*Danica FINK-HAFNER, Tamara DAGEN**

GLOBALISATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION POLICIES: MULTIDISCIPLINARY INSIGHTS

Abstract. *This article contributes to the integration of political science knowledge with higher education science knowledge in order to define the globalisation of public policies in the field of higher education policy. The conceptualisation is based on a review of the literature as well as an analysis of articles published in the period 1999 to 2016 in two leading scientific journals in the field of higher education science (Higher Education and the Journal of Studies in International Education). This multidisciplinary collaboration has proved to be useful not only in conceptualising the globalisation of HE public policies but also in terms of offering new venues for multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary research into globalised public policies.*
Keywords: *public policy, globalisation, Europeanisation, internationalisation, higher education*

Introduction

In this article we conceptualise the globalisation of higher education (HE) public policies while combining political science and education science knowledge. We proceed from the definition that globalisation occurs when '*actions, events, and relations at an increasingly greater distance from the locality affect community life*' (Coatsworth, Cole, Hangan, Perdue, C. Tilly, L. Tilly, 2015: 1). Historically, there have been several waves of globalisation (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt and Perraton, 2003). Common to all globalisation phenomena is an ever wider, deeper and increasingly rapid linking between states and societies (Shaw, 2000; Held, 2000; Anderson, 2002; Grugel, 2002; Held and McGrew, eds., 2003; Kaldor, 2003; Held, McGrew, Goldblatt and Perraton, 2003; Ougaard and Higgott, eds., 2002). Globalisation implies the expanding of processes and movements across territories, just as de-globalisation implies the opposite (Coatsworth, Cole, Hangan, Perdue, C. Tilly, L. Tilly, 2015: 1). Multidisciplinary research is required to grasp such complex phenomena. In this article we focus on a multidisciplinary approach to studying the globalisation of public policies.

* *Danica Fink-Hafner, PhD, Professor, Faculty of Social Science, University of Ljubljana; Tamara Dagen, PhD candidate, Faculty of Political Science, University of Zagreb.*

Based on the above cited literature, we take as our basic working definition of globalisation 'the ever wider, deeper and more rapid linking between states'. In this article, we focus on the globalisation of public policies. But what exactly does the globalisation of public policies mean? How does the globalisation of public policies relate to the internationalisation of public policies? And how and where does the Europeanisation of public policies fit in? In answering these questions we will narrow our focus to the increasing interconnections between countries and between the governments making the public policies. In this way we will address one aspect of globalisation – the internationalisation of public policies. Due to the peculiarities of the European Union, being both an international organisation and to some extent a multi-level political system, we understand 'Europeanisation' to mean the increasing interconnectedness of various actors and their activities within the framework of the political system of the European Union.

So far, various theories and concepts have been developed in the political science subfields to capture the increasing global interconnectedness in public policymaking. These theories and concepts can be found in the fields of international relations (e.g. Young, 1980; Sampson, 1982; Webb, 1991), policy analysis (e.g. literature review in Parsons, 1995: 231–243 and Hajer, 2003; Goodin, Moran and Rein, eds., 2008) and Europeanisation studies (e.g. Cowles, Caporaso, and Risse, eds., 2001; Radaelli, 2003; Štremfel, 2013). Political science research into the globalisation of public policies first focused on economic and foreign policies before evolving in other policy fields. Because HE science researchers are interested in the globalisation, Europeanisation and internationalisation of HE policy, their research interests overlap with those of political scientists on the role of the state in (re) shaping public policies in the context of the last wave of globalisation. For this reason, we believe that the cross pollination of political science and education science brings added value to academic research into education as well as to applied knowledge (Jacobi, Martensand and Wolf, eds., 2010). In addition, we also hypothesise that political science knowledge of globalisation could benefit from the education sciences perspective.

Researchers of HE science have so far primarily focused on particular aspects of HE policy in the context of globalisation and internationalisation. These include: student and academic staff mobility (Teichler, 2004, 2012; Kelo, Teichler and Wächter, 2006; Souto-Otero, Huisman, Beerkens, De Wit and Vujić, 2013); policies and strategies of internationalisation (Luijten-Lub, Van der Wende and Huisman, 2005; Frølich, 2006; Teichler, 2009); knowledge transfer (Teichler, 2004); branch campuses (Shams and Huisman, 2012; Wilkins, Balakrishnan and Huisman, 2012); HE rankings (Marginson and Van der Wende, 2007; Kehm and Stensaker, 2009; Horta, 2009); the quality of HE institutions and accreditation procedures (Haug,

2000; Van Damme, 2001; Westerheijden, 2003; Schwarz and Westerheijden (Eds.), 2007); the governing of HE institutions (Scott, 2000; Enders, 2004; Olsen and Maassen, (Eds.), 2009; Dobbins, Knill and Vögtle, 2011); and the internationalisation of research (Kwiek, 2015). Although many experts in the field of higher education have sought answers to the questions raised by the globalisation, Europeanisation and internationalisation of HE public policies, there remains a gap in the HE science field literature in terms of clear definitions of these terms and their mutual relationships (e.g. Knight, 2004, 2007, 2013; Altbach and Knight, 2007). This gap in the literature is to some extent co-determined by the fact that the globalisation of HE policies has been a more recent phenomenon. In spite of the fact that universities have long been considered the most globalised of institutions (Marginson and Considine, 2000: 8), the same cannot be said of public policies in the field of higher education.

The main aim of this article is to contribute to the integration of knowledge from certain political science subfields (international relations, policy analysis and Europeanisation studies) with higher education policy analysis in order to provide a systematic conceptual framework for studying the globalisation of HE policy in the context of the latest wave of globalisation. We examine Europeanisation as a regional mode of the globalisation of public policies.

This research is primarily based on a review of the literature (including Fink-Hafner, ed., 2010 and Dagen and Fink-Hafner, 2016) and an analysis of 28 articles published in the period 1999 to 2016 in two leading scientific journals. The two journals were selected based on interviews with experts in the HE science field, and on the journals' impact factors – ('IF') (Higher Education – IF 1.207 and Journal of Studies in International Education – IF 1.066). The articles were selected using the following keywords: 'globalisation', 'internationalisation', 'Europeanisation'. Our analysis was performed on the first two chapters of *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education* (2012): (a) Chapter One, on *Internationalisation within the Higher Education Context* by Rumbley, Altbach and Reisberg; and (b) Chapter Two, on *Concepts, Rationales, and Interpretive Frameworks in the Internationalisation of Higher Education* by Knight.

We will first develop the theoretical framework and conceptualisation of the globalisation of public policies within the framework of political science. Since public policies are directly or indirectly related to the role of the state, a more detailed conceptualisation will include a variety of internationalisation of public policies. We will present a synthetic conceptualisation in a table together with general examples. We will then apply this conceptualisation to the HE policy field and present the mosaic of public policies targeting higher education in the framework of the current globalisation

574

processes. We will conclude with some comments on the appropriateness of the general conceptualisation of the globalisation of public policies for the HE policy field and suggestions for further research.

The globalisation of public policies: the political science conceptualisation

As a result of the latest wave of globalisation, many social problems – as well as the search for their effective solutions – have become global. In this article we are interested in how states and their governments respond to the need to renew existing public policies or even adopt entirely new public policies.

So far, globalisation processes have been primarily linked to the rise of policy cooperation processes in which governments decide to cooperate with other governments in making national policies as a means to solving global policy problems. However, individual countries still need to both (i) adapt their national policies to meet the pressures of globalisation, either directly or through inter-governmental solutions, as well as (ii) make sure that these policies fit their domestic context.

The globalisation of national policies has occurred first of all as a result of states and their foreign policies. The outcome has been an increase in policy cooperation among states within the framework of multilateral treaties, forums, and global and regional intergovernmental organisations[1] (Young, 1980; Chayes 1993; Drezner, 2001; Brahm, 2005; Keylor, 2011; Coatsworth et al., 2015: 486–487). This has led to a policy convergence – albeit at different levels and different paces in different policy fields (Drezner, 2007).

There are two terms that are broadly used in relation to intergovernmental policy endeavours – international policy *cooperation* and international policy *coordination*. Keohane (1984: 51–52) and Webb (1991: 312) explain that *international policy cooperation* is a broad term encompassing the sharing of information, international consultations and various kinds of negotiations. Whereas *international policy coordination* can be defined as a particular segment of international policy cooperation with some elements of soft monitoring and control (Fink-Hafner, Lajh and Deželan, 2010). Indeed, international policy coordination is to some extent similar to policy cooperation, but also includes mechanisms of soft sanctioning. Policy coordination additionally includes certain types of information sharing

575

---

[1] *International organisation is primarily composed of sovereign states (their governments), but can also be composed of other intergovernmental organisations. For example, see Bernard Koteen, the Office of Public Interest Advising on Intergovernmental Organisations (IGOs) at http://hls.harvard.edu/dept/opia/what-is-public-interest-law/public-international-law/intergovernmental-organizations-igos/.*

and international consultation which allows participating governments to appraise and compare each other's methods in developing public policies (Webb, 1991: 311–312).

Notions of policy coordination have been linked to the traditions of the 'OECD technique' which was developed in the framework of the Paris-based club of western industrialised countries and has been practised since the 1960s (Wallace, 2010: 98). In practice, various kinds of policy cooperation have evolved not only within the OECD, but also within the framework of intergovernmental organisations such as the UN (for example, Agenda 21, the Kyoto Protocol), the International Monetary Fund (IMF multilateral surveillance procedure) and the Council of Europe's international policy coordination.

However, policy cooperation consists of more than global intergovernmental policymaking. Within the framework of the EU's unique, regional political system (Wallace, Pollack and Young, eds., 2010), intergovernmental policymaking is amended by two types of decision-making. One type is the soft lawmaking[2] which arises from intergovernmental policy coordination and has often been related to the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) (Gornitzka, 2005; Borrás and Radaelli, 2010). This kind of law has also been used in international relations. Although soft lawmaking provides non-binding rules, Guzman and Meyer (2010: 222) stress that such rules can have legal significance when they shape expectations as to what constitutes compliance with the binding rules. The second type of decision-making is the Community Method of supranational policymaking. It is sometimes difficult to decouple international policy cooperation from supranational policy cooperation (Laffan and Shaw, 2005).

In this sense, the EU's complex political system includes broader policy cooperation, particular policy coordination in selected policy fields as well as a state-like policymaking on common European public policies which states are required to implement. Indeed, the intergovernmental aspect of the EU political system has been amended by multi-level (including supranational) policymaking that transcends international relations in terms of the relations between states. Therefore, in addition to intergovernmental

576

---

[2] *In the context of international law, soft law refers to rules, guidelines, policy declarations or codes of conduct which set standards of conduct, but which are not strictly binding. By contrast, hard law refers to binding laws on the obligations and rights of states and other international entities, and is legally enforcible. Examples of hard law would be treaties or international agreements, customary laws. (See Guzman and Meyer [2010] and Soft Law Law and Legal Definition, at https://definitions.uslegal.com/s/soft-law/). In the EU, the term 'soft law' is applied to EU measures which are non-binding. Among them are guidelines, recommendations, declarations and opinions. By contrast, regulations, directives, and decisions are binding and can be enforced. (e.g. http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/observatories/eurwork/industrial-relations-dictionary/soft-law).*

cooperation among EU member states, common European public policies have been increasing. While intergovernmental policymaking remains a rule in some policy fields (particularly in foreign and defence policy), in certain other policy fields, intergovernmental voluntary cooperation has occurred as a soft law. In some policy fields, such as employment, the initial soft law has later become binding common policy. Therefore, in some cases, soft law has become hard law.

Historically, certain policy fields have been shaped by globalisation processes in various ways and with various dynamics. Indeed, international policy cooperation as a process of modifying national processes under the pressure of globalisation has rapidly increased since the Second World War (Coatsworth, Cole, Hangan, Perdue, C. Tilly, L. Tilly, 2015). While economic policies have been pioneering and were the first to be incorporated into the Europeanisation project, education policies, environment policies and sustainable development policies have been subject to delayed international policy cooperation. Multilateral policy cooperation processes in the field of education have also become Europeanised with a delay (Rumbley, 2007; Štremfel, 2013).

As Table 1 illustrates, political science offers two key approaches to classifying policymaking in the context of public policy globalisation: (1) an approach that focuses on the level of government; and (2) an approach that focuses on three characteristics of policymaking, namely, actors, policy decisions, and the means of monitoring and control.

Table 1 presents the globalisation of public policies in terms of the governmental level at which policymaking takes place (the global; the macro-regional-EU; the macro national; and the meso national level), the main actors, the types of policy decisions and the means of monitoring and controlling these policies.

Taking the *level of government* approach, we can identify five levels of policymaking: (1) macro-global policymaking that involves international policy coordination among national governments; (2) confederal policymaking within the framework of the EU, which involves international coordination among EU member states; (3) federal/transnational policymaking within the framework of the EU, which uses the Community method for common European policymaking; (4) macro-national policymaking, where national governments are involved in national and inter-governmental policymaking; and (5) meso-level decision-making, which takes place within the politico-territorial units. These can occur at both the national as well as subnational governmental levels in EU member states (e.g. in the framework of regions/Länder in Germany and Austria and at the local community level).

Table 1: THE GLOBALISATION OF PUBLIC POLICIES – POLITICAL SCIENCE
CONCEPTUALISATION

LEVELS OF GOVERN-MENT POLICY CHARAC-TERISTICS	Macro – global (inter-governmental)	Macro-regional (EU)		Macro National	Meso national
		Confederal / Inter-govern-mental	Federal / the Com-munity method		
Actors	Governments	Governments	State and non-state actors at the EU level	National governing actors	State and non-state policy actors
Policy decisions	Policy coopera-tion	Confederal decision-mak-ing; policy cooperation; policy co-ordination (including soft law)	Directives	Participa-tion in intergov-ernmental coopera-tion, coor-dination; national politics of particular policies	Public poli-cies (includ-ing the national implemen-tation of EU policies – where applicable)
Means of monitoring and control	Multilateral sur-veillance; soft sanctions (e.g. publication of fig-ures on particular countries); pos-sible economic and political sanc-tions in the case of economic-led intergovernmen-tal organisations (OECD and IMF-like PC); possible political sanc-tions (Council of Europe-like PC)	Multilateral surveillance (e.g. pub-lication of figures on particular countries); soft (politi-cal) intergov-ernmental sanctions; possible economic and political sanctions in the case of economic-led policies	EC moni-toring and control; sanctions before filing the case at court; cases before the European courts	National moni-toring, control, sanctions in line with the national law	National moni-toring, control, sanctions in line with the nation-al law

Sources: Fink-Hafner, Lajh, Deželan (2010); Fink-Hafner, Deželan, Lajh (2010).

The three *characteristics of policymaking* (actors, policy decisions, means of monitoring and control) give a more detailed insight into the nature of policymaking and policy implementation. As Table 1 shows, at many governance levels, governments are not only the key players, but also often the sole actors. This makes policymaking in the context of globalisation predominantly inter-governmental endeavours rather than multi-actor endeavours involving state and non-state actors. The characteristics of policy decisions range from policy cooperation to policy coordination and even supranational lawmaking, as in the case of EU directives. The means of monitoring and control are the mechanisms in place to ensure the implementation of

578

particular policy decisions adopted in the framework of inter-governmental processes in the global or regional (EU) context (De Ruiter, 2008).

In the next section, we will test the political science conceptualisation of the globalisation of public policies in the field of HE policy.

The globalisation of higher education policy

Social scientists have identified many policy decisions, programmes and policies created at the global and regional inter-governmental levels as well as national and sub-national levels developed in the latest wave of globalisation. Nevertheless, a vast segment of regulation of educational policies (including HE policies) has remained the preserve of states, inter-governmental organisations and supranational bodies produced by states (Antunes, 2006: 38–39).

Some international organisations were already developing HE agendas as early as the 1960s. For instance, in 1969 the OECD launched the Higher Education Programme – IMHE – which was active until 2016; while the OECD's Enhancing Higher Education System Performance remains active. Several international organisations developed HE agendas during the 1980s which have recently extended their activities in the field (for example, UNESCO, the OECD). The General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), which was adopted by the World Trade Organisation and entered into force in 1995, transformed the position of Higher Education. By introducing the idea of an 'internationally tradable service', higher education became globally commoditised (see Knight, 2008a: 13). Other intergovernmental organisations, such as the World Bank, have only recently begun to focus on Higher Education by setting new regional and national projects for influencing national higher education policies (Shahjahan, 2012). Overall, globalisation has led to international organisations increasingly becoming important players in the HE field (see Moutsios, 2009).

HE policy is clearly globalised by macro-global (intergovernmental) policy interlinking, and is regionalised by the European Union. Since 1987, the European Community (later the European Union), as a region with increasing state-like characteristics, has adopted many strategies, programmes, schemes and policy tools. In 1992, education was incorporated into the Maastricht Treaty (paragraphs 126 and 127 are dedicated to HE). Among the European Commission's key documentation on higher education have been: 'Europe 2020: A European Strategy for Smart, Sustainable, and Inclusive Growth' (2010); 'Supporting Growth and Jobs – An Agenda for the Modernisation of Europe's Higher Education Systems' (2011); and the Erasmus+ Programme (since 2014).

HE policy researchers have identified concerted pan-European policies

579

(Bologna, 1999; Lisbon, 2000), harmonised HE reforms in 49 countries, as well as a dichotomy of convergence and diversity (Zgaga, Teichler and Brennan, 2013: 12–14). The Lisbon strategy of linking education policy with economic policy in the interests of increasing the EU's global competitiveness marks a new phase in the EU's governance of higher education (Haskel, 2009). The European Commission has extended its role and has become influential in generating, coordinating and communicating the discourse on higher education (Haskel, 2009; Komljenovič and Miklavčič, 2013). While the forms of HE policy globalisation identified in Table 2 demonstrate the limited involvement of non-state actors and the weak means of monitoring and control, Haskel (2009) stresses that in spite of weak processes the results may be significant, as is evidenced by the policy cooperation in European HE. This cannot be understood without acknowledged common interests, the interlinkage of HE policy with other policies – particularly economic policies (as in the case of the Lisbon strategy reaction to the global competition) – and the presence of a body acting as a hub and a driver of that process, as the European Commission does (Haskel, 2009: 285).

The Conceptualisation of Globalisation in the Education Science Field

A bottom-up search of the definitions of globalisation, Europeanisation and internationalisation in the field of education science highlights the fragmented endeavours of HE scholars. Based on our review of the education science literature[3] we can say that various terms have been used to describe globalisation and internationalisation both in general and in the field of HE policies. It also reveals, firstly, the predominant interest in linking globalisation with internationalisation (Table 2), and, secondly, a broad range of highly fragmented research endeavours.

The terms used in various attempts to clarify these phenomena include: process, activity, context, concept, frame, effort, response model, cooperation, competition, mobility, academic knowledge transfer, and positive development, etc. Most scholars focus on describing and analysing one or two terms (usually a combination of 'globalisation' and 'internationalisation'). Few scholars attempt to link the definitions of these terms in the education science with general definitions (for example, Knight, 1994, 2004, 2007, 2013; Altbach and Knight, 2007; Van der Wende, 1997, 2001, 2004; Teichler, 2004). While the literature on higher education mostly examines the internationalisation of higher education, the concepts of 'globalisation' and 'internationalisation' are usually not clearly distinguished in the literature (Teichler, 2004). Nevertheless, there have been conceptual

---

3 *Methodological details are presented in the Introduction.*

developments which distinguish between internationalisation abroad and internationalisation at home, particularly the internal internationalisation of HE institutions (Knight, 2008a: 22–24).

Table 2: THE NUMBER OF ARTICLES IN THE HIGHER EDUCATION JOURNAL OF STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION WHICH INCLUDE THE LISTED KEY WORDS (1999–2016)

Journals Key words	Higher Education	Journal of Studies in International Education
globalisation	362	314
internationalisation	320	382
Europeanisation	17	31
globalisation, internationalisation, Europeanisation	8	20
globalisation, internationalisation	169	233
globalisation, Europeanisation	9	20
internationalisation, Europeanisation	11	26

581

Many scholars link the internationalisation of HE policy with traditional internationalisation activities, such as the mobility of students and scholars, the development of study programmes in the English language and cooperation between HE institutions on research projects, joint study programmes and other international activities related to teaching and learning (see Teichler, 2004, 2012; Kelo, Teichler and Wächter, 2006; Souto-Otero, Huisman, Beerkens, De Wit and Vujić, 2013). Here the focus is on internationalisation as cooperation and the development of skills, knowledge, attitudes and values in an international context. Other authors focus on particular innovations in the internationalisation of HE as part of international competition. Examples of such innovations include: branch campuses; educational hubs; virtual learning; transnational education; and franchising and twinning (e.g. Shams and Huisman, 2012; Wilkins, Stephens Balakrishnan and Huisman, 2012; Deardorff, de Wit, Heyl, Eds., 2012).

HE policy specialists sometimes employ a discourse that resembles the political science understanding of the globalisation of public policies. Indeed, education science literature and political science literature share the definition of 'internationalisation' as a process *inter* nations (Zgaga, Teichler and Brennan, 2013: 13). On the basis of this finding and our historical overview of the globalisation of HE public policymaking, we applied the general conceptualisation of globalisation of public policies to the HE policy field (Table 3).

Table 3: THE GLOBALISATION OF HE POLICIES – AN INTERDISCIPLINARY
VIEW

LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT POLICY CHARACTERISTICS	Macro –global (intergovern-mental)	Macro-regional (EU)		Macro National	Meso (policy)
		Confederal / Inter-governmental	Federal / the Community method		
Actors	OECD, World Bank, UNESCO, UNDP, UNICEF, WTO in the field of HE policy	member states' Governments' and national Ministers' meetings on EU level; European Commission, European Council and European Parliament – invited experts – regional inter-governmental stakeholders (e.g. European University Association – EUA; European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education – ENQA; European Students' Union – ESU)	Not used in the field of HE.	national governing actors: Ministries and state agencies in the field of HE (covers policy fields: education, science and technology, culture, foreign affairs, immigration, trade and industry, employment)	national state actors and non-state policy actors: e.g. national Rectors' conferences, students' organisations and groups, academic or professional associations, scholarship organisations, science councils, NGOs in the HE field, think-tanks in HE field, experts' networks, chambers of commerce, employers' associations, HE policy entrepreneurs
Policy decisions	– documents *(e.g. World Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty-First Century: Vision and Action* (UN); *European Regional Convention – Lisbon Recognition Convention* (Council of Europe and UNESCO); General Agreement on Trade in Services – GATS (WTO), etc.) – programmes (e.g. World Bank specific regional / national programs in HE; Enhancing higher education system performance (OECD)	*soft law mechanisms – open method of coordination (OMC) – subsidiarity principle – policy cooperation* – documents (e.g. *Bologna Declaration* – Bologna process; *Lisbon strategy* – Lisbon process, *Education and Training 2010, Education and Training 2020, Europe 2020*) – programmes (e.g. Erasmus+)	no directives explicitly in HE policy field → ***indirect impact on HE policy*** *by some directives related to policy fields that are close to HE* – directives (e.g. indirect influence by Council of European Union's directives on employment)	→ national legislation in the field of HE: – documents (e.g. laws and strategies that regulates national HE system; National action plans (NAPs); budgetary decisions on GDP percentage invested in HE) – policy decisions (e.g. establishment of ENIC/NARIC offices, establishment of national HE quality assurance agencies)	→ national public policies and national implementation of EU policies and programmes; – documents (e.g. acts, programs and strategies that regulate specific issues in HE system related to e.g. students' standard, evaluation and accreditation processes, strategic decisions for specific HE fields – e.g. internationalisation, study programmes, QA, R&D, recognition policy)

Table 3 continued on page 583.

LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT — POLICY CHARACTERISTICS	Macro –global (intergovern- mental)	Macro-regional (EU)		Macro National	Meso (policy)
		Confederal / Inter- governmental	Federal / the Community method		
Means of monitoring and control	publication of cross-national and comparative educational statis- tics and indicators – e.g. *Education at a Glance*) **No direct sanc- tions in HE** but possible difficulties with funding or ab- sence of particular regional or national programmes in HE field or related policy fields	reports and com- parative data – e.g. Bologna process implementation reports for minis- ters' conferences; EURIDICE data) **No direct sanc- tions in HE** but possible: – economic and political sanctions in the case of not following economic- led policies which can influence HE (e.g. EU directives on employment of young people) – consequence of particular courts' verdicts (e.g. European Court of Justice; see e.g. Françoise Gravier v. City of Liège (1985) Case 293/83)* – difficulties in get- ting EU funding if national implemen- tation of EU policies is missing	**No direct sanctions in HE**	– soft sanctions (e.g. publication of figures and data on particular progress of national HE system can indi- rectly influence the government political stabil- ity and the level of voter support) **No sanctions in HE but** possible: – consequence of particular Supreme / Constitutional Courts verdicts - difficulties with EU funding programs (insufficient use of EU funds)	– national monitor- ing, control (e.g. **non-funding sanctions** in line with the national law or partially funding; stakehold- ers exclusion from the relevant policy decision processes)

* The lawsuit was filed at the European Court of Justice by a French student who wished to study in Belgium under the same conditions as Belgian students, without paying tuition fees for foreign citizens. Since the application was rejected, as a citizen of the EU, the stu- dent sued the city of Liege and won the case (ruling against discrimination in access to edu- cation for vocational training). The Gravier verdict served as an impetus to the European Commission to launch the Erasmus mobility programme (see e.g. de Witte, 1993; Corbett, 2003; Maassen and Musselin, 2009).

583

The information in Table 3 reveals that the globalisation of HE policy has followed the same patterns of globalisation seen in other public poli- cies. This can be witnessed first of all in the increasing involvement of inter- governmental organisations in various forms of policy cooperation in gen- eral and policy coordination in particular. While education science mostly examines the structural elements or processes of the internationalisation of HE public policies, it leaves some important segments of globalisation under-researched. Among them has been the role of experts in the HE pol- icy field as well as experts in policy fields closely related to education, such

as research and technology policy. Political scientists have already acknowledged the role of experts, while researchers in the field of education science have yet to do so (Borras and Radaelli, 2010; De Ruiter, 2010).

Conclusion

We have outlined what the globalisation of public policies means, how the globalisation of public policies relates to the internationalisation of public policies and where the Europeanisation of public policies fits in. To do this, we have applied the political science conception of public policy globalisation, distinguishing between the levels of government and the characteristics of policy processes (actors, policy decisions, means of monitoring and control).

The insight into the education science literature (and to some extent also the political science literature) has revealed that, in the field of HE policy, globalisation has primarily taken place through intergovernmental policy cooperation, and in the EU primarily through policy coordination. In this sense, globalisation is reflected in the Europeanisation of HE policy. Although experts in education science (notably Zgaga, Teichler and Brennan, 2013: 13) emphasise that national HE systems persist and vary in terms of their level of globalisation, we can identify differing trends. Firstly, the globalisation (primarily the Europeanisation) of HE policies has been closely connected with the globalisation/ Europeanisation of other policies – particularly those at the heart of strategies to increase global competitiveness (economic, technological, research policies). Indeed, EU member states have effectively shifted more authority to the intergovernmental / supranational level when it comes to education. Secondly, the predominantly soft form of HE policy cooperation among EU member states has been amended by the supranational overriding of national education policies by the rulings of the European Court of Justice (ECJ). The ECJ's rulings relate to other policies within its jurisdiction, but also indirectly affect education policies. Here, the under-researched role of national constitutional courts (particularly the courts of the most influential EU member states) need to be taken into account (White, 2014). Indeed, the political science conception of the globalisation of public policies provides a more detailed and precise insight into the globalisation of HE policies.

This finding is line with the concerns of some education science experts as to whether education science research has adequately adapted to be able to capture the globalisation of HE policy processes from all angels (e.g. actors, policy characteristics, policy instruments, policy outcomes etc.) (Alexiadou, 2016; Robertson and Dale, 2016). These experts have identified the need to improve research in the HE policy field. While we second the

584

call from Alexiadou, Robertson and Dale, we believe the potential improvements in political science research into the globalisation of public policies must also be considered.

Indeed, the insights from the education sciences into the specifics of HE policy globalisation reveal several aspects of public policy globalisation that remain under-researched from a political-science perspective. The following political science research gaps become visible when examining education sciences research: the role of sub-national (regional, local) and organisational (e.g. university) factors in the globalisation of public policies and their implementation; the role of changing values in the globalisation of public policy; the patterns of policy innovation and dissemination; and the role of the national context in the globalisation of public policies and their implementation.

We hope that this article will encourage multidisciplinary endeavours and interdisciplinary research, and bring together researchers from the various disciplines to create new research approaches that would not otherwise be undertaken in their own disciplines.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexiadou, Nafsika (2016): Responding to 'Crisis': Education Policy Research in Europe. Research in Education 96 (1): 23–30. Sage Publications. DOI: 10.1177/0034523716664600.

Altbach, Philip G. and Jane Knight (2007): The Internationalisation of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities. Journal of Studies in International Education 11 Fall/Winter (3–4): 290–305.

Anderson, James (2002): Questions of Democracy, Territoriality and Globalisation. In James Anderson (ed.), Transnational Democracy: Political Spaces and Border Crossings, 6–38. UK: Taylor and Francis.

Antunes, Fátima (2006): Globalisation and Europeanisation of Education Policies: Routes, Processes and Metamorphoses. European Educational Research Journal 5 (1): 38–55.

Borrás, Susana and Claudio M. Radaelli (2010): Recalibrating the Open Method of Coordination: Towards Diverse and More Effective Usages. Sieps (2010): 7, Accessible at http://www.sieps.se/sites/default/files/2010_7.pdf (12. 1. 2017).

Brahm, Eric (2005): Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs). In Guy Burgess and Heidi Burgess (eds.), Beyond Intractability. Conflict Information Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder. Accessible at <http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/role-igo>, (22. 1. 2017).

Coatsworth, John and Juan Cole, Michael P Hangan, Peter C. Perdue, Charles Tilly, Louise Tilly (2015): Global Connections. Politics, Exchange and Social Life in World History (II): Since 1500.

Corbett, Anne (2003): Ideas, Institutions and Policy Entrepreneurs: Towards a New History of Higher Education in the European Community. European Journal of Education 8 (3): 315–330.

Cowles, Maria Green and James Caporaso, Thomas Risse eds. (2001): Transforming Europe. Europeanisation and Domestic Change. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press.

Dagen, Tamara and Danica Fink-Hafner (2016): The Globalisation and Internationalisation of Universities. Paper presented at the 8th Slovenian Social Science Conference on "Contemporary Social Transformations: Reflecting Inter-cultural Encounters". Piran, Slovenia.

De Ruiter, Rik (2008): Developing Multilateral Surveillance Tools in the EU. West European Politics 31 (5): 896–914.

De Ruiter, Rik (2010): "Variations on a Theme. Governing the Knowledge-Based Society in the EU through Methods of Open Coordination in Education and R&D". Journal of European Integration 32 (2): 157–173.

De Witte, Bruno (1993): Higher Education and the Constitution of the European Community. Higher Education Policy Series (16): 186–186. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers Limited.

Deardorff, Darla K. and Hans de Wit, John D. Heyl, Tony Adams (eds.) (2012): The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Dobbins, Michael and Christoph Knill, Eva Maria Vögtle (2011): An Analytical Framework for the Cross-country Comparison of Higher Education Governance. Higher Education, 62 (5): 665–683.

Drezner, Daniel W. (2001): Globalization and Policy Convergence. International Studies Review, 3 (1): 53–78.

Drezner, Daniel W. (2007): All Politics is Global: Explaining International Regulatory Regimes. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Enders, Jürgen (2004): Higher Education, Internationalization, and the Nation-state: Recent Developments and Challenges to Governance Theory. Higher Education (47): 261–282.

Fink-Hafner, Danica (ed.) (2010): The Open Method of Cooperation: A View from Slovenia. Ljubljana: Založba FDV.

Fink-Hafner, Danica and Damjan Lajh, Tomaž Deželan (2010a): The Open Method of Cooperation in the Global Context of Policy Cooperation. In Danica Fink-Hafner (ed.) The Open Method of Cooperation: A View from Slovenia, 17–34. Ljubljana: Založba FDV.

Fink-Hafner, Danica and Tomaž Deželan, Damjan Lajh (2010b): Conclusion: the Open Method of Coordination – Not so Different from Multilateral Policy Cooperation. In Danica Fink-Hafner (ed.) The Open Method of Cooperation: A View from Slovenia, 155–168. Ljubljana: Založba FDV.

Frølich, Nicoline (2006): Still Academic and National – Internationalisation in Norwegian Research and Higher Education. Higher Education 52 (3): 405–420.

Goodin, Robert E. and Michael Moran, Martin Rein eds. (2008): The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gornitzka, Åse (2005): Coordinating Policies for a "Europe of Knowledge"– Emerging Practices of the "Open Method of Coordination" in Education and Research. Oslo: ARENA.

586

Grugel, Jean (2002): Democratization: A Critical Introduction. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and New York: Palgrave.

Guzman, Andrew T. and Timothy L. Meyer (2010): Internatıonal Soft Law. Legal Analysis 171. Berkeley Law Scholarship Repository. Accessible at http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/facpubs/695/ (12. 2. 2017).

Hajer, Maarten (2003): Policy without Polity? Policy Analysis and the Institutional void. Policy Sciences 36 (2): 175–195.

Haskel, Barbara G. (2009): Weak Process, Strong Results: Cooperation in European Higher Education. In Tömmel Ingeborg and Amy Verdun (eds.), Innovative Governance in the European Union, 273–288. The Politics of Multilevel Policymaking. Boulder, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Haug, Guy (2000): National Exchange Agencies in the Process towards a European Space for Higher Education. Journal of Studies in International Education 4 (2): 21–32.

Held, David (2000): The Changing Coutours of Political Community: Rethinking Democracy in the Context of Globalization. In Barry Holden (Ed.), Global Democracy: Key debates, 17–31. London: Routledge.

Held, David and Anthony G. McGrew (2003): Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance. Cambridge, Oxford and Malden: Polity Press in Blackwell Publishing Inc.

Held, David and Anthony G. McGrew, David Goldblatt, Jonathan Perraton (2003): Global Transformations. Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press and Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Horta, Hugo (2009): Global and National Prominent Universities: Internationalization, Competitiveness and the Role of the State. Higher Education 58 (3): 387–405.

Jacobi, Anja P. and Kerstin Martensand, Klaus Dieter Wolf eds. (2010): Education in Political Science. Discovering a Neglected Field. Oxford: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group Ltd.

Kaldor, Mary (2003): Global Civil Society: An Answer to War. Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press in Blackwell Publishing Inc.

Kehm, Barbara M. and Bjørn Stensaker (2009): University Rankings, Diversity and the New Landscape of Higher Education. Global Perspectives on Higher Education, 18. Sense Publishers.

Kelo, Maria and Ulrich Teichler, Bernd Wächter (2006): Toward Improved Data on Student Mobility in Europe: Findings and Concepts of the Eurodata Study. Journal of Studies in International Education, 10 (3): 194–223.

Keohane, Robert O. (1984): After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy. Princeton N.J: Princeton Universtiy Press.

Keylor, William R. (2011): The Twentieth-century World and beyond. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Knight, Jane (1994): Internationalization: Elements and Checkpoints. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.

Knight, Jane (2004): Internationalization Remodeled: Definition, Approaches and Rationales. Journal of Studies in International Education, 8 (1): 5–31.

587

Knight, Jane (2007): Internationalization: Concepts, Complexities and Challenges. In International Handbook of Higher Education, 207–227. Netherlands: Springer Netherlands.

Knight, Jane (2008a): Higher Education in Turmoil. The Changing World of Internationalisation. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Knight, Jane (2008b): The Internationalization of Higher Education in the 21st century. Higher Education in Turmoil. The Changing World of Internationalization. Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 1–18.

Knight, Jane (2013): The Changing Landscape of Higher Education Internationalisation – for Better or Worse? Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education 17 (3): 84–90.

Koehane, Robert O. (1984): After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.

Komljenovič, Janja and Klemen Miklavič (2013): Imagining Higher Education in the European Knowledge Economy: Discourse and Ideas in Communications of the EU. In Pavel Zgaga, Ulrich Teichler and John Brennan (eds.) The Globalisation Challenge for European Higher Education. Convergences and Diversity, Centres and Peripheries, 33–54. Frankfurt am Main, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxfordm Warszawa, Wien: Peter Lang.

Kwiek, Marek (2015): The Internationalization of Research in Europe: A Quantitative Study of 11 National Systems from a Micro-level Perspective. Journal of Studies in International Education, 19 (4): 341–359.

Laffan Brigid and Colin Shaw (2005): Classifying and Mapping OMC in Different Policy Areas. Report of NEWGOV, New Modes of Governance Integrated Project priority 7. Dublin: Citizens and Governance in the Knowledge-based Society. Accessible at http://www.eu-newgov.org/database/DELIV/D02D09_Classifying_and_Mapping_OMC.pdf (4. 2. 2017).

Luijten-Lub, Anneke and Marijk Van der Wende, Jeroen Huisman (2005): On Cooperation and Competition: A Comparative Analysis of National Policies for Internationalisation of Higher Education in Seven Western Countries. Journal of Studies in International Education, 9 (2): 147–163.

Maassen, Peter and Christine Musselin (2009): European Integration and the Europeanisation of Higher Education. In European Integration and the Governance of Higher Education and Research (pp. 3–14). Netherlands: Springer Netherlands.

Maassen, Peter and Johan P. Olsen (eds.) (2007): University Dynamics and European Integration (Vol. 19). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Marginson, Simon and Marijk Van der Wende (2007): Globalisation and Higher Education. OECD Education Working Papers 8. OECD Publishing (NJ1).

Marginson, Simon and Mark Considine (2000): The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

McGrew, Anthony G. (2002): From Global Governance to Good Governance: Theories and Prospects of Democratizing the Global Polity. In Morten Ougaard and Richard Higgott (eds.), Towards a Global Polity, 207–226. London and New York: Routlege.

588

Moutsios, Stavros (2009): International Organisations and Transnational Education Policy. Compare 39 (4): 469–481.

Ougaard, Morten and Richard Higgott (eds.) (2002): Towards a Global Polity. London and New York: Routlege.

Parsons, Wayne (1995): Public Policy. Aldershot, UK and Vermont, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing Company.

Radaelli, Claudio M. (2003): The Europeanization of Public Policy. In Kevin Featherstone and Claudio M. Radaelli (eds), The Politics of Europeanization, 27–56. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Robertson, Susan and Roger Dale (2016): Comparing Policies in a Globalising World: Methodological Reflections. In Andreas Hadjar and Christiane Gross (eds), Education Systems and Inequalities, 33–50. Bristol: Policy Press.

Rumbley, Laura E. (2007): Internationalization in the Universities of Spain: Opportunities, Imperatives and Outcomes. Boston College Dissertations and Theses, 2007, AAI3268514.

Sahlin, Kerstin (2016): International Relations Theory. In Christopher Ansell and Jacob Torfing (eds.), Handbook on Theories of Governance. Cheltham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Sampson III, Martin W. (1982): Some Necessary Conditions for International Policy Coordination. The Journal of Conflict Resolution 26 (2): 352–384.

Schwarz, Stefanie and Don F. Westerheijden (eds.) (2007): Accreditation and Evaluation in the European Higher Education Area, 5. Netherlands: Springer Science & Business Media.

Scott, Peter (2000): Globalisation and Higher Education: Challenges for the 21st Century. Journal of Studies in International Education, 4 (1): 3–10.

Shahjahan, Riyad A. (2012): The Roles of International Organizations (IOs) in Globalizing Higher Education Policy. Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research. Netherlands: Springer Netherlands, 369–407.

Shahjahan, Riyad A. and Meggan Madden (2015): Uncovering the Images and Meanings of International Organizations (IOs) in Higher Education Research. Higher Education, May 2015, 69 (5): 705–717.

Shams, Farshid and Jeroen Huisman (2012): Managing Offshore Branch Campuses: An Analytical Framework for Institutional Strategies. Journal of Studies in International Education, 16 (2): 106–127.

Shaw, Martin (2000): Theory of the Global State: Globality as an Unfinished Revolution. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Souto-Otero, Manuel and Jeroen Huisman, Maarja Beerkens, Hans de Wit, Sunčica Vujić (2013): Barriers to International Student Mobility: Evidence from the Erasmus Program, Educational Researcher, 42 (2): 70–77.

Štremfel, Urška (2013): Nova oblika vladavine v Evropski uniji na področju izobraževalnih politik, Doctoral dissertation, Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.

Teichler, Ulrich (2004): The Changing Debate on Internationalisation of Higher Education. Higher Education 48 (1): 5–26.

589

Teichler, Ulrich (2009): Internationalisation of Higher Education: European Experiences. Asia Pacific Education Review, 10: 93–106.

Teichler, Ulrich (2012): International Student Mobility in Europe in the Context of the Bologna Process. Journal of International Education and Leadership 2 (1): 1–13.

Van Damme, Dirk (2001): Quality Issues in the Internationalisation of Higher Education. Higher Education, 41 (4): 415–441.

Van der Wende, Marijk C. (1997): Missing Links, the Relationship between National Policies for Internationalisation and those for Higher Education in General. In Torsten Kälvemark and Marijk van der Wende (eds.), National Policies for Internationalisation of Higher Education in Europe, 10–41. Stockholm: National Agency for Higher Education.

Van der Wende, Marijk C. (2001a): The International Dimension in National Higher Education Policies: What has Changed in Europe in the Last Five Years?.European Journal of Education, 36 (4): 431–442.

Van der Wende, Marijk C. (2001b): Internationalisation Policies: About New Trends and Contrasting Paradigms. Higher Education Policy, 14 (3): 249–260.

Van der Wende, Marijk C. (2004): Introduction. In Jeroen Huisman and Marijk van der Wende (eds.), On Cooperation and Competition: National and European Policies for the Internationalisation of Higher Education, 9–17. Bonn: Lemmens.

Wallace, Helen (2010): An Institutional Anatomy and Five Policy Modes. In Helen Wallace, Mark A. Pollack and Alasdair R. Young (eds.) Policy-making in the European Union, 69–104. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Webb, Michael C. (1991): International Economic Structures, Government Interests, and International Coordination of Macroeconomic Adjustment Policies. International Organization, 45 (03): 309–342.

Westerheijden, Don F. (2003): Accreditation in Western Europe: Adequate Reactions to Bologna Declaration and the General Agreement on Trade in Services?, Journal of Studies in International Education, 7 (3): 277–302.

White, Camille (2014): National Constitutional Courts and the EU. Civitas: Institute for the Study of Civil Society. November 2014.

Wilkins, Stephen, Melodena Stephens Balakrishnan and Jeroen Huisman (2012): Student Choice in Higher Education: Motivations for Choosing to Study at an International Branch Campus. Journal of Studies in International Education, 16 (5): 413–433.

Young, Oran R. (1980): International Regimes: Problems of Concept Formation, World Politics 32 (3): 331–356.

Zgaga, Pavel, Ulrich Teichler, John Brennan (2013): Introduction. Challenges for European Higher Education: 'Global' and 'National', 'Europe' and 'Sub-Europes'. In Pavel Zgaga and Ulrich Teichler, Brennan, John (eds.), The Globalisation Challenge for European Higher Education. Convergences and Diversity, Centres and Peripheries, 11–30. Frankfurt am Main, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxfordm Warszawa, Wien: Peter Lang.

590

INTERNET SOURCES:

Bernard Koteen Office of Public Interest Advising on Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs). Accessible at http://hls.harvard.edu/dept/opia/what-is-public-interest-law/public-international-law/intergovernmental-organizations-igos/ (12. 1. 2017).

591