionalism to global economic integration (Coleman and Underhill, 1998) has resulted in an ever-increasing understanding of how crucial a role education plays in strengthening the economies of the nation-state and, as a result, in building inter-territorial educational pursuits[5]. The challenge for global enthusiasts is to exercise their influence on the promotion and delivery of global educational opportunities, equity, and access as a means of raising issues of common concern that transcend national borders (i.e. pollution; drug trafficking; intellectual property; labour distribution) as well as in diminishing future conflicts between peoples. Whether such a challenge is put into practice, is considered the primary initiative, or is seen as realistically feasible, is the fundamental question for both neo-liberals and neo-realists alike.

## THE EMERGENCE OF TRANS-REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE SCHEMES (TREES)

The emergence of trans-regional educational exchange schemes has been heavily influenced by top-down approaches dictated at international, intra-regional and national levels. Other forms of international university cooperation may be viewed as market-driven and self-supporting, but the majority tend to rely on bottom-top, institutional approaches. The manner in which international university organisations have emerged can be described as follows:

**Top-Bottom Approaches**
- inter-regional partnerships which have been established as a direct result of a collective action by certain nation-states to increase student mobility and promote inter-cultural understanding within a given region or territory. Examples include trans-regional educational exchange schemes (*e.g.,* ERASMUS/SOCRATES), intra-regional schemes (*e.g.,* Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration (CONAHEC)), and transnational schemes (*e.g.,* Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU)).

- national, inter-state, and state partnerships which develop their own internationalization policies and agendas and convince higher educational institutions within their jurisdictions to implement them. Examples include national organisations such as Netherlands Organisation for International Cooperation in Higher Education (NUFFIC), and state systems such as the Oregon University System International Programs.

- like-minded inter-institutional partnerships which prefer to create their own exclusive working arrangements overseas. Although the majority of these partnerships are based on the consent of institutions themselves, the formation of these partnerships are created as separate business entities with CEOs as senior managers, and thus, construed as utilising a top-bottom approach. The incentive of such partnerships are designed to harness the strengths of individual academic standards as a means to increase visibility, recognition, or to improve or maintain a sense of quality control, among others as a collective whole. As Sizer indicates, they are creating a university brand of international

---

War II phenomenon.

[5] I have purposefully used the term "inter-territorial" in an effort to illustrate that economic regionalism---in the context of international education---is a misnomer. The data collected on region-specific free trade zones suggests that many international university organisations transcend the geographic cluster of nation-states that form the respected economic partnership. These international university organisations are often better defined by their underlying ethos or purpose (i.e. religious affiliation, language orientation, or developmental aid pursuits) rather than through the institutionalisation of regionalism.

visibility with the intention of developing a "critical success factor". Examples include liberal arts colleges such as the Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM), Five Colleges, Inc., and exchange organisations such as the International Student Exchange Program (ISEP), which are not exclusive per se, but are like-minded in focus with the purpose of creating balanced student exchanges between institutions during a set period of time.

**Bottom-Top Approaches**
- faculty-initiated partnerships between colleagues from overseas institutions, which have a tendency to be project-based. Examples may include a specific field of study (e.g. Cooperative Cultural Partnership in Nursing Education), a concentrated area of scholarly focus such as language study (e.g. Inter-University Program for Chinese Language Studies Taipei (IUP), regional studies (e.g. Great Lakes Jerusalem Peace Studies Program), cultural studies (e.g. Cultural Landscapes), or development studies (e.g. Consortium for Sustainable Community Development and Planning).

- institution-initiated partnerships which are either project- or program-based. The project- or process-based function tends to be directed to an individual department, school, or faculty and may be dependent on external funding controls such as foundation or governmental support 'soft monies', short-term institutional funds, or donor wishes. They may also be self-supporting inter-institutional partnerships in which membership fees, tuition fees, program fees, and the sale of publications are used to help defray program-based costs. Quality control measures and maintenance of standards may also be imposed to ensure academic integrity. Examples include projects that are research-oriented (*e.g.,* Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development (ALO) and the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE)) and program-based initiatives which are aimed at promoting and developing the internationalization efforts of partners (*e.g.,* Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning (ASAIHL)).

- cluster-type inter-institutional partnerships which emphasize the consolidation of resources as a means to reduce administrative costs, minimise duplication, and build on inter-institutional relationships through student and faculty exchanges, joint research, and the sharing of knowledge. They may also incorporate an exclusive membership in the form of a "club", which shifts the focus of partnerships based on voluntary participation to privileged invitation. Examples of the former may include international university organisations in the developing world (*e.g.,* Universal Foundation for Training & Information (UNITI)), information and advising centres (*e.g.,* the Australian Education Office (AEO), IDP Education Australia), and localised inter-institutional partnerships (e.g. Cooperating Raleigh Colleges). Examples of the latter include partnerships based on religious orientation (*e.g.,* Adventist Colleges Abroad) and partnerships based strictly on invitation (*e.g.,* European American University Consortium).

- market-driven partnerships which focus solely on the sale of international education as a commodity. Examples include profit-oriented international consortia (*e.g.,* American Institute for Foreign Studies (AIFS)) and certain types of international agencies (*e.g.,* Consultants for Global Programs).

It is generally assumed that in spite of the difference in approaches, all contribute to the development of international university co-operation. Davies and Guppy concur that such

types of co-operation are taking greater hold in both top-bottom and bottom- top approaches. They state that,

> As a result, we argue that globalization's effect on education is a simultaneous centralization and devolution of authority that squeezes power from middle levels of educational administration and redistributes it upward to more central states and downward to individual schools and reform groups  (Davies and Guppy, 1997; 438).

## INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF EDUCATION POLICY

Many nation-states have revised their educational attitudes toward neighboring countries by establishing international student mobility schemes, particularly the European Union.  The majority of these schemes have been forged from an institutionalized top-down approach as a result of the development of economic free trade agreements[6].

From Kitching's interpretation of neo-populism in modern development theory, it may be argued that the development of transnational student mobility schemes resulting from regionalized economic free trade are simply responses to a Western ideology in a capitalistic context.[7]  Indeed, the European Union (EU), the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and the Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation (APEC), all began with idealistic notions of developing socio-economic standards and quality of life-objectives within their respective regions.  Initially they did not recognise the need for education in their statutes.  In the case of the EU, it was the signing of the Maastricht Treaty that began the process for the European Union..."to legally contribute to the development of high quality education and training by defining and increasing its competencies while respecting the principle of subsidarity and therefore the responsibilities of the Member States"  (Zoller, 1993, p. 3).  In North America, as Weber states, "Higher education was not included specifically in the provisions of NAFTA.  Nevertheless, the agreement provided increased impetus for faculty, administrators, and higher education authorities to come to grips with the education implications of economic integration" (Weber, 1998, p. 9).  APEC, despite its uncertain future as a result of the Asian economic crisis in 1997-98 and the rising conflict in Indonesia, is still maturing from an informal dialogue group to a formalized institution.  The formation of APEC Study Centers, a culmination of several initiatives introduced initially in the APEC Education Forum, is still in its infancy after having experienced several political setbacks in its Human Resources and Development Working Group in 1993.[8]

---

[6]  It may be argued that the formation of the EC, and thus SOCRATES/ERASMUS, was the product of the political agenda to denationalize Europe for the purpose of avoiding another world war.  Although this argument has some merit, the primary objective is and has always been economic free trade.  Klayman writes, "...the progressive establishment of a common market...was expressly contemplated by the Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) signed in Paris on April 18, 1951; by the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community (EEC) signed in Rome on March 25, 1977; and by the Treaty establishing a European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC) also signed in Rome on March 25, 1957"  (Klayman, 1989, pp. 1,2).

[7]  Kitching states, "Of course one should not suppose that the resonance of populist ideas among policy-makers represents the meanderings of intellectual influence winding its devious and hidden way through history.  The ideas recur so frequently simply because of similarity of problem and context gives rise to a similarity of intellectual response"  (Kitching, 1989, p. 61).

[8]  In the US Department of State Dispatch, (November 29, 1993), vol. 4, no. 48, it states:  "...the Human Resource Development Working Group plans to finish its medium-term work plan and continue to promote the US-APEC Partnership for Education, the Japan-APEC Partnership for Education and Training, and Australia's University Mobility in the Asia-Pacific" (p. 837).  The political drawbacks may have something to do with the

## THE EUROPEAN UNION

The European Union, which formed as early as 1951, has gone through a series of transformations from unity (suggesting one dominant system) to integration (suggesting a free flow process between countries) to harmonization (suggesting consentual leadership by means of consensus)[9]. Non-EU nation-states vying for membership in the EU, especially those countries from Eastern Europe, have adopted the term "Europeanization" to broadly state their desire to "adapt to the European standard" (Gwyn and Slavova, 1997, p. 47), suggesting that the formation of the EU has spilled over and affected those nations which once considered themselves a part of the greater European community. ERASMUS, the European Community programme for the mobility of students and for cooperation in higher education, was adopted in 1987 to initially serve the EC by providing financial support to EC universities and to award certain travel and study grants to EC students and academic staff . It has led to the formation of TEMPUS (Phare and Tacis), which was established in Western Europe to develop formalized institutional linkages with those in Eastern and Central Europe.

## NORTH AMERICA

In the case of the United States, the U.S. National Task Force on Undergraduate Education Abroad in 1990 submitted a report to review and make recommendations on future priorities for study abroad opportunities at the undergraduate level. Influenced heavily by the goals established by the prior 1988 report, *Educating for Global Competence*[10], the Task Force recommended the following priorities: the expansion of education abroad, with the hope that by 2000, ten percent of American college and university undergraduates would have a significant educational experience abroad; increased diversity, advocating greater diversity in students and greater accessibility to a variety of foreign locations; and curricular connections, arguing for easier transferability of academic credit and the need to require study abroad for certain academic fields of study. It noted several obstacles to achieving such objectives, such as insufficient institutional commitment to international education, negative reviews from academic staff, restrictive curricular requirements, foreign language deficiencies, inadequate support services and outreach, and inadequacies in financial aid resources.

Unfortunately, the Task Force's report failed to keep the issues in the forefront of national attention to policy in international education. It did, however, spur many institutions to implement their own internationalization agendas, and a few even went to the extent of requiring a study abroad experience as an integral part of a student's undergraduate degree (i.e. Kalamazoo College).

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) and the Office of International Education and Graduate Programs (IEGP) of the U.S. Department of Education

---

launching of individualised nation-state initiatives, suggesting a fierce competition for recognition, for increased visibility, or even for possible financial gain, possibilities that require further investigation.

[9] The de-intensification of terms from unity to integration to harmonization are characteristic of the obstacles with which the EU is currently faced with regard to a collective strategy.

[10] The Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange in 1988 arrived at the following statement: The role of the United States as a leader among nations is changing rapidly. Despite our position of International leadership for almost fifty years, we are ill-prepared for the changes in business, manufacturing, diplomacy, science and technology that have come with an intensely interdependent world. Effectiveness in such a world requires a citizenry whose knowledge is sufficiently international in scope to cope with global interdependence (Educating For Global Competence, 1988; 1).

offer small institutional grants for US institutions to develop partnerships with their counterparts in the EC[11] (FIPSE administered) as well as larger grant programs, Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs (IEGP administered---$67.5 million appropriated for 1999).   Other U.S. government programs include the Fulbright Program ($ 94 million in 1998), the USIA University Affiliations Program (now the USIA's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs---$1.077 billion in 1998), and the National Security Education Program (NSEP--- approx. $8 million of which $2 million is obligated annually for undergraduate scholarships, graduate fellowships, and institutional grants)[12] (Chandler, 1999).  In spite of the absence of a national agenda, there is an overwhelming interest in fostering international ties.

In Canada, the Interamerican Universities Organization (OUI) has proposed that the Canadian Agency for International Development establish the *Colegio de las Américas*, a post-secondary institution that will be physically based in Costa Rica.  This particular initiative suggests that Canada is looking beyond the trilateral relationship of Canada, the United States, and Mexico to include Central and South America.

## THE ASIA-PACIFIC

In the Asia-Pacific region, APEC Study Centres and University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific (UMAP) have identified a number of organisations in the region that are committed to fostering further international ties, with emphasis upon developing Asia Pacific region as a formidable trading zone.  FitzGerald believes that Australia is attempting to align itself with its Asian neighbors in an attempt to accelerate the regionalization of the area as a consequence of globalisation (FitzGerald, 1997).  Of particular relevance to the Australia/Asia partnership is the continuation of twinning programmes.  Also known as a type of offshore scheme, twinning programmes have been the backbone to furthering institutional ties between Australia and Southeast Asia in particular.  Yet, at this writing, twinning programmes along with other forms of offshore delivery, are fueling concerns that education is being commodified, spurring fierce competition between countries to attain or retain students.  In some instances, the development of twinning and other offshore programmes of Australia have had negative repercussions on foreign relations.  As Caston articulates,

> ...such mass movement of students seeking their education in other countries because of perceived deficiencies of places or quality in their own universities cannot really be seen as 'international co-operation'; it is more like competition, and indeed the University of the South Pacific complains about Australian universities unfairly attracting many of the best students from its countries, often with scholarships paid for with government aid funds (Caston, 1996; 6).

---

[11]  FIPSE's program is called The United States-European Union Program for Cooperation in Higher Education and Vocational Training.

[12]   FIPSE and IEGP report to the Department of Education; USIA's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs reports to the State Department; and NSEP reports to the Department of Defense.  According to Frank Frankfort of FIPSE, there is no co-ordinated effort by the United States government to consolidate these programs.  The US national agenda is purposely decentralized, and thus assessing it is problematic.  The dollar figures of governmental appropriations are somewhat misleading, since they have been in steady decline across the board in the 1990s, appropriations have significantly diminished  (USIA's funding in constant dollars is one third less than five years ago), and it is unclear how much money is appropriated strictly for educational exchange or inter-institutional-building relationships.

In spite of their motive or mission, the majority of these individualised programmes and initiatives have limited resources, and as such, are constantly having to concern themselves with sustainable financing. Nonetheless, they act as a bridge. They are more than likely to succeed if they have created a niche for themselves and are not drawn down the path of a "be-all-to-end-all". If they don't succeed, it is assumed that others are likely to take their place. Some scholars like Neave may view the culmination of these developments as more of a "mobilising myth"[13], but it may be that the conceptual ideal behind international co-operation may be the key factor that serves as a catalyst for further co-operation. In other words, the act of co-operating may lead others to seek further co-operation in a domino-type effect. The types of co-operation vary, as they should, but in essence, regionalized educational exchange is evolving into trans-regional ones. It can thus be described that trans-regional educational exchange schemes serve as a geographically-relativistic collection or amalgamation of existing international educational programmes and initiatives that have "spilled over" into regions other than which they were initially intended.

*Conclusion*

Trends have emerged in higher education collaboration. The development of trans-regional educational exchange schemes have arguably been born out of convergent reasoning (neo-liberal thought) through the institutionalisation of educational policy and divergent reasoning (neo-realistic thought) through individualized interests, concerns, and prerogatives. Both are necessary to create a catalyst for change, for the friction between the two keeps things in balance. If anything, neo-liberal institutionalism and neo-realism need to be viewed as complementary within globalization processes.

Some scholars emphasize that there is a shift in attitude from development assistance to development co-operation. Neo-populism asserts the assumption that like-minded intellectuals [leaders] respond to similar situations and issues. Thus, those regions attempting to collectively work together, in economic terms and subsequently in educational terms, there is an increasing need to look at other like-minded models to identify objectives and anticipate the challenges that may lie ahead. There continues to be a need for caution in preserving identities and not overstepping one's bounds to commodify education for one's personal benefit. As regionalized amalgamations take form, it is clear that steps need to be strategically put in place to ensure that homogenization does not happen. Autonomy therefore should take precedence and necessary precautions in place so as not to be undermined.

An assumption can be made that Europe began the trend toward international collaboration. Shared consciousness or "collective wisdom" in education as Teichler prefers to state, has a longstanding history in Europe. Neave identifies it in the late 1700s during the Austro-Hungarian empire. He states, "The Austrian reforms, curtailed though they were, provide a useful exemplar of the general process which, first applied to government, moved progressively back into the university and from there infiltrated steadily downwards by dint of educational provision generally. From being a universal community of belief and faith, territorial unity became equated with the particularism of dynastic loyalty" (Neave, 1997, p. 8). Thus, the shared consciousness of the late 1700s suggests that it was initially perceived as a form of national identity, or more precisely, empire citizenry. North America, taking on

---

13 Neave states, "...the 'European Dimension'...may be classified as 'mobilising myths'...but if myth is to be greater than reality, it has also to be bonded onto that same reality which, in the case of higher education, lies in the individual institution" (Neave, 1997, p. 1).

a more individualized form of consciousness, has historically been less nationalistic but more competitive in focus.

International co-operation is perceived differently around the world. Although a form of developmental assistance, international co-operation is viewed as extending well beyond the realm of relief or preventive aid. The reason is that assistance in the traditional sense has evolved into the notion of joint co-operation, whereby home and host cultures actively engage in working collaboratively for their mutual benefit. What is apparent is the fact that the majority of international university organisations, including international consortia, are not formed on the basis of fostering international co-operation. While international co-operation is extolled as a hallmark of altruism, the underlying mission tends to harken back to economic survival. In sum, the emergence of trans-regional educational exchange schemes may be considered complex forms of international university co-operation, but they may not necessarily offer any service to the world-at-large which is co-operative in its truest sense. It can therefore be concluded that in a Western-dominated environment due to an integrated global economy and the development of economic free trade zones, co-operation will not work without competition. (In making such a statement, this author would like to note a concern that there may be excessive focus on the system versus the individual.) There are numerous nation-states in the world which are unwilling to participate in global economic integration as defined by Europe, North America, and in the Asia-Pacific region.

On a positive note, it is more than likely that new programmes, projects, and initiatives will emerge as a result of co-operation. As indicated by the provisions of free trade agreements, education is increasingly seen as crucial to the well-being of a region, and perhaps more specifically to the nation-state. It therefore appears fruitful that other forms of education will 1) compete for new, emerging markets, and 2) converge to help offset the costs associated with the internationalization of higher education. This should not be seen as a threat, but rather a more even distribution of opportunities to offer more, if not all, an education.

International university organisations, as a result of the domino effect of regionalized educational exchange schemes will continue to proliferate, and thus, emphasize the emergence of trans-regional educational exchange schemes. Although the types of programmes may differ in terms of structure and function over time, there collective force will increasingly influence the way the internationalization of higher education is taught, perceived, funded, and reviewed.