

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE MODALITIES OF ACADEMIC GLOBALIZATION AND
ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA FOR FUTURE MODELS**

Abdur Rahim Choudhary, Maryland, USA, arc@vahida.org
Rehan Choudhary, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, USA, rehan@umd.edu

ABSTRACT

Different modalities of academic globalization are analyzed in the light of their objectives and their adaptations in different parts of the World. This analysis views academic globalization as part of the globalization phenomenon in general. In this context academic globalization has two different stake holders, namely the providers and the consumers of academic services in a global context. The objectives of academic globalization are different when analyzed from the provider perspective versus the consumer perspective. The academic globalization is most beneficial when there is maximum overlap between these two sets of objectives, and it can be useless when these two sets of objectives are mutually orthogonal. In the case when the two sets of objectives point in opposite directions, the academic globalization can be used as an instrument of subversion. Criteria are presented for the acceptability of Academic Globalization Models. The criteria are intended to be used to construct new models that incorporate these criteria, or to evaluate existing models against these criteria. The criteria take the form of a set of requirements that are formulated with the goal to make the future models widely beneficial for the providers as well as the consumers of the globalized academic services.

INTRODUCTION

In today's practices, academic globalization is treated as part of the globalization phenomenon in general, which is governed by the world trade organization (WTO). The foundations of the phenomenon of globalization were established at the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference at Bretton Woods that took place in July 1944 when the Allied Nations conferred to regulate the International monetary and financial order. Agreements were concluded to set up the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and the International Monetary Fund. The banking, trade, and monetary policies still remain the essence of Globalization today.

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

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

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

The analysis shows that, in the case of academic globalization, the objectives of the providers greatly diverge from the objectives of the consumers. The benefits of the academic globalization are mostly for the providers of the globalized academic services who are from the U.S. or Europe. Any benefits to the consumers are rather incidental [1].

The reasons for the above circumstance are discernable from an examination of the objectives of the providers and consumers of the globalized academic services [see section 0]. The providers' objectives in all existing modalities are well formulated and carefully pursued, while the consumers' objectives are not well deliberated and therefore are not pursuable in any of the existing modalities. Hence new models of academic globalization are urgently needed. In order to avoid the deficiencies of the previous models, it is necessary to establish criteria of acceptability for any emerging models of academic globalization. This paper presents such criteria in the form of a set of requirements that any emerging model should comply with. These requirements are formulated in five areas that together cover all aspects relevant to a model of academic globalization.

WHAT IS ACADEMIC GLOBALIZATION?

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

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

In the context of the above definition of academic globalization, there are cases that might be regarded as ambiguous with respect to their being instances of globalization. One of them is the globalization of the results of academic research for which the following observation [3] is noteworthy:

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

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

A third example comes from the role of the individual academicians who work in a global context, for example through employment, exchange programs, and International collaborations. In general, such individual contributions are understood based on the associations that they have with the institutions.

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

EXISTING MODALITIES

With the above definition and caveats of academic globalization in mind, one needs to examine the different modalities that have been implemented around the world. The following five modalities together cover all existing instances of academic globalization.

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

recently, American sponsored universities have arisen in Kyrgyzstan, United Arab Emirates, Armenia, Bulgaria, and many other parts of the world.

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

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

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

This model is cleaner than the Colonial or Cold War models but requires a caveat against profit-making ventures that advance the hegemony of powerful academic institutions and systems. Some economists see globalization as inevitable, but argue that it works against the interests of developing countries by reinforcing international inequalities [7]. The same result may also be inferred from the fact that the GATS model that also governs the academic globalization does not apply symmetrically in the sense that the developing countries are always on the receiving end of the trade.

Twinning Model: The twinning model establishes a relationship between a university in Euro-America and a university in a developing country, sometimes facilitated by the UNESCO program for International Universities Cooperation.

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

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

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

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

OBJECTIVES OF DIFFERENT MODALITIES

Having clarified the meanings of academic globalization and a taxonomy of the existing modalities of implementing it, the next logical step is to analyze the goals and objectives of academic globalization. These vary with the model used to implement academic globalization, as well as the provider and consumer perspectives. Therefore there is no

single goal behind the academic globalization across these modalities. Rather, there are a large number of goals, separate goals for each modality and separate goals for providers and consumers within each modality. These are depicted below in tabular form.

Table 1: Academic Globalization Objectives within each Modality

Modality	Provider Objectives	Consumer Objectives
Colonial	The goal of the colonial provider is to perpetuate the hold on the colonized through an education that redefines their values and encourages a psychology that accepts the superiority of the colonial power. The goals of the American Universities around the world can be seen similarly, notwithstanding their claims at benevolence.	The colony has no say in the process, and hence can not entertain goals of its own under this model. As regards institutions like the American Universities around the world, there is obviously some level of consent from the consumer side. However, such consent is often the result of American persuasion rather than any specifically designed objectives of the host country.
Cold War	The objectives of the superpowers were to win the hearts and minds of the people of the consumer countries. This winning of the hearts and minds was not unlike the efforts of the Colonial powers at being liked by those whom they colonized.	The consumers in this model do willingly participate, though they seldom or never have well deliberated objectives. The activity is driven by the superpower's objectives, with little or no allowance for the objectives of the consumers. It is helpful to the superpowers if the consumer countries do not have well deliberated objectives.
Campus Extension	The provider objectives in this model are similar to those of a corporation. This aspect emphasizes trade versus education.	The consumer objectives in this model are explicit if rather amorphous. The host countries allow the Euro-American universities to establish their extension campuses because their educational needs exceed what the indigenous universities can provide. Because the extension campuses are commercial enterprises, students who can pay can get admission even if they could not be admitted into the indigenous universities because of merit competition. However, the extension campuses sell the reputation of their parent universities and that of Euro-America as a region, even if the service standards are often found wanting. The aura built and carefully maintained around the extension campuses helps their graduates find better job placements than those of the indigenous universities. This in turn reinforces the aura and further advances the commercial objectives of the providers [9].
Twinning	Twinning objectives are those of the UNESCO program for International Universities Cooperation. They are not explicitly commercial; rather they seek to promote the planned objectives, often socio	The consumer objectives are similar to those for the campus extension model, though in rather selective areas of academic activity. The drawbacks and caveats are similar to those for the campus extension model. There

Modality	Provider Objectives	Consumer Objectives
	economic and political, of the donor countries from Euro-America. These objectives of the donor countries usually do not serve the objectives of the consumer countries.	is however an additional caveat for twinning when UNESCO is involved. The usual criticism applied to the World Bank and IMF applies also to International Universities Cooperation because the same overarching objectives apply in this instance as well.
Franchise	The provider objectives of the franchise model, as might be understood from its name, openly and aggressively seek commercial profit. The motives are very similar to those of a corporate enterprise. The selling point of this model is the reputation of Euro-America as a region, and its institution in particular.	The openly commercial nature of the franchise model, and the relatively unregulated way in which it operates, often attracts profit seeking elements in the consumer countries. So the consumer objectives in this case are more closely aligned with the provider objectives because they are both profit driven. However the objectives of the user community of the resulting academic services in the consumer country are seldom served because the providers of these services are often of low caliber.

EVALUATION OF EXISTING MODALITIES

The discussion above presents five modalities of academic globalization that encompass almost all its instances that exist around the world. All these modalities have their genesis in some historical epochs such as the colonial era, the cold war, the rise of corporations, and the emergence of GATS under WTO. As shown by the discussion on the objectives of academic globalization, the provider objectives diverge from the consumer objectives in all modalities. The franchise model deserves additional explanation because in this model the profit motives align on provider and consumer sides; however, the consumer objectives in this model greatly diverge from the objectives of the end users (students). The end result in the franchise model is often exploitative¹.

The benefits of academic globalization are mostly for the providers of the academic services who are generally in the U.S. and Europe. Any benefits to the consumers are rather incidental and the consumers are at a great disadvantage [10]. The reasons for this situation are clear from the above discussion of the objectives of the providers and consumers. The provider's objectives in all modalities are well formulated and carefully pursued, while the consumer's objectives are never well deliberated and therefore are not pursuable. Hence none of the presently implemented modalities of academic globalization are beneficial to the consumers, though they are clearly beneficial to the providers.

New modalities of academic globalization are therefore needed. An on-line education experiment in Australia [11] is noteworthy because it seeks a future evolution of academic globalization that considers the consumer societies as well as the provider societies. Acceptability criteria and requirements are needed in order to assess any such effort. Such a set of criteria is formulated in the following section.

ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA FOR FUTURE MODALITIES

One of the urgent needs is to formulate a new model of academic globalization that meets the objectives of the consumers and providers. Such a model cannot be standardized based on the input mainly from providers because it must maximize the overlap between the objectives of consumers and providers. This is not possible without active

¹ In a similar way, distinction needs to be made between the providers and the Faculty. The individual academicians that serve on the faculty may have very good intentions but the franchiser/franchisee motives for the profit will often override such intentions.

attention to consumer objectives, as the consumers want to formulate and achieve their goals, not as the providers want to enunciate them and implement them on behalf of the consumers. Hence the presumptuous attitudes of the providers in Euro-America must be rectified and the cultivated reputation of Euro-American institutions must be recalibrated for the reality of the objectives of the consumers. This requires a formulation of the reality checks performed by the researchers in the consumer countries.

This section presents such reality checks and criteria in the form of a set of requirements that any emerging model should comply with. These requirements are formulated in five areas that together cover all aspects relevant to a model of academic globalization. Following are the five areas.

1. *Overarching objectives* are high level goals for any model of academic globalization, both from the consumer and provider perspectives. A model must meet these goals in addition to meeting the criteria in other four areas described below.
2. *Students' needs* must be met according to the understanding and expectations of the student body. In this sense, the students are fundamental stake holders in any model.
3. *The teachers* must help the students to meet their needs, as well as achieve the overarching goals. In addition, the interests of the teachers as stake holders must be served, including the values of academic independence and freedom.
4. *Academic content* that the teachers teach, and the way they teach, must equip the students to meet their needs and also must enable the achievement of the overarching objectives.
5. *Governance model* used by any academic globalization effort must ensure that the overarching objectives are achieved and the interests of the stake holders are served.

The subsections below contain detailed requirements in each of these five areas.

Overarching Objectives

The overarching objectives for a model of academic globalization must be formulated primarily in terms of the near term needs and the longer term aspirations of the country that receives the globalized academic services. A priori, these needs and aspirations are unique to the receiver country and therefore the academic globalization model must be sufficiently versatile in its approach and rich in its content to meet the specialized needs and aspirations of all receiver countries. For example, the near term needs of a country may be determined by the state of its resources, populace, and development. The longer term aspiration will generally be a function of its culture, religion, history, geopolitical context, and philosophy of life.

As a corollary, one size fits all approach will not be acceptable. This has been the problem in all existing models, namely that they use substantially the same approach in all cases. The approach is determined by the provider country and it is assumed, without sufficient basis for the assumption, that the approach will fulfill the needs and the aspirations of the receiver country.

The requirement to meet the overarching goals of the receiver country is like an audit which has to be performed on a periodic basis to ensure that the model and its implementation remain acceptable. This acceptability criterion requires that there be some objective quantitative measures to meeting a country's short term needs and longer term aspirations. Current practices do not provide such measures. Therefore research is needed on this aspect before a model of academic globalization can be meaningfully deployed.

The global student statement [12] requires that Social Justice across the world be adopted as an overarching objective. Education should be a key enabler and it should eliminate existing systemic inequalities and discrimination in the World Society. Explicit steps must be taken to ensure that the needs and aspirations of a receiver country will not be undermined by globalized academic services provided under market forces [13].

Students as Stake Holders

Raison d'être for any education system is its students. This obvious fact sometimes becomes clouded during the high powered deliberations on education that take place at national and international forums, especially those on the topic of academic globalization.

According to the global student statement [12] made to the UNESCO world conference on higher education, following criteria should be adopted.

- *Fundamental right*: Education is a fundamental right for all students. This means protection of the students' rights within the education system, accessibility and affordability of education, learning experience through partnerships and mobility, and social justice as an overarching goal of education.
- *Ability to pay*: Everyone should be able to access and succeed in education. Therefore education should be based on willingness/eagerness to learn and not the ability to pay. Currently, all post secondary education in the USA violates this criterion. Academic globalization efforts spearheaded under market forces also violate this criterion.
- *Public good*: Education should be recognized as a public good. As a corollary, education cannot be undertaken as a profit making venture. All existing models of academic globalization violate this criterion.
- *Student visas*: For education experience through partnerships and mobility, it is necessary that the governments adopt flexible visa procedures. These days, this criterion is widely violated in USA and Europe under the pretext of national security.
- *Education as a market*: Governments should stop using academic globalization programs as a way of gaining access to educational markets in developing countries. The WTO GATS model violates this criterion by design.
- *Degree recognition*: Governments and institutions should adopt a transparent mechanism for degree recognition across countries. This is necessary so that the students are not discouraged by the accepting institutions for lack of recognition of their qualifications, or by the potential employers upon return of the student to the home country.
- *Quality of education*: High quality and accessibility of education are two inseparable criteria. Accessible education that is not sufficiently high quality is worthless, and high quality education that is not widely accessible is meaningless. Government should protect students from disreputable education providers. An accessible education that is high quality should improve graduate career prospects and build societies through active citizenship.
- *Consultation with student bodies*: Countries and international forums like UNESCO should consult with the necessary student bodies on a regular basis and also facilitate dialogue between the students of the world.

Teachers as Stake Holders

While an education system is primarily for the students, the needs of the students are accomplished through the efforts of the teachers. Teachers are therefore stake holders in the education system and without their agreement and enthusiasm there can be no success or quality for the education system. As stake holders, many of the criteria mentioned in section 0 will also apply to the teachers with obvious modifications. For example, it should be necessary to apply to the teachers the criteria for the quality of education; and it should be a requirement to consult with the necessary teacher bodies.

Academic Content

Academic content is the nucleus of the education system. This is where the mechanisms reside for realizing the short term needs and the longer term aspirations of the receiver countries. The contents are not to be viewed in abstract. For example it is not true that the subject matter of physics is the same everywhere. While the fundamental principals remain the same, their presentation methods, delivery mechanisms, illustrative examples, and relationship to the needs differ; and they can differ very substantially. Thus, citing the phenomenon of snowing as an example of weather would be so remote from the experience of the students in a tropical country that it might not serve as a useful example. Similarly, the teaching methods of the subject matter would need to be particularized to the experiences of the students. A student centered approach across the board would ensure critical thinking, active participation, and an enquiring mindset. It should eliminate historical artifacts from the content, because progress in the fields of science, arts and engineering is often influenced by politics, culture, religion and economics. It should not try to promote homogeneous priorities for accomplishments in science and engineering across countries.

The question is more profound than mere particularization of subject matter, text books, and teacher training. It squarely relates to the local society needs of the receiver country. For instance, does its industry seek forward looking engineering implementations or does it merely want to catch up with well known practices? Similarly, does it need strategists into untried territories or does it merely need to implement an already well established technology? Does the receiver country need to promote traditional disciplines or does it need to explore integrated knowledge across disciplines [14]?

In more recent times, even the view towards the nature of knowledge is undergoing transformation. The research results in quantum mechanics have brought into question the views based on a deterministic world. They have also questioned a mechanistic view of nature where phenomena are to be understood by analyzing them into their parts, ignoring the interdependence of the parts themselves. The quantum mechanics reveals an interconnectedness that is very relevant to the academic globalization [15]. It makes imperative to have a global view in which “the part is in the whole and the whole is in each part”. It requires us to let go of fixed perceptions and rigid devotions to our own corners. Instead, it requires us to let our inner freedom unfold the common reality of self and community.

The longer term aspirations of a country are also realized through the academic content, which itself can evolve. These aspirations include the material goals and cultural world-views. Currently, culture is treated fragmentally and superficially rather than holistically and paradigmatically. Therefore there is a strong need for academic content that is transformative, explicitly ethical, and deals with the asymmetries of the interdependencies in academic globalization [16].

Governance

The governance of academic globalization process is of fundamental importance. Education has to serve the short term needs and longer term aspirations of the receiver country. It is imperative to particularize for the receiver country the academic content, the teachers training, and the delivery mechanisms. It therefore derives as a corollary that the governance of the education dynamics must remain firmly under the local control at the country and province level. The global student statement [12] has identified some criteria for the governance. It requires that the governance structure must protect the student rights as a key to the maintenance of universities and democracies. The formalized governance structure must be transparent and it must protect the right of the students and teachers to freely speak out and criticize the actors in the governance structure. Guarantees must exist for them to do it without fear of retribution. The human right to free association and opinion must be promoted at all levels. The governance structure must not be legally imposed to the extent that academic freedom and the overarching objectives are impeded. Therefore systematic provisions must be made in the governance structure for the students and teachers to play effective roles as stake holders, for instance via a formalized role for them in national and international policy formulation and budget allocation.

Attention is drawn to a governance structure for academic globalization [17] that is being pushed under the World Trade Organization. This model does not respect the above mentioned criteria, and it is feared:

‘... that regulations relating to higher education will be included in an international agreement “under the radar” and without much analysis’.

The implications of this for higher education are immense; mostly with respect to the developing countries having little autonomy; thereby exacerbating dramatic inequalities.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper has analyzed all the existing modalities of academic globalization. They serve the interests of the providers of the globalized academic services very well. The interests of the consumers of these services are almost never served in any of these modalities.

A new model for academic globalization is therefore urgently needed to make it beneficial to consumers as well as providers. It is unlikely that a WTO/GATS type paradigm can produce such a model because of the exploitative possibilities and ethical loopholes left open in this paradigm.

A set of requirements is formulated in this paper as acceptance criteria for any future model. This set of requirements is necessary but not sufficient. That is because the requirements are at the highest level in a

hierarchical sense. There are other factors that will yield more detailed criteria at progressively lower levels. For instance the academic content will include topics like curricula, course compositions, and delivery schedules. Similarly, the governance will include such topics as international agreements, memoranda of understanding, ministries of education, vice chancellors, and deans.

The criteria suggested in this paper need further discussion also for other reasons. This is because a rough consensus must be reached within the community, and the constraints implied by the criteria must be assessed for implementability. In this regard, further questions arise that need resolution. For example, who should be reaching the consensus? Should it be the educator and research community, political entities like United Nations, vendor communities like the corporations, regions like EuroAmerica? Perhaps the most appropriate community is the community of practitioners of education, i.e. students, teachers, vice chancellors, deans, etc. The purpose is to arrive at results that promote academic excellence rather than commercial progress, corporate profits, or the special interest groups like the promoters of WTO/GATS agenda.

Further research is needed to reveal the requirements, framework, and modality upon which the academic globalization should be based in future.

A corollary to the findings of this paper is that the currently implemented modalities of academic globalization must be reexamined using the requirements formulated in this paper and others from future research. Such a reexamination is not a onetime event but a reoccurring theme. The purpose is for the consumer country to independently steer the existing implementations towards the consumer objectives. Often the consumer objectives were not carefully deliberated at the time of these implementations, so that it would need to be done post facto. Implementations that fall way short of the consumer objectives should be abandoned and those that are sufficiently close to the consumer objectives should be systematically reformed.

In addition, the acceptance criteria for a model of academic globalization presented in this paper, and additional criteria that future research will produce, can be used in many areas of importance. Examples of these areas include: as content in teaching academic globalization as a subject; as guidance to the universities that are in the process of globalization; as a metric for measuring success for those universities that have already globalized; and as evaluation criteria for the acceptability of implementations of an academic globalization that the consumers of the globalized academic services can use worldwide.

REFERENCES

- 1 Altbach, Phillip G. (2005). *Globalization and the University: Myths and Realities in an Unequal World*. The National Education Association Almanac of Higher Education.
- 2 Vlk, Ales (2006). *Higher Education and GATS*, Doctoral Thesis at University of Twente, Netherlands.
- 3 Paasi, Anssi (2005). Globalization, academic capitalism, and the uneven geographies of International journal publishing spaces. *Environment and Planning A* 37, 769-789.
- 4 Altbach, Philip G. and Umakoshi, Toru (eds.). (2004). *Asian Universities, Historical Perspectives and Contemporary Challenges*. The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- 5 Shanks, Daniel. (2007). *Cold War History Education: Constructing the American Ideology*. Proceedings of the Third Semi-Annual Conference on the Rhetoric's of Monstrosity, Stanford University, CA, March 2007.
- 6 Lowen, Rebecca S. (1997). *Creating the Cold War University – The Transformation of Stanford*, ISBN 0-520-20541-3, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- 7 Stiglitz, Joseph E (Nobel Laureate in Economics). (2002). *Globalization and its Discontents*. Norton, New York.
- 8 Association of University Teachers and Development Education Association, London, UK. (1999). *Globalization and Higher Education – Guidance on ethical issues arising from international academic activities*, ISBN 0 900107 227.
- 9 Garten, Jeffrey E. (1997). Can the World Survive the Triumph of Capitalism? *Harvard Business Review* 75, 144-150.
- 10 Lieven, Michael and Matin, Graeme. (2006). Higher Education in Global Market: The case of British overseas provision in Israel. *Higher Education*, vol. 52, pp. 41-68.
- 11 Ziguras, Christopher and Fazal Rizvi. (2001). Future directions in international online education. Dorothy Davis and Denis Meares (Eds) *Transnational Education: Australia Online*. Sydney: IDP Education Australia, pp.151-164.
- 12 “Global Student Statement to the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education +10”, a statement adopted in Paris on January 23, 2009 by fourteen worldwide student bodies.

(<http://www.esib.org/index.php/documents/statements/566-world-conference-on-higher-education-wche10-global-student-statement>)

- 13 Slaughter S. and Rhoades G. (2004). *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets State, and Higher Education*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- 14 Ramalhoto, M. F. (2006). Transforming academic globalization into globalization for all, *European Journal of Engineering Education*, Vol. 31, pp. 349-358.
- 15 David Selby. (1999). *Global Education: Towards a Quantum Model of Environmental Education*, *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, September.
- 16 Toh S. H. (1993). Bring the World into the Classroom: Global Literacy and the Question of Paradigms in Global Education: *Global Literacy*, Issue 1, Volume 1, pages 9-17.
- 17 Altbach, Philip G. (2001). *Higher Education and the WTO: Globalization Run Amok*, Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, spring meeting of International Higher Education.