

INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN EMERGING EUROPE. A DIACHRONIC PERSPECTIVE

Constantin HALANGESCU*

Abstract: *The dynamics and implications of internationalization vary quite considerably among different regions and countries, depending on the history and structure of their Higher Education systems. With a target to become the most competitive and dynamic economy in the world, Europe has scaled academic mobility, partnerships between the European Research Area and the world's top universities. The aim of this paper is to present some considerations regarding the internationalization of academic space in emerging European countries; more specifically it is an analytical review of the opinions on the phenomenon of internationalization in diachronic perspective of its development, in order to distinguish the structural problems at the level of interference, of the internationalization strategies before the economic crisis in the academic phenomenon. It can be a point of view in order to prove (argued by some causal relationship) that the academic Emergent Europe manifest itself in a differentiated manner, even if the strategies are common.*

Keywords: Internationalization, Emerging Europe, Higher Education, Bologna Process, mobility

JEL Classification: I23, I29, P36

Introduction

It is widely recognized that the epistemological and ontological-axiological power belonging to a paradigm for current reform of Higher Education (HE) can not constitute the *sine qua non* conditionality to impose a new contemporary paradigm. There are two safe ways: the ability of the new paradigm to respond to accumulated anomalies of previous reforms cycle and the ability to integrate the new socio-economic realities that are emerging at national, regional or global level. According to Altbach (2010), the strategic role of HE is to seek solutions to the inherent challenges and opportunities brought by globalization and the emergence of a truly global University, not only plans to compete worldwide in exchange of resources (teachers, researchers, students, infrastructure). Also, the strategic role is not only a response to aggressions of emerging economies that generated asymmetric interdependencies within metamorphosis of academic paradigms. Uneven economic development, with asymmetric consequences in the global academic landscape has led to a social mobility marked by variations and diversity, differences between educational systems and therefore the academic world is not called just to respond to change, but also to initiate changes. Outsourcing benefits through internalization redesigned the university education functions, and although HE is increasingly perceived as a commodity to be traded, it should be noted that international academic

*Post-PhD Fellow, SOP HRD/159/1.5/133675 Project, Romanian Academy Iasi Branch, e-mail: constantin.halangescu@uaic.ro

landscape in the 21st century society is driven and revolves around paradigms of internationalization, Americanization, Europeanization and globalization. (Deem, 2008).

The process of globalization and the construction of a united Europe, the knowledge society, the increased dynamic of labor markets and capital flows, human resources and information, visible gaps between regional education systems in Europe countries, multiplying "factorial" of HE providers, the increasing global competition between and / or among universities - these are key elements in what I could afford to be called the domino effect between the Bologna Process and the triumph of values.

With the ambition to become the most competitive and dynamic economy at a global scale, Europe has scaled the academic mobility, cooperation in quality assurance, partnerships between the European Research Area and the world's top universities. Given that it was *the cradle of University* by streamlining the provisions of the Bologna Process with full roll in the Lisbon Strategy in the context of internationalization, with position as *sine qua non* element on a global scale, inextricably linked in the amalgam of research and performance demanded by a knowledge based society, Europe is cheering *in-ad-per se* the *domino effects* in the global academic structure.

In the following, we present some considerations regarding the internationalization of the European academic space, especially the so-called Emerging Europe states; more specifically it is a scoring key opinions on the phenomenon of internationalization in diachronic perspective of its development, without it exhaustive treatment (the literature is generous on this topic) in order to distinguish, in a comparative manner, the structural problems at the level of interference, of the internationalization strategies before the economic crisis in the academic phenomenon of emerging markets of Europe.

1. Internationalization - some considerations of theoretical background

The concept of internationalization, for a very long period of time was associated or related to globalization, europeanization, westernization, americanization, terms that have received attention from researchers of different academic disciplines from the last decade of the last century and although phenomena have been widely discussed, interpretations of these concepts still differ among scientists. Held *et al.* (2004), for example, emphasizes persuasive and, from our point of view very realistic, that "*there is no universally agreed definition for globalization*". In addition to the complicated boundary and coherent use of these terms, concepts, processes is difficult due to the complexity of studying inter-relational dynamics involved. With regard to contextual factors, they

can be used to identify general trends (e.g. *society europeanization* or *globalization of the economy*), and for certain policies (European HE policy, national policy of internationalization in HE) and activities that promote the internationalization of HE (exchange students, internationalization of curricula etc.).

The globalization of human society and dynamic role of HE in this process is an important reason for the development of human society (Wit, 2013). Teichler (2004), Scott (2005), Altbach (2006), Wit (2008), Knight (2008), Leask *et al.* (2011) and others have described in detail the complex relationship between globalization and internationalization in HE.

According to Scott (2005, p. 14), the distinction between internationalization and globalization is not categorical, since they overlap and are interrelated in every way possible. Frans van Vught *et al.* (2002, p. 117) states that "*In terms of practice and the perceptions, the internationalization is seen like closer traditions, well established, on international cooperation and mobility to core values of quality and excellence, while globalization means more competition, pushing the concept of HE as a product sold, refusing the concept of HE as a public good.*" But in recent years, the term of globalization was replaced by internationalization in the public debate on HE, resulting at the same time, a shift in semantics and meaning of the phenomenon: „*the term tends to be used for any supra-regional phenomenon related to education academic and/or any global scale, corresponding to HE characterized by market and competition.*”(Teichler, 2004, p. 24).

Although different accents and connotations can be seen and it can be said that the general perception is that globalization is a social, economic and political process to which HE is responding, while the internationalization is understanding how to the HE is responding and acting in this process. The common denominator of the opinions is that globalization is an external process affecting HE. Scott (2005) believes that HE institutions are agents of globalization, while Marginsons (2000) argues that universities are the most globalized institutions, although other researchers often claim the national character of HE. These opinions do not necessarily contradict each other, only the starting point in the analysis of different researchers. As places that produce and transfer the knowledge, HE institutions are global. On the other hand, the same institutions of HE, as argue Van der Wende (2001, p. 254), are incorporated belong to the nation-state, they are strongly shaped by national context, especially because most of them are funded by governments.

During the last 600 years there have been a few significant periods of cross-border student and scholar flows and the emergence of few university-based intellectual hubs attracting them – for example, in England, Italy, and Germany (Zgaga, 2008). In the last 50 years, a number of institutions, mainly in North American and Europe, expanded their cross-border educational and research

networks, some widely so. Yet, the majority of HE institutions remained internationally unengaged or minimally so. Even among engaged institutions student opportunities for education abroad, exposure to internationalized curricula and courses, and faculty cross-border research activity extended to the few, not to the many. Mainstreaming access to cross-border learning and research/discovery was not generally the objective (Huzdik, 2013, p. 48).

Internationalizations has a long history in HE (Wit, 2002). However, its shape and purpose has undergone many changes since the Middle Ages. Various phases in the internationalization of HE and various types of response to an increasingly mobile and diverse student and staff population have been described in the literature (e.g. Vita, 2007).

Internationalization is not a static phenomenon, but a constantly evolving process. The main stakeholders: international organizations, national governments, regions, institutions of HE, faculties and students, have to understand and react to this process and define their niche in it.* “*Internationalization is changing the world of HE, and globalization is changing the world of internationalization*”, remarks Jane Knight (2008, p. 1). She (2008, pp. 22-24) also states that we can see now basically two components evolving in the internationalization of HE.†

When we talk about internationalization, it is important to distinguish the question of why we are internationalizing the HE, from what we mean by internationalization. Many documents, policy papers and books refer to internationalization, but do not define the why. The global HE landscape and its international dimensions have been changed over the past five years, even more than in the decade before. The global competition for talent, the emergence of international branch campuses, the growing of complexity in the cross-border activity are just some of the issues that until recently were not at the forefront of HE debates. The dynamics and implications of internationalization vary quite considerably among different regions and countries depending on the history and structure of their HE systems, national and institutional resources, and their respective geopolitical locations and aspirations.‡

*Over the past ten years one can note a whole new group of terms emerging which were not actively present before in the debate about internationalization of HE. These are much more related to the cross-border delivery of education and are a consequence of the impact of globalization of society on HE: borderless education, education across borders, global education, offshore education and international trade of educational services.

† One is *internationalization at home* – activities that help students to develop international understanding and intercultural skills. Activities under this at home dimension are: curriculum and programs, teaching and learning processes, extra-curricular activities, liaison with local cultural/ ethnic groups, and research and scholarly activities. And the second movement is that of *internationalization abroad*, including all forms of education across borders: mobility of students and faculty, and mobility of projects, programs and providers.

‡ Generally, internationalization processes and activities are mediated through and involve six sets of actors, namely, international actors, bilateral actors, interregional actors, regional actors, sub regional actors, and national actors. Each category can be further subdivided and the composition and relative power of the various actors varies among regions and countries.

Internationalization over the years has moved from a reactive to a pro-active strategic issue, from added value to mainstream. It also has seen its focus, scope and content evolve substantially. Increasing competition in HE, the commercialization and the increased cross-border delivery of HE, have challenged the value traditionally attached to cooperation: exchanges and partnerships. At the same time, the internationalization of the curriculum and the teaching and learning process (*Internationalization at Home*) has become as relevant as the traditional focus on mobility (both degree mobility and mobility as part of the home degree).

2. “Internationalization of Europe” or “Europeanization for All”?

In presenting Europe as a case study, we have to keep in mind that Europe is not a homogeneous region; still less is its education homogeneous, as the rationales behind the *Bologna Declaration* on the European space for HE of 1999 make manifest. This implies that when analyzing internationalization and globalization of HE in Europe, one has to take account of several important issues, such as national and regional differences, diversity of the language, different educational traditions and systems, diversity of stakeholders, and the coexistence of universities and a strong non-university sector. The historical analyses, which shows the diachronic perspective of the phenomenon of internationalization in Europe, accredit certain stages of development of the phenomenon (see *Table 1*), which are similar phases, in general, the main actions of the European Commission (EC) on HE.

Table 1 – The main phases of internationalization in Europe

Autor	Phases
Brouwer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1951-1972, the phase of incidental cooperation; • 1972-1977, the preparatory phase of European co-operation in education; • 1977-1986, the first phase of implementation of educational programmes, mainly based on intergovernmental cooperation; • 1986-1993, the second phase of implementation, mainly based on action by the EU; • 1993 onwards, the first phase of implementation of the EU Treaty for EU co-operation
Field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1957-1973, education and training received relatively little interest; • 1974-1985, development of some interest but mainly in vocational training; • 1986-1992, education becomes a significant area of policy for the EU;

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1992 onwards, development of a more radical approach seeking to promote the concept and practice of the learning society |
|--|--|

Source: Wit, 2001, p. 43

As Wit (2001, p. 43) indicates, to understand the present European situation, it is essential to place current developments in a historical perspective. Macro-historical changes affecting the international dimension of Europe's HE were: the emergence of nation-states in the nineteenth century and earlier; Europe's historical role in the world, in particular its role in colonization and in the process of de-colonization; the impact of HE in countries such as France, Germany and the United Kingdom on HE in the rest of the world; the recent trends in European integration; the collapse of the former Soviet Union and associated East-West rapprochement; the recession and financial constraint; the „massification” of HE; the dissolution of some structures and blocs and the emergence of others. Some characteristics, by decades, can be associated in historical development of internationalization in Europe:

- the 1950s and 1960s: Laisser-Faire
- the 1970s: the first steps to policies of europeanization in education
- the 1980s: the great leap forward (individual mobility, the research and technological development programmes, the mobility programmes, the involvement of the EC with the rest of the world)
- after 1996: towards harmonization of systems and structures

The novelty of the last two decades, the *Bologna Process* has generated profound and multidimensional transformations, both within the European Union (EU) and globally.*

The challenges imposed by globalization made entirely Bologna Process as a real metamorphosis of the old medieval-academic concepts and values that generated new axiological dimensions in the knowledge society: the coexistence of cultures, the increasing of competition of academic mobility of students, the university autonomy, the sustainability and the identity of universities, the quality assurance, the rediscovering and redefining the relationship between knowledge and vision in terms of three-dimensional set of skills, the creativity and research.

* Of course, about the objectives and principles, provisions, development, the implementation and the Process effects have written many pages in the manner *pro* or *contra*, diachronic and synchronic, analytical and synthetic, official and journalistic, into socio-cultural, economic, managerial reflexes, at the level of authority and "through the eyes of students", but what is relevant is that the entirety of, the Bologna Process created and resized European values, he transplanted more or less on a global scale, imposed a new way of thinking and designing the entire system of HE. By developing a common set of coordinates and reference points and the mutual recognition of accreditation has created new conditions for cross-border mobility. The result was as: forming a European dimension that facilitate compatibility and comparability of national systems of HE, ECTS as "convertible currency", European cooperation in quality assurance, student-centered learning and "outcomes" based skills.

The meeting between Humboldtian heritage (which even today underpins the American academic system) and the Bologna Process, requiring unanimous ubiquitous existence of values and integrated structures in different national contexts, has led to various dilemmas and paradoxes (NVAO, 2011a, NVAO, 2011b). European educational policy generated by the Bologna Process, grafted on variations of philosophies of life long learning, towards the learning society, triggered multiple and quasi-governmental reforms, for scientific quality assurance and internationalization.

The Bologna Process and emerging *European HE Area* (EHEA) are not only transforming substance and structure of systems and institutions, but have become powerful drivers for change with many countries enacting reform agendas that go beyond the action lines of the process (Reichert 2009).

With the ambition to become the most competitive and dynamic economy on a global scale, Europe has scaled the academic mobility, the cooperation in quality assurance, the partnerships between the European Research Area and the world's top universities (Zgaga, 2006).*

Given that was *the cradle of the University*, Europe has increased today the visibility of its mobility programs. And this is circumscribed relationship between the overall qualifications, governance and academic autonomy, the attractiveness of the EHEA, the diversity of society (Knight, 2010).

Undoubtedly, the internationalization of European academic mobility generated by specially designed programs, led to development of integrated services that are more professional. These systems, initially focused on student mobility, today focuses attention on the phenomenon of europeanization through internationalization (Vught *et al.*, 2002).

Significantly, the objectives of “common” European national systems adopted in 2001, were developed by *Education & Training 2010* initiative, whose characteristic - *wider opening up to the world* - is the current major political, policy actions multiplied by the *Europe 2020 Strategy*.

The *Erasmus Programme is one that marks the most direct and concrete way the phenomenon of internationalization in Europe.*[†] Was initiated by the European Commission 25

* The EU's objective of becoming the most competitive economy at globally level in 2010 did not succeed, and not only because of the effects of the recession and sovereign debt crisis, because in the years 2006 and 2007 the R&D funding has not progressed, the average 1.9% of EU GDP allocated to this area remaining constant for almost 5 years. The objective of allocating 3% remained without interest even after 2012, related fields such as financial support mobility of students, teachers and researchers by *Erasmus Mundus Programme* knowing even a substantial cut.

† The European Mobility Policy is contextualized by a series of programs and measures While Erasmus is the most important instrument for countries in the program Lifelong Learning, Tempus and Erasmus Mundus Mobility provides conditions for non-EU countries, although countries eligible for these programs extend beyond the SEIS. CEEPUS program supports academic mobility and cooperation between universities in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, and the same sub-program NORDPLUS, subvention cooperation and collaboration in the Nordic-Baltic region of Europe.

years ago, in a time that the Commission even not had a mandate on education, the community only had eleven members and the Iron Curtain was still present. The programme continues to have a great impact on the development of Europe and its HE. *

The proposal by the European Commission for a new “*Erasmus for All*” programme reflects this global approach to Erasmus and the ambition of the Commission to extend the scope and targets of the programme: an additional 5 million students studying abroad between 2014 and 2020.

While the Bologna ministers of education in their 2012 biannual meeting in Bucharest kept firm to their aspiration to have 20% mobility, the figures though are showing a different picture. In most countries the number of mobile students is still below 5%. There is an increased concern about the focus on numbers and percentages, which moves away from the need to concentrate on the content and the quality of the international experience.

3. Effects of internationalization in Emerging Europe

The opening-up of Central and Eastern Europe has had an enormous impact on HE in this region and on co-operation between institutions of HE between Western and actual emergent states from Central and Eastern Europe.† As Kallen (1991) points out, academic co-operation and exchange already existed before this opening-up and was developing rapidly in the 1980s, in particular with Poland and Hungary. Co-operation concentrated mainly on staff exchanges and far less on student exchanges. From the point of view of the regimes in these countries, academic cooperation was mainly a political issue and little institutional or personal autonomy was possible. Although, as Cerych (1996) states, the opening-up of Central and Eastern Europe had a global effect, the increase in academic mobility with Western Europe was quantitatively greater than with any other area. Regional proximity and the political push by national governments and the EC formed the basis for this strong inner-European academic co-operation. The EC, through its so-called PHARE programme, opened the way in 1989 for several forms of co-operation, both in R&D and in education.

* In 1987, 3244 students spent a part of their study in another member country. Three million students have followed their example in the past 25 years and the number of countries has grown from 11 to 33, including non-EU members such as Croatia, Iceland, Lichtenstein, Norway, Turkey and Switzerland. The budget of the programme for the period 2007-2013 is EUR 3.1 billion. More than in numbers of mobile students, the impact of the programme has been on the internationalization and the reform of HE. *Erasmus Programme* has paved the way for the reform of European HE under the Bologna Process, has been a pilot for its study point scheme ECTS, and was an initiator for the opening up to countries in Central and Eastern Europe to EU-membership, as it is for current aspiring candidate members. The programme stimulated both national governments and institutions of HE to develop European and international strategies. See more at: http://ec.europa.eu/education/tools/lp_en.htm#tab-4

† On 16 July 2012, the IMF has labeled emerging economies of the countries of Europe: Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and. See more about that at: <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2012/update/02/index.htm>

An example is the „*Trans European Mobility Programme for University Studies*”, the *Tempus* scheme.*

HE systems and institutions in Emergent Europe were profoundly challenged by political turmoil of the late 1980s and early 1990s, but not only. As it has been argued by Zgaga, (2007, 63, 2009), it is possible to differentiate between a political transition as the challenge of an open and pluralistic society, and a global transition as the challenge of the “*emerging knowledge society*” (here we do not enter in detailed definition). The former was mainly a characteristic of the former socialist countries in Europe while the latter is much more complex. If the deep changes seen in the educational systems of the former socialist countries in the 1990s are only understood as “something” linked to a political transition (e.g. as a necessary adaptation of education to the new political order) then they are being misinterpreted and not understood in their true complexity.

There have certainly been some common features in HE across all these emergent countries. Everywhere, for example, numbers of students started to grow immensely in the early 1990s and, since then, access to HE has been a constant issue of policy and public debates. Very soon, private institutions started to appear: it was a totally new phenomenon almost everywhere. State budgets were decreasing very fast and public universities entered serious troubles; they started to charge student fees what was also unimaginable before.

HE systems in this group of countries had the same (and one) “forefather”; transformation of the former Soviet empire into independent states brought new challenges also to their HE systems. Not only in these countries but everywhere, national systems of HE, an idea and a reality which emerged in Europe in late 18 and early 19 century (but did not exist before), confronted with the requirements of the emerging knowledge society and globalization trends at the end of 20 century. Even the biggest national systems understood that, for their own sake, they have to open and to cooperate with others, to search for “comparability and compatibility”.

However, as Zgaga (2009) assert, challenges and opportunities of building EHEA have had specific echoes in European emerging countries. For various reasons, these specific echoes have been accompanied by a specific semantics. In political and public discourses terms like “European standards” or “European requirements” contain a specific “value code”. It can be positive and stimulative, but not always and everywhere. Thus, the Bologna Process has been sometimes transformed into a tool of convincing, motivating and pushing forward various actors in HE as well as broad public. After such translation, “Bologna” sounds as something what “they expect from us”, as a sort of “directive from above”: “We must do it because it is European”.

*http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/programme/history_tempus_en.php

In the following, for reasons of systematization,* we present, for each of the seven emerging countries of Europe, some of the most important actions and effects of those measures by which governments have tried to adapt to the internationalization strategies promoted in the whole Europe.

Table 2 – The main action, effects and responses of emergent European country to internationalization

Country	Actions, effects, responses
Bulgaria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bulgaria is among the 30 European countries included in the second phase of SOCRATES II programme. The finances for the implementation of the Programme run up to 1 850 000 000 Euro for all activities and a seven years period 2000-2006. • With the 2004 amendments of the Law on HE Bulgaria gave the HE institutions opportunity to sign on their own contracts with international higher schools that concern mobility of students and academic staff. The main obstacle for outgoing student mobility is the insufficient financial support. Universities are not rich enough to set aside significant support funds, so availability of national support funds for student grants become very important. • The mobility of the academic teachers is provided by special funds held by the government, but there is a need of greater financial support for mobility grants. • The incoming student mobility has risen for the academic year 2005-2006 alone, by 29%, and that of the lecturers by 48%. Bulgaria has signed so far 60 bilateral arrangements, agreements and programmes for cooperation and exchange in the field of education and science. • Students participating in Leonardo da Vinci programmes as a share of vocational students at ISCED 3 was increased with 0.6% in 2010 and 0.8% in 2013. Erasmus inbound students as % of student population in host country: 0.3% in 2013. Inbound international degree mobile students as % of student population in the host country: 3.5 in 2010 and 3.9 in 2013.
Estonia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since 1998, Estonia has participated in the Erasmus cooperation programme of the European Union. The mobility of researchers which often includes tuition is rather common in Estonian universities. A systematic exchange of lecturers began in connection with the Tempus Phare assistance programme of the EU and later due to the implementation of the Erasmus cooperation programme of the EU. • The biggest factor influencing student mobility out of the country is socio-economic discrepancies. The legislative framework supports mobility schemes - student loans are portable, there are very few signals regarding failure of academic recognition of studies abroad. For inward mobility in 2006 there were first steps made on the national level in order to bring in third country nationals for PhD studies. • The national strategy for HE internationalization foresaw the agreement of code of conduct for internationalization by HE. Agreement on Good Practice in the Internationalisation of Estonia's HE Institutions is signed by 21 Estonian HEI-s active in

*In another paper (*Emerging Europe between the Bologna Process and the post-crisis internationalization*) I presented, in a more extensive manner, with related statistical data, in what has evolved academic internationalization of emerging European countries in the period 2006-2013, at the level of student mobility and the effects of economic and financial crisis on this mobile. See at: <http://www.upm.ro/ccci3/CCI-03/Eco/Eco%2003%2054.pdf>.

	<p>internationalization (including public, state and private institutions). The Agreement has taken into account the principles prescribed in OECD/ UNESCO Guidelines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students participating in Leonardo da Vinci programmes as a share of vocational students at ISCED 3 was increased with 2.6% in 2010 and 3.5% in 2013. Erasmus inbound students as % of student population in host country: 1.6% in 2013. Inbound international degree mobile students as % of student population in the host country: 1.8 in 2010 and 2.3 in 2013. • The amendments to the Law on Foreigners that came into force on 1 September 2013 aim to simplify the process for students from non-EU countries to access HE in Estonia, enabling them to work during their studies and to enter into employment after graduation. One important amendment abolishes the requirement for students who already have been issued residence permits for studying to apply for work permits.
Hungary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the 2001-2002 academic year, the Ministry of Education has provided additional support for social purposes so that talented but socially disadvantaged students be not excluded from the Erasmus programme. Students are free to use the additional support during their stay abroad to cover any expenses necessary for their studies. For the 2003 round of the Leonardo da Vinci programme, the Ministry of Education earmarked an amount of about 420.000 EUR for additional support from the development and training part of the Labour Market Fund. • In the Erasmus programme, students coming to Hungary may separately apply to participate in a 1 or 2 month intensive language course organised by the host institution before they start their placement in Hungary. • The two-way mobility of academic staff is asymmetric: the intensity of outward mobility well exceeds that of inward mobility. The main obstacles to inward mobility are: scarcity of financial resources, limits posed by a special language. • Students participating in Leonardo da Vinci programmes as a share of vocational students at ISCED 3 was increased with 1,4% in 2010 and 2013 too. Erasmus inbound students as % of student population in host country: 1.0% in 2013. Inbound international degree mobile students as % of student population in the host country: 4.0 in 2010 and 4.6 in 2013. • In July 2013, the national rules for setting the number of fully state financed university places changed: to attract the most talented students, the quota system was replaced by minimum score requirements per study programmes that applicants have to achieve and admission also depends on the programme capacities of HE institutions. In 2013, 57 544 students (74.5 % of all) were admitted to state funded programmes and 56 913 (77% of all) in 2014. • An important objective in modernising and internationalising HE is to create vocational training at higher levels.
Latvia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student and staff mobility has grown during the years of Bologna process, but the growth is slow. Student mobility would more or less fit the Bologna goals, if 10% of students had the possibility to complete a study period abroad. In practice it means that every year at least 2% of students should complete a study period abroad. • The main obstacle for outgoing student mobility is the insufficient financial support available for student grants. Universities are not rich enough to set aside significant support funds, so availability of national support funds for student grants become very important. Concerning incoming students there still is insufficient interest to come for

	<p>studies to Latvia. The main obstacles are the language and also the fact that Latvian universities are not widely enough known internationally, so they are not always seen as attractive by the foreign students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To facilitate student mobility from Latvian HEI the government allocated 203,950 EUR for Erasmus student grants for the academic year 2003/2004 and 217.390 EUR for the academic year 2004/2005. For the year 2003/2004 this national support has given 32% increase of Erasmus student mobility. • In Erasmus Programme the number of incoming teachers is higher than the number of outgoing teachers. To make it more balanced and to facilitate teacher mobility, government allocated financial support from national sources for Erasmus teachers 31.019 EUR for the year 2003/2004 and 42.790 EUR for the year 2004/2005. Staff mobility for longer periods unfortunately may sometimes lead to brain drain. Mobility for short periods is growing intensively since there are less funding obstacles to travelling. • Students participating in Leonardo da Vinci programmes as a share of vocational students was increased with 1.3% in 2010 and 2.1% in 2013. Erasmus inbound students as % of student population in host country: 0.9% in 2013. Inbound international degree mobile students as % of student population in the host country: 2.9 in 2013. • The HE reforms announced in 2012/2013 and concerning accreditation, financing, consolidation of institutions and internationalisation are progressing more slowly than initially planned. A new HE financing model, based on European best practice, which would aim to increase quality, internationalisation and labour market relevance of HE, is currently being prepared in cooperation with experts from the World Bank. The new funding model is planned to be implemented by 2016.
Lithuania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lithuanian HE institutions actively participate in the international collaboration: take part in various international programmes, sign agreements with foreign institutions of HE, based on which the mechanism of international exchange of students, scientists and teachers operates. The exchange programmes were also induced by a successful implementation of such international programmes as – Tempus, Phare, Copernikus, Framework, and ACE. • Lithuanian HE institutions have been involved in the Socrates programme since 1999/2000. Initially, 12 universities took part in the programme. Since 2000/2001 all HE institutions have become involved in the Socrates. • Starting with the year 2002 the annual national budgeted allocation for Socrates/Erasmus programme has been 9.1 mln.litas (2.63 mln. EUR). 6.2 mln. litas (1.79 mln. EUR) go directly to mobile student grants. All these exchange students are also eligible for extra support through the Lithuanian State Science and Studies Foundation as well as bank loans on the individual basis. • A senior academic staff member is allowed to take a sabbatical every five years and, increasingly, this time is being used for the stay at an institution abroad. The grants they receive usually are from international agencies and foundations. Socrates/Erasmus programme plays an important role in the whole scheme of the teaching staff mobility. The HEI receive 0.4 mln. litas (0.1 mln. EUR) of extra funding for Erasmus teaching staff mobility. There are no obstacles for the staff coming to Lithuania for the short duration stay. • Students participating in Leonardo da Vinci programmes as a share of vocational students at ISCED 3 was increased with 2.8% in 2010 and 3.9% in 2013. Erasmus inbound students

INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN EMERGING EUROPE

	<p>as % of student population in host country: 1.1% in 2013. Inbound international degree mobile students as % of student population in the host country: 1.5 in 2010 and 1,8 in 2013.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The action plan for internationalisation of HE for 2013-16 was approved in 2013. Its aim is to identify the main areas in which internationalisation of HE institutions and the development of Lithuanian (or Baltic) studies abroad can be promoted, and to strengthen ties with Lithuanians and those of Lithuanian origin living in other countries. In view of the very small number of vocationally oriented HE programmes, the government has increased funding for maths, science and technology faculties, reduced the number of HE institutions and introduced external evaluations of these institutions.
<p>Poland</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 1990 Polish students have begun to visit HE institutions of EU member states. This date marks Poland and Hungary's entry into the TEMPUS Programme whose aim is to serve as a non-return EU help destined for HE systems in countries of Central and Eastern Europe. In the whole period circa 13,000 students were granted scholarships to foreign HE institutions in various EU member states. • Principles of student mobility worked out through the SOCRATES/ Erasmus Programme are first and foremost focused on the student's good interest and highly facilitate his/her studies in HE institutions of the EU member states. • Participation of Polish academic teachers in the Erasmus Topic Networks has similar advantages and it seems that Polish teachers understand it more nowadays. Among partners of the Topic Networks functioning in the 1998/1999 academic year, Polish HE institutions hardly appeared, whereas in the current year Polish institutions were mentioned as the Network partners over 100 times. • The benefits of academic teachers mobility, are increasingly obvious. This form of education is weakened due to a shortage of funds and minor importance of teaching achievements in the assessment of a teacher's work. • Particular attention was given to measures increasing inward student mobility: the development of new courses in widely spoken EU languages; arrangements making International Relation Offices in HEIs more efficient so that they could provide better services to foreign students. However, despite gradual improvement, the disproportion between outward and inward mobility is still substantial. • Students participating in Leonardo da Vinci programmes as a share of vocational students at ISCED 3 was increased with 0.5% in 2010 and 0.6% in 2013. Erasmus inbound students as % of student population in host country: 0.4% in 2013. Inbound international degree mobile students as % of student population in the host country: 0.9 in 2010 and 0.2 in 2013. • Poland belongs to the group of countries that come most of the students SEIS, along with Germany, France, Russia, Ukraine, Italy, Slovakia and Greece.
<p>Romania</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student and teaching staff exchange programs were set beginning with 1991 within the TEMPUS program between Romanian universities and universities in EU countries. Starting with the academic year 1990/1991, several Romanian universities have offered complete study programs in foreign languages like English, French and German, along with the education in Romanian. The teaching staff and the support material for learning have been prepared with technical assistance from partner universities in Great Britain, France or Germany and with financial support

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HE institutions in Romania have been involved in Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci programs starting 1997. After 1998, over 9,000 students were granted mobilities within the Erasmus program. During the academic year 2002/2003 45 universities participated in ERASMUS activities, involving approximately 2,400 students. • The Black Sea Universities network was created in 1997 upon a Romanian initiative in order to develop co-operation among universities from member states of the Economic Cooperation of the Black Sea area, in the field of education, science. • Starting with 1998 Romanian universities have taken part in projects developed within the CEEPUS Programme. After 1998, over 1500 students and teaching staff have been involved. During the 2002/2003 academic year, 16 universities have taken part in 18 such networks. For the academic year 2003/2004 the sum allotted for Erasmus mobilities was 3.100.000 EUR and 3.122.308,38 were spent and a number of 3005 students have participated in mobility programmes. • In the academic year 2003/2004, 807 Romanian exchange teaching staff was involved in mobilities and in the academic year 2002/2003, 330 foreign teaching staff came to Romanian universities. • In the case of Romania, the best example of portability is the regional portability of social support for mobile students within the regional exchange program CEEPUS. It is based on a multilateral agreement between participating countries and has as objective the promotion of university networks. • Students participating in Leonardo da Vinci Programmes as a share of vocational students at ISCED 3 was increased with 0.2% in 2010 and 0.3% in 2013. Erasmus inbound students as % of student population in host country: 0.2% in 2013. Inbound international degree mobile students as % of student population in the host country: 1.3 in 2010 and 2.4 in 2013. • The internationalisation of Romanian universities is a slow process, with few active partnerships with foreign universities. |
|--|---|

Source: Selected data, structured combined and adapted from Bologna Process – European HE Area. National reports (<http://www.ehea.info/article-details.aspx?ArticleId=86>), European Commission, Education and Training Monitor (2012, 2014), European Commission (2014), EACEA/Eurydice (2010, 2012), OECD (2010).

Conclusions

How we seen, the studies on internationalization in HE are extremely numerous and are oriented towards general approach or the structural analysis of different aspects that constitute the essence of the phenomenon of internationalization *in integrum*. In addition, it becomes very obvious that the interpretation of such internationalization as a phenomenon, activity and effect of globalization, include more than the mobility of students and academic staff, the range of problems that are generated by the phenomenon in question knowing a multiple approach for Emergent Europe since 1990s.

The relationship between internationalization, national policy, institutional and regional policies overall HE, even leading to qualitative leaps in this strategic area of emerging markets of

Europe. And this, because the international activities of universities in emerging Europe are no longer considered like at missing and auxiliary level, but have become regular and systemic character. High demand for highly skilled people in developed countries promoted the migration of skilled workers from emerging to developed economies.

The emerging European countries contributed to even broader diversity and to the enrichment of the existing “European treasury” of the “old” member states. However, a splendid rainbow of diversity often brings further questions.

However, despite diversities between as well as within European countries, the Bologna Process has had an enormous impact to new member countries. In last few years, a large number of cooperation projects with “old” and “new” members of the Bologna Process have been running within this framework addressing key topics e.g. developing quality assurance in HE, implementing new degree structures and ECTS, strengthening mobility of students and staff etc.

Since the early 1990s, post-communist European countries have achieved similar development goals. Democratization, integration with the EU, the development of bilateral and multilateral relations, and the economic and political transformation of financial systems, were the most popular achievements of long-term development strategies of the analyzed countries.

The themes of globalization, knowledge economy, EU integration, quality, and efficiency shaped the HE discourses in this period, and expanded the concept of the university mission.

A university was expected to implement simultaneously a variety of functions: generate knowledge, transmit it effectively and efficiently, respond to the needs of the labor economy, educate citizens, and promote democracy. The discourses of national emancipation, de-sovietization and integration with Western European nations underscored transition reforms in emergent Europe.

What we wanted to emphasize in the above considerations (absolutely not exhaustive in relation to the actual reality of the phenomenon of internationalization in Emerging Europe), is that, on the one hand, the emerging countries of Europe have adapted, diachronic differently to the phenomenon of internationalization, even if they had to apply the same common strategy, and on the other hand, that this adaptation is highly dependent on the differences in the economic, social and cultural needs of each nation separately.

Of course, all views expressed are not disparate from those we have expressed in other studies and should be seen as a continuation of their research so that in future, what we have presented above can become starting points for more extensive research.

Acknowledgement

This paper is supported by the Sectoral Operational Programme Human Resources Development (SOP HRD), financed from the European Social Fund and by the Romanian Government under the contract number POSDRU/159/1.5/S/133675.

References

- Altbach, P. G. (2010), "The complex roles of universities in the period of globalization", in: *Higher Education in the World 3: New Challenges and Emerging Roles for Human and Social Development*, Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 5-14, available at: <http://upcommons.upc.edu/revistes/bitstream/2099/8111/1/altbach.pdf> (accessed 24 January 2015).
- Cerych, L. (1996), "East-West Academic Mobility within Europe: trends and issues", in: Blumenthal, P. et al. (eds.), *Academic Mobility in a Changing World: Regional and Global Trends*, Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London.
- Deem, R. (2008), "Producing and Re/producing the Global University in the 21st Century: Researcher Perspectives and Policy Consequences", *Higher Education Policy*. Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 439-456.
- EACEA/Eurydice (2010), "Focus on Higher Education in Europe 2010: The Impact of Bologna Process". Brussels: EACEA.
- EACEA/Eurydice (2012), "Spatiul European al Invatamantului Superior in 2012: Procesul Bologna", available at: <http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice> (accessed 24 February 2015).
- European Commission (2014), "Erasmus - Facts, Figures & Trends. The European Union support for student and staff exchanges and university cooperation in 2012-13", Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
- European Union (2012), "Education and Training Monitor", Publications Office of the European Union Luxembourg, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/education/library/publications/monitor_12_en.pdf (accessed 3 March 2015).
- European Union (2014), "Education and Training Monitor", Publications Office of the European Union Luxembourg, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/education/library/publications/monitor_14_en.pdf (accessed 3 March 2015).
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., Perraton, J. (2004), *Transformari globale*, Polirom, Iasi.

- Huzdik, John K. (2013), "Changing paradigm and practice for HE internationalization", in Wit H. de (ed.), *An introduction to Higher Education Internationalization*, Centre for Higher Education Internationalization, Milan pp. 47-60.
- Kallen, D. (1991), "Academic Exchange in Europe, Towards a New Era of Co-operation", in: CEPES/UNESCO, *The Open Door, Pan European Academic Co-operation, an Analysis and a Proposal*, Bucharest.
- Knight, J. (2008), *Higher Education in Turmoil. The Changing World of Internationalization*, Sense Publishers, Rotterdam.
- Knight, J. (2010), "Internationalization and the Competitiveness Agenda". In Laura M. Portnoi, Val D. Rust and Sylvia S. Bagley (eds.), *Higher Education, Policy, and the Global Competition Phenomenon*. Palgrave Macmillan New York, pp. 205-218.
- Leask, B., Carroll, J. (2011), "Moving beyond wishing and hoping: internationalization and student experiences of inclusion and engagement", *Higher Education Research & Development*, Vol. 30, No. 5, pp. 647-659.
- Marginson, S. (2000), "Rethinking academic work in the global era", *Journal of higher education policy and management*, Vol. 22, No.1, pp. 18-37.
- NVAO, (2011a), "The Assessment of Internationalization, an evaluation of the NVAO's pilot procedures", available at: [http://www.nvao.net/page/downloads/Assessment of Internationalisation An evaluation of the NVAOs pilot procedures-2011-11-14.pdf](http://www.nvao.net/page/downloads/Assessment%20of%20Internationalisation%20An%20evaluation%20of%20the%20NVAOs%20pilot%20procedures-2011-11-14.pdf) (accessed 10 March 2015).
- NVAO, (2011b), "Frameworks for the Assessment of Internationalization", available at: [http://www.nvao.net/page/downloads/Kaders BKK Internationalising Frameworks for the Assessment of Internationalisation 14-11-2011.pdf](http://www.nvao.net/page/downloads/Kaders%20BKK%20Internationalisering%20Frameworks%20for%20the%20Assessment%20of%20Internationalisation%2014-11-2011.pdf) (accessed 10 March 2015).
- OECD (2010), "*Education at a Glance 2010*", OECD, Paris.
- Reichert, S. (2010), „The Unintended Effects of the Bologna Reforms”, *Higher Education Management and Policy*, Vol. 22, Issue 1, pp. 1-20.
- Scott, P. (2005), "The global dimension: internationalising higher education", in: Kehm B., Wit, Hans de (eds.), *Internationalisation in higher education: European responses to the global perspective*. European Association for International Education (EAIE) Amsterdam.
- Teichler, U. (2004), "The Changing Debate on Internationalization of Higher Education", *Education*, Vol.48, pp. 5-26.

- Vita, G. de (2007), "Taking Stock An appraisal of the literature on internationalizing HE learning", in: Jones E., Brown, S. (eds.), *Internationalizing Higher Education*, Routledge, Abingdon, pp. 154-167.
- Vught, F.v., Wende, Marijk van der, Westerheijden, Don (2002), "Globalization and Internationalization: Policy Agendas Compared", in: Enders, J., Fulton, O. (eds.), *Higher Education in a Globalizing World. International Trends and Mutual Observations. A Festschrift in Honors of Ulrich Teichler*, Kluwer Academic Publishers Dordrecht, pp. 103-120.
- Wende, M. C. v. d. (2001), "Internationalisation policies: about new trends and contrasting paradigms", *Higher education policy*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 249-260.
- Wit, H. de (2013), "Internationalization of Higher Education, an introduction on the why, how and what", in: Wit H. de (ed.), *An introduction to Higher Education Internationalization*, Centre for Higher Education Internationalization, Milan, pp. 13-46.
- Wit, H. de (2002). *Internationalization of HE in the United States of America and Europe. A historical, comparative and conceptual analysis*, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut.
- Wit, J.W.M. de (2001), "Internationalization of HE in the United States of America and Europe", available at: <http://dare.uva.nl/record/1/173117> (accessed 2 March 2015).
- Zgaga, P. (2003), "Reforming the Curricula in Universities of South East Europe in View of the Bologna Process". *Higher Education in Europe*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 3, pp. 251-258.
- Zgaga, P. (2006), "Looking out: the Bologna Process in a Global Setting. On the "External Dimension" of the Bologna Process". Oslo, Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research; available at: <http://ceps.pef.uni-lj.si/knjiznica/sodelavci/zgaga.htm> (accessed 5 March 2015).
- Zgaga, P. (2007), "Higher Education in transition. Reconsiderations on Higher Education in Europe at the turn of millennium", Umeå, Umeå University, available at: <http://ceps.pef.uni-lj.si/knjiznica/sodelavci/zgaga.htm>, (accessed 5 March 2015).
- Zgaga, P. (2009), "The Bologna Process and its role for transition countries", *Revista de la Educación Superior*, Vol. XXXVIII (2), No. 150, pp. 83-96.