

TEACHERS AND STUDENTS PERCEPTIONS OF INTERNATIONALISATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN NIGERIA

Blessing. F. Adeoye, PhD

Faculty of Education, University of Lagos, Akoka, Lagos

Blessing E. Anyikwa, PhD

Faculty of Education, University of Lagos, Akoka, Lagos

Deneca W. Avant, PhD

School of Social Work, Illinois State University. USA

Abstract

This study seeks to address the gap in literature supporting internationalization of higher education by exploring the perceptions of teachers and students in Nigeria. Four hundred and forty six participants were involved in the study. Descriptive statistics was used to describe the profile and distribution of the sample population, the motivational factors and the perceptions of participants. Eighty four percent of the participants admitted that internationalization of higher education promotes collaboration among students and lecturers, 80% indicated that it exposes students to online programme and other international opportunities. Also, 81% admitted that internationalization of higher education will expand academic/research horizon of a practicing institutions in Africa while the remaining of the respondents disagreed with such notion. Majority indicated lack of awareness of guiding policies on internationalization of higher institutions in Africa, and that it is not part of African government foreign policies. The participants also indicated that there is no national framework for monitoring and evaluation of internationalization of higher education in Africa. They pointed out some barriers/challenges of internationalization of higher education across Africa.

Keywords: Teachers and students perceptions, internationalization, higher education, education in Nigeria

Introduction:

The subject of internationalisation of higher education has been one of the most discussed issues in academia around the world. Experts in the higher education believe that this subject is a new paradigm and inevitable approach in the universities and curriculum (Ghasempoor, Liaghatdar, & Jafari, 2011). Internationalisation has a multiplicity of definitions. According to Ghasempoor, Liaghatdar, and Jafari, internationalization refers to the process of integrating an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution; it is also a term that is being used progressively to discuss the international dimension of higher education.

Since the development of this definition in the early nineties, internationalization of higher education has evolved. Knight (2008) defined internationalization as a process of integrating international and cultural dimensions into the teaching, research and service functions of the education institution. Knight also indicated that Internationalisation is changing the world of higher education and globalization is changing the world of internationalisation. Althach, Reisberg, and Rumbley (2009) defined Internationalisation as the variety of policies and programs that universities and governments implement to respond to globalization. Some of the programmes include creation of International programmes departments, exchange programmes, cross-border distance education, and e-learning. In the recent years, the international dimension of higher education has become more prominent on the agenda of many governments, tertiary institutions, students organizations and accreditation agencies.

Higher education has become increasingly international in the past decade as more and more students choose to study abroad, enroll in foreign educational programmes and institutions in their home country, or simply use the Internet to take online courses at colleges or universities in other countries. Delivering foreign educational programmes and institutions so that students can study at a foreign college without leaving home has been largely driven by educational institutions themselves. It has been made easier by institutional frameworks which grant substantial autonomy to higher educational institutions and the policies adopted by receiving countries.

Going abroad to study is only one form of cross-border education. A new option is taking a degree or other post-secondary course offered by a foreign university online without

leaving their home country. Programme and institution mobility has grown over the past decade and is likely to meet a growing demand in the future. Programme mobility is the second most common form of cross-border higher education after student mobility. It involves cross-border distance education, including e-learning, generally supplemented by face-to-face teaching in local partner institutions, but mainly takes the form of traditional face-to-face teaching offered via a partner institution abroad. Institution mobility is still limited in scale, possibly because it involves more entrepreneurial risk, but it has become an increasingly important feature of cross-border education. It corresponds to foreign direct investment by educational institutions or companies. The typical form of institution mobility is the opening of foreign campuses by universities and of foreign learning centres that educational institutions provides. It may also involve the establishment of a distinctly new rather than affiliated educational institution or the takeover of all or part of a foreign educational institution.

There are many aspirations that serve as driving forces for internationalization. These include, but are not limited to, the desire to promote mutual understanding, the migration of skilled workers in a globalised economy, institutional ambition to generate additional revenues, and the necessity for emerging economies to build a more educated workforce in their home countries. The aforementioned internationalization driving forces also serve as four different approaches to cross-border higher education. Three of them - skilled migration, revenue generation, capacity building - have a strong economic drive and have emerged in the 1990s while the fourth, mutual understanding has a longer history (OECD, 2004).

According to OECD, the mutual understanding approach encompasses political, cultural, academic and development aid goals. It allows and encourages mobility of domestic and foreign students and staff through scholarship and academic exchange programmes as well as supports academic partnerships between educational institutions. This approach does not generally involve any strong push to recruit international students. The skilled migration approach shares the goals of the mutual understanding approach, but gives stronger emphasis to the recruitment of selected international students and aims at attracting talented students to work in the host country's economy. Within the skilled migration approach, students are supplemented by active promotion of a country's higher education sector abroad, combined with an easing of the relevant visa or immigration regulations. This approach can have a variety of targets, such as student from certain areas, post-graduates or research students rather than undergraduates, or students in a specific field. This approach generally results in a rise in the number of international students. The revenue-generating approach shares the

rationales of the mutual understanding and skilled migration approaches, but offers higher education services on a more or less full-fee basis, without public subsidies. The capacity-building approach encourages cross-border higher education, however delivered as a relatively quick way to build an emerging country's capacity. As previously stated, the mutual understanding approach encourages scholarship and academic exchanges. Scholarship programmes supporting the outward mobility of domestic civil servants, teachers, academics and students are important policy instruments.

Internationalisation across Africa:

Internationalisation is currently at the center of attention in the global debate on the innovation of higher education across the continent of Africa. The evident of internationalisation can be seen in many African universities. In South Africa, the most devastating period for higher education was between 1948 to 1994. During the apartheid years the sanctions, divestment, and disinvestment initiatives had a devastating impact on South Africa; especially the impact of academic boycotts. It was not possible for both students and lecturers to visit a South Africa African university before 1990 neither were South African academics welcomed at universities around the world (Some & Khaemba, 2004). As a result, International education association of South Africa (IEASA) was established purposely for the internationalisation of higher education. Recognisable efforts at internationalisation of higher education across many higher institutions in Africa include the following: students exchange programmes; staff exchange programmes; external examination, linkages, regional programmes; and short term and occasional study programmes. Many universities have opened international programmes offices. It has also become a common practice for higher institutions in African to establish linkages for research, students and staff exchange, curriculum development with institutions within Africa and abroad and these points out the elements of internationalisation of higher education..

Statement of the Problem:

The majority of institutions give a high importance to internationalization worldwide, with Europe topping the list, followed by North America; in this regard, the Middle East, Latin America, and the Caribbean are at the bottom (Marmolejo, 2010). According to Marmolejo, those involved in the internationalisation of higher education rely on a series of assumptions that are often not supported by data or evidence. For instance, they believe that internationalisation is not only positive, but also very relevant as a key component of the

changing landscape of higher education. When asked about why internationalisation is important, proponents are often prepared to recite a list of its many benefits for the students, the faculty, the institutions, and to the society in general. It is critical to defend the claims and advantages of internationalisation of higher education. It is also important to know that there are different rationales as to why, how, and for which purposes an institution wants to engage in an internationalisation effort. Recently, the number of studies on internationalisation of higher education has been growing; a few of such studies have been conducted in many higher institutions in Africa. As a result, this study seeks to address the gap in literature supporting internationalization of higher education by exploring the perceptions of teachers and students in Nigeria.

Purpose:

The purpose of this study is to explore the perceptions of teachers and students regarding the Internationalization of higher education in Nigeria.

Research Questions:

1. What level of awareness do lecturers /students have about internationalization of higher education in Nigeria?
2. What perceived barriers will students/ lecturers face when involved in internationalization of higher education in Nigeria?
3. What is the status of the national policy with respect to internationalization of higher education in Nigeria?
4. How do lecturers /students perceive the internationalization of higher education in Nigeria?
5. What combination of individual factors (e.g. age, gender), academic factors (e.g. type of institution and academic rank), motivational factors (e.g. intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation) best associate with lecturers/students perceptions of internationalization of higher education in Nigeria?

Significance:

From an institutional perspective, this study is informative for a number of stakeholders in higher education including, lecturers, researchers, administrators, policy makers. It is useful for identifying key issues that can direct educational policy and practice. It will also be useful to politicians and advisors to government seeking to make suggestions on Higher Education (HE) policy.

Methodology:

Descriptive statistics (sample size, frequency, mean, variance and standard deviation) will be used to describe the profile and distribution of the sample population (age, gender, marital status, type of institution, and academic rank), the motivational factors and the perceptions of participants.

Data Collection:

Four hundred and fifty surveys were sent out (300 for students and 150 for lecturers). Two hundred and ninety six surveys were fully filled and returned by the students while 100% were filled and returned by the lecturers. The participants are randomly selected from various universities in Lagos State. The goal was to have private, State, and Federal universities represented in this study. From each institution, 100 students and 50 lecturers were given a questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed by the researchers; it was tested for validity and reliability by twenty Master students in the Faculty of Education at the University of Lagos.

Data Analysis:

Demographic Information

Students' Data - Fifty percent of the respondents (students) were male students while the remaining 47.3% were female respondents. Also the data revealed that about 8% of the respondents used in the study were in 100 level, 18.3% were 200 levels 25.1% said they were in 300 levels while the remaining came 46.1% and 2.4% came from 400 and 500 levels respectively. Furthermore, the data also show that 33.0%, 33.7% and 33.3% of the respondents were from the Federal, State and privately owned institutions.

Lecturers' Data - The distribution of the lecturers that participated in the study shows that 44.7% of them were male lecturers while the remaining 55.3% were female. The distribution of the lecturers based on their institutional affiliation shows that about 33.33% of the respondents came from Federal, State and Privately owned institution. The distribution of the respondents by their academic ranks shows that about 38.4% were assistant lecturers, lecturer II constitute about 26.7% of the respondents, lecturer I (15.8%), senior lecturer (5.5%) while 8.9% and 4.9% were Association professor and Professors.

Table 1: Knowledge of lecturers/students on Internalization of Higher Education in Africa

Variables	5 f (%)	4 f (%)	3 f (%)	2 f (%)	1 f
1.Aware of the concept of internationalization of higher education (11.1)	78 (19.7)	116 (29.3)	50 (12.6)	108 (27.3)	44
2. Have heard it but not sure it exist within my school setting (18.2)	57 (14.4)	95 (24.0)	52 (13.1)	120 (30.3)	72
3. Have heard but do not understand its meaning (17.7)	69 (17.4)	79 (19.9)	52 (13.1)	126 (31.8)	70
4. Internationalization involves teaching & research collaboration (10.1)	75 (18.9)	149 (37.6)	76 (19.2)	56 (14.1)	40

Keys+ 5= strongly agree, 4=Agree, 3= undecided, 2= Disagree, 1= strongly disagree
Note: figures outside parentheses are frequency distributions; figures in parentheses are percentage distributions

Table 1 above *shows* the knowledge of the respondents about the internationalization of higher education in Africa. The data shows that 19.7% of the respondents strongly understand the concept of the internationalization of higher education, 29.3% also agreed with the concept of internationalisation. However, 12.6% were not sure about the concept of internationalization, 27.3% disagree while the remaining 11.1% strongly disagree with the concept. Similarly, 14.4% of the respondents strongly agreed that they have heard the concept by are not sure whether it exist in their schools, also 24% of the respondents also admitted that they have heard but not exist in their schools. However 13.1% of the respondents were

indifferent in the views in respect to the question while 30.3% and 18.2% strongly disagree and disagree respectively.

Furthermore, 17.4% of the respondents also admitted that they do not understand the meaning of the internationalisation, another 19.9% of also shared similar view while about 13.1% were indifferent in the response leaving 31.8 and 17.8% (49.6%) who admitted that they understand the meaning. In the views of the respondents, 56.5% (18.%, ,37.6%) believed that internationalization of education involves teaching and research collaboration in higher institutions, 19.2% were undecided in their views concerning this questions while only about 24.2% of the respondents disagree with this view. In summary, it can be deduced that there is a limited knowledge of the respondents on the concept of Internationalization of higher education in Africa.

Table 2: Students & Lecturers' Perception of Internalization of Higher education in Africa

Students Variables	4 f(%)	3 f (%)	2 f (%)	1 f (%)
1.Internationalization promotes collaboration among students (mobility)		101	150	36
9	(34.1)	(50.7)	(12.2)	(3, 0)
2. Exposes students to participate in outreach programmes	103	134	42	17
	(34.8)	(45.3)	(14.2)	(5.7)
3. Improves curricular		146	100	42
8	(49.3)	(33.8)	(14.2)	(2.7)
4. Improves quality of facilities and academic development	144	90	54	8
	(48.6)	(30.4)	(18.3)	(2.7)

Note: figures outside parentheses are frequency distributions; figures in parentheses are percentage distributions

Key: 4 = Strongly agree,, 3=Agree , 2= Disagree t, 1= Strongly Disagree for Students

Lecturers

Variables	5	4	3	2	1
(%) f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)
1. Expands lecturers' academic/research horizons	56 (37.3)	66 (44.0)	10 (6.7)	17 (11.3)	1 (0.7)
2. Helps to build powerful learning community and deepens quality of products produced by this institutions	20 (13.3)	89 (59.3)	11 (7.3)	22 (14.7)	8 (5.3)
3. Improves the substance of teaching, learning and research in Africa	(42) (28.0)	(63) (42.0)	(12) (8.0)	(21) (14.0)	(12) (8.0)
4. Brings about co-operation and competition		28 (18.7)	94 (62.7)	13 (8.7)	10 (10.7)
5					3 (3.3)

Note: figures outside parentheses are frequency distributions; figures in parentheses are percentage distributions

Keys: 5= strongly agree, 4=Agree, 3= undecided, 2= Disagree, 1= strongly disagree For Lecturers

The table above shows students and lecturer's perception of internationalization of higher education in Africa. The result show 84.7 % of the respondents admitted that internationalization of higher education promotes collaboration among students and lectures in higher institutions, 15.2% of the respondents were of a different view point.

Similarly, 80.1% of the respondents admitted that internationalization of higher education exposes students to outreach programme and other international opportunities while the remaining 19.9% disagree with this view.

Furthermore, 83.1% of the respondents also admitted that internationalization of higher education will improve curricular activities while only about 16.9% of the respondents disagree with it. On the same issue, 79% of the respondents (students) also admitted that internationalization of higher education in Africa will improve the quality of facilities and hence bring academic development while 21% of the respondents however disagree with this. Furthermore, they revealed that 81.3% of the respondents (lecturers) admitted that internationalization of higher education will expand academic/research horizon of a practicing institutions in Africa while the remaining 12% of the respondents disagree with the statement while 6.7% of the respondents were indifferent in their views

Again, 72.6% of the respondents also admitted that internationalization helps to build powerful learning community thus deepening the result quality of output in the system. However, 20% of the respondents disagree with view while about 7.4% of the respondents were undecided on their views concerning this.

The data also revealed that 70% of the lecturers consented that internationalization of higher education in Africa will improve the substance of teaching, learning and research in Africa while 22% of the respondents were of different views on this issue. However, about 8.0% of the respondents were undecided in the views regarding this issue.

Finally, 81.4% of lecturers admitted that it will yield to co-operation, collaboration and completion in higher education which is healthy for sector, 14% however disagreed with this notion while the remaining 8.7% of the respondents were undecided in the views. In summary the result shows a positive perception on internationalizing higher education in Africa.

Table 3: Status of Internationalization on higher Education on National Policy (Lecturer's)

Variables	5	4	3	2	1
	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)
1. I am aware of guiding policies on Internationalization	8	4	25	72	41
(5.3)	(2.7)	(16.7)	(48.0)	(27.3)	
2. Internationalization is part of government foreign					

policy	-	4	39	74	33
	(2.7)	(26.0)	(49.3)	(22.0)	
3. There are clear national policy to cover franchising arrangement in higher education across Africa			7	33	36
	(4.7)	(22)	(24.0)	(28.7)	(20.7)
4. There is a national policy on internationalization of Higher education		-	12	24	68
			(8.0)	(16.0)	(45.3)
5. There is a framework for categorizing potential Indicators for Monitoring and Evaluation on Internationalization			14	12	19
			(9.6)	(8.2)	(13.0)
				66	35
				(45.2)	(24.0)

Note: figures outside parentheses are frequency distributions; figures in parentheses are percentage distributions

Keys+ 5= strongly agree, 4=Agree, 3= undecided, 2= Disagree, 1= strongly disagree

Table 4 shows the knowledge about any national policy on Internationalization of Higher education in Africa. The result shows that 75.3% of the respondents disagreed that there is guiding policies on internationalization of higher institutions in Africa, 8% of the respondents however admitted the presence of guiding policies on the internationalization of higher education in Africa while 16.7% of the respondents were undecided in their views. In the same view, 71% of the respondents disagreed that internationalization of higher education in Africa is part of African government foreign policies while only 2.7% of the respondents admitted that it is part of government foreign policies leaving about 26% of the respondents indifferent in their views. On the issue bordering franchising arrangement in higher education 49.4% of the respondents disagreed that there is a national policy covering franchising education in most African countries, 26.7% of the respondents however agreed that there is a policy on franchising arrangement. Finally, 49.2% of the respondents also admitted that there is no national framework for monitoring and evaluation on internationalization of higher education in Africa.

Table 4: Identified barriers/challenges of Internationalization of Higher Education in Africa

S/N	Variables	No of Observations	Percentage	Ranks
1.	Recognition of Prior qualification/grade /standard	37	8.2	10 th
2.	Poor Government policy	121	26.9	1 st
3.	Poor technology base	83	18.4	5 th
4.	Culture/language and value systems	77	17.1	6 th
5.	Poor publicity/co-ordination	88	19.6	4 th
6.	Inadequate investment in teaching & Research	47	10.4	9 th
7.	Bad leadership/poor governance/ill politics	63	14.0	7 th
8.	Poor funding of Education in Africa	113	25.1	2 nd
9.	Poor infrastructural base in Africa	94	20.9	3 rd
10.	High level of illiteracy in the continent	2	0.4	12 th
11.	Corruption in the system	31	11.3	8 th
12.	Inadequate grants/subvention	27	6.0	11 th

Table 4 summarised the barriers/challenges of internationalization of higher education across Africa. Prominent in the list was the issue of poor government policy which was ranked 1st among the challenges with 26.9% response, followed by poor funding of higher education across Africa with 25.1% response, poor infrastructural base in Africa (20.9%) ranked 3rd, poor publicity (19.6%) ranked 4th, poor technology base (18.4%) ranked 5th, culture/language and value systems (17.1) ranked 6th, bad leadership/poor governance/ill politics (14.0%) 7th. Others are: high corruption in the system (11.3%) ranked 8th, inadequate investment in teaching and research (10.4) ranked 9th, qualification/grade/standard (8.2%) ranked 10th, inadequate grants/subvention (6.0%) 11th while the high level of illiteracy also recorded the least response (0.4%).

Discussion:

The rise of globalization has created a more interconnected competing global market, which has extended to the world of academia. Historically, there exist many policies of evaluations spearheaded by the United States in an effort to maintain its leadership role. In 1983, the United States National Commission on Excellence in Education released the report *A Nation at Risk* (U.S. Department of Education, 1983). The report had a strong impact on American urgent need of improvement based on numerous statistics that demonstrated the inadequate quality of American education. In many ways, this report created a division and further perpetuated a spirit of competition between the United States and many other nations; despite the aim of higher education internationalization has created better societies-internationally, nationally and locally. Nevertheless, historical policies are crucial in examining futuristic endeavors.

From our current study, the 446 students and lecturer surveyed yielded responses that are key to advancing academies of learning both at home and aboard. In this section, we presented the summary of our survey results. Firstly, in regards to understanding the concept of internationalization, less than 20% of Nigerians surveyed understood this idea. Secondly, though their understanding of internationalization was low, their perception of higher education in Africa was relatively high, 84%. Thirdly, 75% agreed that there was no guiding policy of internationalization of higher education for Africa. And finally, some contributing factors that the participants believed were cause of deficits with internationalization were: poor funding (25%), poor technology base (18%), bad leadership (14%) and inadequate investment in teaching and research endeavors (6%). While there is no guiding policy that exist to connect issues regarding internationalization, with the rise in knowledge and “convenience” of internationalization through e-learning opportunities, political entities will be forced to create legislations that allow for governmental autonomy. Looking more in-depth to the response to Nigerians regarding not identifying with the concept internationalization, it is left to wonder if the lack of exposure to the concept could have been done strategically in hopes of confining the learning of its citizens to a place of mediocrity. Perhaps in a follow-up study we can delve into further political factors and institutional governances that could have contributed to this response.

In addressing the deficits further, poor funding, technological bases and inadequate investments in teaching and research are collective in that they both address issues of fiduciary lack. As demonstrated in the *A Nation at Risk* policy, our procedures and initiatives are driven by our values (U.S. Department of Education, 1983). Recent study has

indicated that students in the United States, while more money is spent, the level of achievement on standardized international test as well as high school completion levels are steadily lower than its global counterparts Department of Education (2008). The Department of Education (2008) reports in regards to current testing for American students:

“These results are generally consistent with our performance on international tests —a risk that was of particular concern to the Commission in 1983. American education outcomes on international comparisons have not improved significantly since the 1970s. International tests show that the United States is, at best, running in place, while other nations are passing us by. Many countries now match or exceed us, not only in the number of years their children attend school but also in how much those children learn” (p. 9).

According to this report, United States achievement levels are stagnant while other countries are enhancing academically. Although this notion is contrary to our study responses noting a low understanding of internationalization, the Department of Education (2008) report indicates that foreign students studying in the United States find our schools easier than those overseas which may be associated to Americans spending more money per student than other countries. It is vital to highlight that while proper funding is instrumental in building effective institutions and providing effective infrastructures within institutions, it is not the only factor that contributes to successful students and staff. When government officials throughout Africa and across the global understand more fully that a globally exposed citizen will only serve to enhance the community locally and nationally, then, greater value will be placed on educational policies that will benefit respective citizens. Effective leadership within universities and other educational institutions remain paramount in the growth of that institution. One new concept that looks greatly into this growth is transformative leadership.

Effective internationalization of higher education requires the connectedness of innovative trailblazers. Contrary to traditional leadership these individuals must be transformative. To transform means to make a thorough or dramatic change in the form, appearance or character of a thing. In regards to education, transformative leaders are those individuals who provide have democratic participation, are committed to social change, have a great understanding of institutionalized power and a great measure of cultural competence (Avant, 2011). It is further suggested that, “...transformative leaders play an integral role within society and have high expectations to accompany their responsibilities. Society looks to transformative leaders to act in important roles, including as strategists, motivators, developers, sustainers, innovators, and catalysts for change, to name a few. These leaders are

conscious about operating in a world dominated by national interests and therefore must act as visionaries to facilitate a global community” (2011, p.119-120).

Because of this, study revealed poor leadership as one deficit with internationalization, this subject is one area that transformative leaders could work to improve issues in worldwide academia. Incorporating transformative leadership to counteract negative publicity will assist others in understanding the importance of this changing world landscape. According to Winfrey (2009) it is essential for leaders to promote a sense of social justice by exercising transformative leadership. This action includes acknowledging, discussing, and respecting differences amongst students and lecturers to address the result of poor leadership noted within study responses. Transformative leaders are aware of issues simmering below the surface, are able to decipher complex cultural codes, and they understand what is needed for social change (Henze, Katz, Norte, Sather, & Walker, 2001). Ultimately, transformative leadership is necessary to achieve the goal of enhancing global comprehension of higher education internationalization.

There is abundant literature on the need of increased internationalisation of higher education; however, research has failed to examine many institutions in Africa as well as perceptions of teachers and students. Contrary to this premise, results from this study identify perceptions of Nigerian teachers and students. This study contributes to the field of educational leadership by supplementing the literature on the importance of acknowledging a myriad of advantages related to internationalisation of higher education.

Conclusion:

Overall, there were many factors that impact thoughts regarding internationalization of higher education. This research concluded that perceptions of teachers and students in Nigerian are very individual. Specifically, internationalization was based on perceptions which are tied to a myriad of complex factors such as online and study abroad opportunities, leadership and communication styles, government policy, and funding. Furthermore, obstacles of internationalization were identified while exploring higher education institutions in Africa. Some of the disadvantages that could use strengthening are the seemingly systemic corruption, social injustices and disparities, ineffective leadership, ongoing language barriers and various challenges regarding illiteracy. In this endeavor, though there is a comprehensive plan needed for effective techniques in efforts to creating a larger global community, there are incremental measures that may prove beneficial in furthering this mission.

One definite barrier to increased internationalization is that of language. With regard to culture and language barriers, this becomes a significant factor in higher education. Bennell and Pearce (2003) conduct a study regarding the interrelationship of Australia, United Kingdom (UK) and the United States in relation to internationalization of higher education. As they focus on Overseas Validated Courses (OVC), or studying abroad opportunities, they examine clearly how language is crucial element. They state:

Language has also been a critical factor in determining the spread of OVCs. With UK and Australian universities taking the lead during the 1990s, it is clear that training institutions in countries where English is either the official medium of instruction or is widely used at the secondary and tertiary education levels have been relatively well placed to establish collaborative links. In countries, on the other hand, where English is not widely used in tertiary education, (most notably in South and Central America and Francophone Africa), there has been much less scope for establishing OVCs with English as the medium of instruction (p.13).

While language is a barrier, collaboration and not competition must become a perpetual mantra for especially for the more leading countries. In a post-apartheid society, there is much advancement needed for many parts of Africa to regain its educational footing. A country rich in resources and supplies that are vastly imported across the global could definitely use further collaborations and partnerships for more established institutional bases and governments. There must be a greater collaboration in order to produce greater opportunities. This could be done with further use of e-learning and online course offerings. The rationale for internationalization is higher education should be the desire to promote mutual understanding on the parts of each country involved. This is essential in there exists no hierarchical structure within the relationships and engagements of the various institutions. There exists a mutual understanding of the significance in gaining knowledge to capacity build, where each student learn about the others' culture in hopes of ultimately impacting themselves as well as informing their own cultures.

While it is not the sole responsibility of other nations to supply the necessary tools adequate for other nations, it is critical that citizens of one's own nation become global citizens. Global citizenship not in the sense of dual citizenship, but that the individual in respective countries obtain and maintain an awareness of the advantages, disadvantages, histories, cultural practices, languages, religions and ways of living of other individuals different from themselves. It is then, once we have gained awareness of those unlike us to we truly become educated.

In regards to funding opportunities, it would be essential for various host schools to provide scholarships and other forms of financial aid to international students. The cost for international students to attend various universities is typically nearly 50% higher than for those domestic students. By implementing programs that allow a minimal number of spots for international students for a reduced cost could aid in the increased amount of participation in global higher education. It is then when our nations become no longer at risk, but on the verge of reaping a great harvest from collaborating efforts. Even as this article is produced in collaboration with African and Nigerian scholars, as we advance, we will begin to see more relevant research and scholarship that will impact our world.

The internationalization is on the rise. Scholar Hudzik (2010) studies analyst that predicts that by 2025 there will be a surge in demand for internationalization. According to Hudzik, the demand for global higher education will have annual increases of about 250 million seats. Hudzik suggests, "...global international student mobility, currently at 2.9 million, could more than double to 7 million annually by then" (p. 98). Ultimately, the size of higher education institutions globally will increase dramatically which will greatly impact economy communities internationally. Because of this increase in demand and capacity, world's higher education systems will advance to accommodate more widely accessible educational paradigms. These worldwide models include more students enrolling in online programs, taking their degrees abroad, and incorporating education abroad into their home programs. This conception is consistent with the literature as higher education perceptions expand globally and nontraditional student enrollment increases. Global competition for the best faculty, administrators, and students will intensify; price competition is likely to intensify; and quality control will be challenged (Hudzik, 2010).

According to Hudzik (2010), competitiveness will require rapid higher education innovation as previously noted in the purpose of this study to explore the perceptions of Nigerian teachers and students in internationalization of higher education. The advantages seen in this study conclude with collaboration among student and professors, interactive engagement between nations, the possibilities to build powerful learning communities. Ultimately, educationally enhancing the connectedness existent between universities across the global will serve the interest of each nation.

References:

- Altbach, P., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. (2009). Trends in global higher education, tracking an academic revolution. Boston, Center for International Higher Education, Boston College.
- Benell, P., & Pearce, T. (2003). The Internationalisation of Higher Education: Exporting Education to Developing and Transitional Economies. *International Journal of Educational Development*. 23(2), 215-232.
- Brandenburg, U., & De Wit, H. (2010). The end of internationalization. In *Internationalization of Higher Education*. Center for International Higher Education, Boston College.
- de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: a historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Ghasempoor, A., Liaghatdar, M., & Jafari, E. (2011). The Internationalization of Higher Education: An Effective Approach for Iran Higher Education. *Higher Education Studies* 1 (2).
- Henze, R., Katz, A., Norte, E., Sather, S., & Walker, E. (2001). Leading for diversity: How school leaders promote positive interethnic relations. Educational Practice Report 7. Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence. Santa Cruz, CA and Washington, DC.
- Hudzik, J. K. (2010). The Economy, Higher Education, and Campus Internationalization. *International Educator* (Washington, D.C.), 19(3), 96-102.
- Knight, J. (2008). *Higher education in turmoil. The changing world of internationalisation*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Marmolejo, F. (2010). Internationalization of Higher Education: the Good, the Bad, and the Unexpected. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. May 17, 2012. Available online at <http://chronicle.com/blogs/worldwise/internationalization-of-higher-education-the-good-the-bad-and-the-unexpected/27512>.
- OECD, (2004). *Internationalisation and Trade in Higher Education: Opportunities and Challenges*, Paris.
- Pradeepkumar, A.P., & Behr, F. J. (2009). Globalisation and internationalisation: European and German perspectives on higher education under GATS. Available online at <http://www.scribd.com/doc/17348780/GATS-globalization-and-internationalization-of-education>. Retrieved June 02, 2012.
- Some, D. & Khaemba, (2004). *Internationalisation of higher education: The African experience and perspective*. MOI University Press.
- U.S. Department of Education (1983). *The National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*.

U.S. Department of Education (2008). *A Nation Accountable: Twenty-five Years After A Nation at Risk*, Washington, D.C.

Winfrey, A. D. (2009). *How teachers perceive their job satisfaction is influenced by their principals' behaviors and attitudes related to race and gender* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3363112).

Winfrey, A. D. (2011). *Unwrapping Tradition: Shifting from Traditional Leadership to Transformative Action*. In C. M. Shields (Ed.), *Transformative Leadership: A Reader* (pp. 114-130). New York, NY: Peter Lang.