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- A careful and suggestive sketch of Int’n. in Asia-Pacific.
- Focus on ASEAN + 6 embraces considerable diversity: wealthy, Anglophone systems such as NZ and Aust., middle income nations (Thailand, Malaysia), poor nations (Laos and Myanmar). Asian giants: China, India, Japan.
- Confucian heritage (Viet Nam); French legacy (Viet Nam and Cambodia). Soviet influence (Viet Nam).
- Small Pacific nations not included (PNG, Fiji, Vanuatu, New Caledonia), at least two of which are Francophone.
- Significant distinction between major, lengthy international experience, and short-term periods of few weeks.
- Distinction too between systems such as Austr and NZ (far more successful at attracting int'l. students than persuading their own to study abroad, less effective at intn at home), and others where the imbalance is in the other direction?
- Other: Normative v empirical definitions. Table 2: Quant v qual defns. (e.g. Sydney). Theory v Practice
Re-thinking the System level

- In internationalisation, the traditional unit of analysis has long been the nation-state. (Yet many nation states are newer than suspected: Germany 1870 (But NB DDR 1945-1989), Italy 1870, Australia 1901, much of Asia and Africa post WWII…
- Empires also important: China, Greece, Persia, Austro-Hungarian, etc. Meaning..?
- Diaspora, too, challenges the traditional notion of system.
- Religion as basis for mobility: Muslim students from Indonesia, China studying in Malaysian HEIs. (and current Chinese response?)
- Rise of the privates, which in some systems are the more dynamic and entrepreneurial. Elements of internationalisation. Often less well regulated and less researched – how well are they captured in studies of Int’n. ? NB too, rise of multi-nationals such as Laureate (Thailand, Malaysia), Kaplan (Aust., Korea, Singapore). Data is often also now ‘private’. Implications of private HEIs for Equity & Quality.
- Some systems are more entrepreneurial (NZ, Aust); East Asia (China, Japan, Taiwan, Korea) arguably more motivated by projecting their culture, esp. in Asia Pacific region. Malaysia also – intn. as a matter of prestige and status, (but NB some differences between public & private?
- How well are such differences captured by indicators?
Knowledge Diasporas

• For many Asia-Pacific systems, their high-skilled diaspora, some of whom eventually return with new skills, are of growing importance.
• China’s overall diaspora is estimated at between 35 & 50 million, many now highly educated. E.g. Australia. Foreign Talent schemes target *Hua Qiao* +.
• India also has large high-skilled diaspora, & has Ministry of Oseas. Indian affairs.
• Korean academics often take their Ph. D abroad, (mostly in US), but often return later in life. Special programmes: BK 21
• In all cases, the contribution of knowledge diasporas is highly significant to both source and host systems, and challenges notions of methodological nationalism. How does it affect the understanding of system?
The rise/renaissance of Asia

- 2 important features signify the rise of Asia:
- 1. The rise of China, Singapore and Malaysia as destinations for intl students. PRC e.g. now has 400,000+ intl. students in H/Ed.
- 2. The growth of Asian regionalism (Indonesian students studying in Malaysia, Chinese students in Singapore and vice versa.
- But it is important to recall that e.g. China and India both had major scholarly centres in ancient times, that attracted scholars from abroad.
- Now Xiamen U has established a substantial campus in Malaysia, and Peking Business school a campus at Oxford. Is this the beginning of a wider movement?
- But in many Asian systems, capacity remains an issue: staff, statistics/data, competition for resources. Can UNESCO Bangkok, + UIS + H/Ed. specialists help?
- Declining value of intl degrees? (China: *Hai Gui* → *Hai Dai*). Competitiveness of returnees now declining cf local graduates from leading universities. How good are indicators for this?
Intl Res collaboration in Asia Pacific (1)

• This is clearly growing, despite the considerable diversity within the region.

• Underpinned by quant. and qual. growth of H/Ed in several systems, including intentions to build world class HEIs (esp Singapore, Malaysia)

• BUT it is very uneven, with more developed systems more actively engaged, and non-english language collaboration less evident.

• League Tables, World Class Universities → more pressure to publish in ‘leading international’ journals, mostly in English. (impact on local research, languages and cultures)?

• Rise of China VIP: in some fields PRC now Australia’s leading knowledge partner.
The scientific gap is narrowing: during 1998-2008, articles published by Australia e.g. rose from 16,432, to 28,313, a growth rate of 72%.

BUT Indonesia’s rate of growth over the same period, (off a much lower base) was 113%, China’s 363%, Malaysia’s 312%, Philippines’ 137%, Thailand’s 383% and Viet Nam’s 341%.

This provides the basis for more research collaboration between Asia-Pacific systems.

Databases such as Scopus, InCites are proprietary; but available. Can UIS do more to chart such intl. research collaboration at national level?
Intl Res collaboration in Asia Pacific (3)

- E.g. Australia’s academic collaboration with the region 2000-2011 is mainly with China (18,465 pubns., 256,584 citations), but Singapore, Indonesia, Malaysia also significant. For China, both Australia and Singapore are among its top 10 partners.
- But China is also Malaysia’s largest intl. collaborator; for Phil. China is 3rd largest (For Indonesia and Singapore, Australia is 3rd largest partner).
- In an era of network science, significant, if as yet unexplored potential exists to expand regional knowledge network, which could strengthen alumni networks, as well as boost R&D, and regional relations more generally.
# Australia’s regional academic collaboration 2000-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Publication total 2000-2011</th>
<th>Citation total 2000-2011</th>
<th>Citations per publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>512,042</td>
<td>5,801,020</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- with China</td>
<td>18,465</td>
<td>256,584</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- with Indonesia</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>14,287</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- with Malaysia</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>16,399</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- with Philippines</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>12,613</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- with Thailand</td>
<td>2,387</td>
<td>36,354</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- with Viet Nam</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>8,249</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Globalisation – and Internationalisation

- It is often argued that there are two basic dimensions of Globalisation, each of which are weakening national borders: economic, and cultural.
- But such cultural flows are not new: consider Ancient Greece, Roman Empire, Chinese cultural model (in Korea, Viet Nam, SE Asia).
- But now, as countries around the world open up more and more to the rising tide of financial flows (and to some extent labour flows), it became clear that globalisation was introducing major changes.
- By 1995, only 70 countries (of c. 200) had GNPs of US$10b+; cf. 440+ global companies with sales of US$10b+. In 2010, many US conglomerates had bigger budgets than many countries.
- Many of these TNCs have a truly global footprint (Coca Cola, Xerox, Shell, Volkswagen, Toyota, News Ltd), and earn much of their income internationally. Most are headquartered in ‘Global North’ - but not all (Korean Chaebol, Chinese Haier, Alibaba, TenCent) - and have a global strategy for development (and tax avoidance), as well as corporate training for international executives.
- If global Kapitalism is the most influential, is it changing intn, in the Asia Pacific? Including TCC & GATS? Australia moved from Intn as Aid, to Intn as Trade from mid 1980s - this transition influencing other Asian systems? Indicators for relation between Intn. & inequality?
- Growing role of English as platform for Internationalisation. Impact?
Internationalisation Matrix
(after Bray and Thomas, 1995)