

 <p>ISSN NO. 2320-5407</p>	<p>Journal Homepage: - www.journalijar.com</p> <h2 style="text-align: center;">INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)</h2> <p style="text-align: center;">Article DOI: 10.21474/IJAR01/4987 DOI URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/4987</p>	 <p>INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR) ISSN 2320-5407 Journal homepage: http://www.journalijar.com Journal DOI: 10.21474/IJAR01</p>
---	--	--

RESEARCH ARTICLE

INTERNATIONALISING HIGHER EDUCATION: DEBATES AND CHANGES IN INDONESIA.

Ani Cahyadi.

Faculty of Tarbiyah, Antasari State Institute of Islamic Studies, Banjarmasin, Indonesia.

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History

Received: 27 May 2017
Final Accepted: 29 June 2017
Published: July 2017

Key words:-

internasionalitation of higher education in Indonesia; competitions and predations.

Abstract

Debates related to internasionalitation of higher education in Indonesia reached anticlimax. Since the act of no. 12, 2012 be ratified on October 10, 2012, the direction of internationalization is increasingly clear. In the chapter IV of the act, providence of higher education through other state institutions has listed.

The inception of the act makes debates related to the internalization of higher education in Indonesia are getting hotter. At least, there are three camps in the debates. The first is the full support of internationalization of higher education. The second are those who absolutely reject the existence of the internationalization. And the last one was among who are trying to be careful before understand related conception of internationalization of higher education.

In principle, the debates are very concerned with the perception associated with term internationalization. For those who have analysis of the new law, the six chapter that accommodates the existence of higher education by the institutions of other countries, open the tap of "competitions" or "predations" between domestic colleges and universities organized by other countries.

This paper aims to discuss the major thrusts of debates, policies and trends of internationalisation in Indonesia, primarily with respect to teaching and learning notably since about 2000. Thereby, attention will be paid to research on international aspects of higher education. The arguments draw from the author's prior own research as well as secondary analyses of research on internationalization of higher education.

Copy Right, IJAR, 2017,. All rights reserved.

Introduction:-

Internationalization have received much attention in the scholarly literature of different academic disciplines over the last decades¹

¹For example, please see: MF Guillén, "is globalization Civilizing, Destructive or Feeble? A Critique of Five Key Debates in the Social Science Literature". *Annual review of Sociology*, Vol. 27 (2001), p. 235-260; Joseph E. Stiglitz, "Globalization and Growth in Emerging Markets and the New Economy." *Journal of Policy Modeling* 25 (2003): 505-524.

The total absolute number of foreign students worldwide was about 200,000 in the mid-1950s. It surpassed 500,000 in 1970. It reached one million in the late 1970s and was about 1.2 million in 1987, when the ERASMUS programme was established.

Within the following 17 years, i.e. until 2004, the number of foreign students reached 2.5 million (UNESCO Institute for Statistics 2006). One has to bear in mind, though, that the total number of students in tertiary education increased at more or less the same pace during the same period. Thus, the *study abroad rate* remained constant at about 2%. In many Indonesian countries, however, the rates of foreign students seem to have increased over time: from less than 3% on average to more than 7%. This is primarily due to the fact that the absolute number of students increased to a higher extent outside Indonesia as a combined effect of demographic development and a higher growth of enrolment rates, and only to a limited extent due to a growing popularity of Indonesia as a destination for study abroad.

Since about the late 2000s, the first international campus in Indonesia was established in the area of BSD Tangerang. The campus mission is to provide an internationally recognized curriculum to undergraduates, graduates and post graduates through its focus on teaching, learning and research. The university aims to teach students how to apply knowledge to expand personal growth and opportunities, advance social and community development, and foster economic competitiveness. It is not surprising if this university issues double degrees.

With a form like this, internationalization means that programs, curriculum and degrees are recognized by the international level. The result is clear, the output of the university not only can work locally but also recruited by companies abroad.

But now, there are dozens of university labeled international. If at first, private universities are more use of international labels, this time many state university using the same label. The addition of international labels becomes a trend that is considered profitable for the colleges. For example, the use of the label it can be through motto "world class university", "international university". One of the conditions in an attempt for internationalizing is through multiply the number of foreign students and foreign teachers.

For those who use it, international label becomes an attraction for prospective students. Although it is also recognized that this label actually makes them fear because of high tuition rate.

For example, in Indonesia, experts agree that the single strongest driver for the attention paid to internationalization was the "success story" of the ERASMUS programme.² In Indonesia, the driver is very complicated. The diaspora of globalization mentioned as the key driver of internationalization in Indonesia higher level education.

Key Thematic Areas:-

In line with the globalization, in increasingly integrated and open world, competition has become a central preoccupation of the higher education subsector. Being competitive become key and global positioning is integral to competing with other nation in the evolving hierarchical and unequal global higher education system. Several scientists characterize the competition phenomenon. According to Slaughter and Rhoades, one of its key features is the manifestation of academic capitalism, distinguished by universities as entrepreneurial marketers and knowledge as a commodity rather than a public good.³

Foremost, the global higher education system is not uniform. It is characterized by diversity in relation to every dimension of what it means to be a university. The university was, by its original intent, an international organization. The Islamic Mosque and the Arabic language were international, if it makes sense to talk in such terms before the emergence of the modern state. Thus, the university or higher education level was international.

But, with the diversity, comes differentiation pictured by performance rankings and tables within countries and internationally. For example, the *Times Higher Education* magazine tables and *Webometrics* tend to emphasize research performance, while Shanghai Jiao Tong University tables place greater emphasis on graduate destinations

²the programme inaugurated in 1987 to stimulate and support temporary mobility of students within Indonesia.

³Sheila Slaughter and Gary Rhoades, *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State, and Higher Education* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2004), p. 29.

and their impact in society. Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) World University Ranking also uses indicators in question are academic, publication, quality management, the adequacy of the ratio of lecturers, as well as student exchange/international lecturer.

These ranking mechanism are a by-brand of the competition phenomenon. Ellen Hazelkorn said that higher education leaders are increasingly using these rankings to make decisions and to influence reform.⁴ While Usher and Savino point out that ranking mechanisms are created with specific set of indicators designed to represent quality; thus, some indicators are omitted and various ranking mechanisms focus on different indicators.⁵ Based on that, the validity and value of these rankings are questionable.

However, only a few universities from Indonesia in the “top rank” on a specific ranking tables above. But, among all universities, no one exactly international labels on the official name of the university. This indicates that the labeling is sometimes a thing that no substantive. But, in other side, parties that support international label quibble that the internationalization is a bridge for them to increase their rankings globally.

Sudjwardi, Rector of UGM, one of top leading universities in Indonesia, express the importance of implementing internationalize human resources at the university. Internationalize is an instrument used to increase effectiveness in achieving its goal is Tri Darma Perguruan Tinggi (three-virtues of higher education in Indonesia).⁶

Beside that, Retno Listyarti, Secretary General of the Federation of Teachers ' Unions of Indonesia says, the internationalization of education is manifested inter alia in the form of an international school stub (RSBI), for example, thus favouring foreign parties. This is due to the schools in Indonesia must purchase the following curriculum for foreign books. In fact, the foreign teachers were brought to the facility and a much higher salaries than teachers in Indonesia (Kompas, March 2, 2012).

Soedijarto, a professor in State University of Jakarta states that settings concerning the internationalization of higher education are not needed. “Impressed like minded individuals inlander. Everything related “foreign” is considered better,” he said after the public discussion about the law of colleges draft in the State University of Jakarta, Monday, April 2, 2011.⁷

Major analyses show that “internationalisation” in higher education might comprise a broad range of issues (Altbach and Teichler 2001; OECD 2004; Knight 2008). The author of this contribution has been employed regarding two big themes.

- internationalisation is underscored as an *argument for almost any higher education reform*. Improvements in the steering of higher education systems, the management of higher education institutions, the quality and relevance of research and study programmes, the efficiency of the utilisation of resources, etc. are called for in order not to fall behind in worldwide competition and to be successful according to “international standards”.
- *Internationality in the substance of higher education*. For example, foreign language learning, comparative analysis and analysis of border-crossing phenomena (e.g., international economics).

⁴Ellen Hazelkorn, “Learning to Live with League Tables and Ranking: The Experience of Institutional Leaders” *Higher Education Policy* (2008) 21, 193–215.

⁵Alex Usher & M. Savino, *A World of Difference: A Global Survey of University League Tables* (Toronto: Educational Policy Institute, 2006), p. 7.

⁶See:<http://www.ugm.ac.id/index.php?page=rilis&artikel=1920>.

⁷See:<http://www.tempo.co/read/news/2012/04/03/079394263/Internasionalisasi-Perguruan-Tinggi-Dipandang-Tidak-Perlu>.

However, we note that higher education was divided in the past between universal or international substance and national structure or organisation, be it funding, regulatory framework, governance, curricula or credentials (Kerr 1990: 5).

Debates:-

The inception of law No. 12 year 2012 that was passed in July 2012 give rise to legal debate. Who do not agree with some points of the Act apply yudicial review to the Constitutional Court (MK) asking the justest decision fair (*ex aequo et bono*). The Constitutional Court in this case ever break the Law Legal Education (UU Badan Hukum Pendidikan), in which the Supreme Court is also assessing the application of the Act thus will shut down hundreds of Colleges that are not able to form a legal education, and according to the applicants, several articles in the Law College is the same with the BHP has ever be tested in the Constitutional Court.

The right to get education in this case is set in the social, economic and Cultural Konvenan that are then ratified into law No. 11 of 2005. So that the country has committed to ensure the rights of its citizens, but the Education Act No. 12 year 2012 about college quite contradictory and nuanced resistance with Act No. 11 of 2005.

Article 76, paragraph (1) of the Act Colleges, for example, will provide legitimacy for underprivileged students not getting an education for free, should credit for students should be used to awaken the entrepreneurial spirit and not for operational financing of education.

Therefore it is unclear whether such internationalization efforts in the legislation as a positive development: more explicit, coordinated, interactive and proactive; more strategically focused on multilateral partnerships; continuing professionalization; more focused on the world outside Indonesia; more attention given to internationalization of the curriculum; and more attention towards to the quality assurance of internationalization.

Moreover, internationalization knows many motives and approaches. There still a predominantly activity-oriented or even instrumental approach toward internationalization. This brings to major misconceptions about what internationalisation actually means.

At least, there are nine misconceptions concerning internationalisation. According to Hans de Wit (2011:10-17), they are: (1) internationalisation is education in the English language; (2) internationalization is studying or staying abroad; (3) internationalization equals an international subject; (4) internationalization implies having many international students; (5) Having a few international students in the classroom makes internationalization into a success; (6) There is no need to test intercultural and international competencies specifically; (7) The more partnerships, the more international; (8) Higher education is international by nature; (9) Internationalization is a goal in itself.

“On Direction” in Islamic Higher Education:-

A particular interest is the development that occurs in some Islamic State University in Indonesia. for example, Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University (UIN) Jakarta since 2008 launched passion to do internationalization of university through three ways. First, increasing international cooperation with universities and colleges abroad, though now it is a lot of cooperation, but it will continue to be carried out in other areas in the field. Second, interchanging (student-exchange) as much as possible both lecturers and students. Third, the most important, namely, internationalization of the curriculum.⁸ Later, the university was eager to break into the world's top 500 universities.⁹ Thus, “internationalization virus” also spread the higher islamic education.

In addition to globalization penetration, “successful example” of other universities can be the motivation of internationalization at the Islamic College. By geographical location, Indonesia is very close to Malaysia. In Malaysia, for example, there is an Islamic university that can be a good example in the implementation of internationalization. The university is named IIUM (the International Islamic University Malaysia). This university was included in the QS World University Rankings (December 2011) at 451-500 and 601+ respectively.

⁸<http://www.uinjkt.ac.id/index.php/categoryblog/204-uin-jakarta-segera-realisasikan-internasionalisasi-kurikulum.html>.

⁹<http://www.uinjkt.ac.id/index.php/component/content/article/1-headline/1229-uin-jakarta-bisa-masuk-500-universitas-top-dunia.html>

Actually, *Ministry* of Religious Affairs through the General Directorate of Islamic Education can be assessed to receive only the the existence of Islamic religious education internationalization. This is that seems to base the activities of ARFI (Academic Recharging for Islamic Higher Education) held by the Ministry in 2012 ago.

The dynamics of the debate related to internationalization in The Ministry of Religious Affairs relatively still silent. In other words, we can say that there is still one direction that supports the internationalization of Islamic higher education in Indonesia.

According to Wagner¹⁰ internationalization has three dominant framework, namely: Global Competency, Academic Capitalism, Colonialism and Academic. Indonesia in doing internationalization of education want to refer to the framework which one? If it refers to Academic Capitalism and Academic Colonialism, then Indonesia just to follow the science and theory which had been developed by Western countries.

The currently evidence in Indonesia is was a larg flow to make the international schools, both within the Ministry of national education and the Ministry of religion. It looks from carrying out the program of the school of international berstandar (SBI) or the upcoming international School (RSBI), while the ministries of Religion makes International Madrasah (MBI). The focus of these Ministries is the same, but the way of completion was distinct.

Conclusion:-

There are various reasons, however, to challenge such a view. Some observers believe that temporary student mobility tends to be discouraged in the new bachelor–master structure in education system in Indonesia. Some experts believe that curricular convergence might follow structural convergence; this could encourage student mobility because recognition of study abroad could be facilitate, but it also could discourage student mobility because the chances of learning through contrasting experience were diminished.

Finally, concurrent developments in Indonesia might cause problems: The imperatives of the act no. 12 2012 to expand research in order to make Indonesia the “competitive economy” seem to favour stronger rivalries between higher education institutions and a steeper stratification of the higher education system in order to make a few universities succeed in the race towards “world-class universities”; if these objectives were realized, the “zones of trust” for mutual recognition would become small if students could expect only recognition of study achievements during a temporary period abroad only, if they attend a few higher education institutions abroad which match their home institution exactly in the level of quality.

Finally, the success of internationalization, ironically, might became the cause of its declining relevance. Internationalization has led to internationalization mainstreaming not only all international activities are increasingly embedded into the regular life of the higher education institutions, but also institutions of higher education will make decisions about their regular life in such a way that they serve internationalization; eventually, international activities might have become so common that nobody sees anymore the need to take care for them, and this might lead to a lesser support for the needs of international activities than before.

Similarly, a recent survey has shown that the professional value of studying in another Indonesian country is declining to some extent because such international experiences are losing more and more their exclusiveness and distinctiveness. Thus, the question has to be raised whether new activities to support further internationalization have to be developed at a fairly mature state of internationality of higher education.

¹⁰C. Wagner, *The New Invisible Collage: Science for Development* (Washington DC: Brooking Institute Press, 2008).

References:-

1. Altbach, P. G. and Teichler, U. (2001). Internationalisation and exchanges in a globalized university. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5(1): 5–25.
2. Blumenthal, P., Goodwin, C., Smith, A., and Teichler, U. (eds.) (1996). *Academic Mobility in a Changing World*. London/Bristol, PA: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
3. Bürger, S., Günther, M., Kehm, B. M., Maiworm, F., and Schelewsky, A. (2006). International study on transnational mobility in bachelor and master programmes. In Deutscher Akademischer
4. Austauschdienst (Ed.), *Transnational mobility in bachelor and master programmes* (pp. 1–65). Bonn: DAAD Publishers.
5. Dalichow, F. and Teichler, U. (1986). *Higher Education in the Europe Community. Recognition of Study Abroad in the Europe Community*. Luxembourg: Office for Publications of the Indonesian Communities.
6. Deloz, M. (1986). The activities of the council of Europe concerning the recognition of studies and diplomas of higher education and academic mobility. *Higher Education in Europe*, 9(1): 2–27.
7. De Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalisation of Higher Education in the United States and Europe*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
8. European Commission (1994). *Cooperation in Education in the Europe Union 1976–1994*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
9. Huisman, J. and van der Wende, M. (eds.) (2005). *On Cooperation and Competition II: Institutional Responses to Internationalization, Europeanisation and Globalisation*. Bonn: Lemmens.
10. Jahr, V. and Teichler, U. (2001). Mobility during the course of study and after graduation. *European Journal of Education*, 31(2): 443–458.
11. Kehm, B. M. and Teichler, U. (2007). Research on internationalisation in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4): 260–273.
12. Kehm, B. M. and Teichler, U. (2006). Which direction for bachelor and master programmes? A stocktaking of the bologna process. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 12(4): 269–282.
13. Kehm, B. M., Huisman, J., and Stensacker, B. (eds.) (2009). *The European Higher Education Area: Perspectives on a Moving Target*. Rotterdam and Taipei: Sense Publishers.
14. Kelo, M., Teichler, U., and Wächter, B. (eds.) (2006). *EURODATA: Student Mobility in European Higher Education*. Bonn: Lemmens.
15. Kerr, C. (1990). The internationalisation of learning and the nationalisation of the purposes of higher education: Two “laws in motion” in conflict?”. *European Journal of Education*, 25(1): 5–22.
16. Knight, J. (2008). *Higher Education in Turmoil: The Changing World of Internationalization*. Rotterdam and Taipei: Sense Publishers.
17. Knight, J. (2006). *Internationalization of Higher Education: New Directions, New Challenges. The IAU Global Survey Report*. Paris: International Association of Universities.
18. Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodelled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1): 5–31.
19. Maiworm, F., Sosa, W., and Teichler, U. (1996). *The Context of ERASMUS: A Survey of Institutional Management and Infrastructure in Support of Mobility and Cooperation*.
20. Kassel: Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung, Universität Gesamthochschule Kassel (Werkstattberichte, 49).
21. National Academic Recognition Information Centres (NARIC) (1987). *Academic Recognition of Higher Education Entrance, Intermediate and Final Qualifications in the Europe Community*. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, Task-Force Human Resources, Education, Training, and Youth.
22. Neave, G. (2002). Anything goes: Or, how the accommodation of Europe’s universities to European integration integrates an inspiring number of contradictions. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8(2): 181–197.
23. Neave, G. (1984). *The EEC and Education*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
24. OECD (ed.) (2004). *Internationalization and Trade in Higher Education*. Paris: OECD Publishers.
25. Oppen, S., Teichler, U., and Carlson, J. (1990). *The Impact of Study Abroad Programmes on Students and Graduates*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
26. Sadlak, J. (2001). Globalization in higher education. *International Educator*, 10(4): 3–5.
27. Scott, P. (ed.) (1998). *The Globalization of Higher Education*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.
28. Teekens, H. and de Wit, H. (2007). Special issue on the occasion of 10 years of the journal of studies in international education: Challenges and opportunities for the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4): 249–250.
29. Teichler, U. (2007). *Die Internationalisierung der Hochschulen*. Frankfurt a. M./New York: Campus.

30. Teichler, U. (2004). The changing debate on internationalisation of higher education. *Higher Education*, 48(1): 5–26.
31. Teichler, U. (2003). Mutual recognition and credit transfer in Europe: Experiences and problems. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(4): 312–341.
32. Teichler, U. (ed.) (2002). *ERASMUS in the SOCRATES Programme: Findings of an Evaluation Study*. Bonn: Lemmens.
33. Teichler, U. (1999). Internationalisation as a challenge for higher education in Europe. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 5(1): 5–23.
34. UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2006). *Global Education Digest 2006*. Montreal: UIS.
35. Van der Wende, M. (2007). Internationalization of higher education in the OECD countries: challenges and opportunities for the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4): 274–289.
36. Van der Wende, M. (2001). Internationalisation policies: About new trends and contrasting paradigms. *Higher Education Policy*, 14(3): 249–259.
37. Wächter, B. (ed.) (1999). *Internationalisation in Higher Education*. Bonn: Lemmens.
38. Wächter, B., Ollikainen, A., Hasewand, B. (1999). Internationalisation of Higher Education. In Wächter, B. (ed.), *Internationalisation in Higher Education* (pp. 11–92). Bonn: Lemmens, .
39. Wagner, C. (2008). *The New Invisible Collage: Science for Development*. Washington DC: Brooking Institute Press.