Modern State in Higher Education Internationalization at Global and Local Levels (by the Example of SSU, SNAU, SSPU. Ukraine)

Andrii CHYRVA¹,
Olena STATSENKO²,
Tetiana KYRYCHENKO³

¹ Assoc. Prof. in pedagogical sciences, Associate professor, Foreign Languages Department, Sumy National Agrarian University, 40021, Ukraine, Sumy, Herasyma Kondratieva str., 154/2, r/111 candrew@ukr.net

² Lecturer, Foreign Languages Department, Sumy National Agrarian University, Ukraine, helen0876@meta.ua

³ Senior Lecturer, Foreign Languages Department, Sumy National Agrarian University, Ukraine, honey11t@ukr.net

Abstract: The article aims to reveal modern state of higher education internationalization (HEI) at global and local levels. Synthesis of conceptual approaches to studying HEI allowed to concretize the meaning of HEI at modern stage in a global and institutional levels. Renovated notion has been proposed as “complete internationalization”. It is interpreted as engagement, devotion and commitment of both all education management levels and teaching stuff to multifaceted process of intentional long-lasting infusion and integration of international dimensions with comparative constituent into all functions and missions of higher education and active designing of policies, plans, programs, strategies and approaches for promotion of internationality in higher education. Due to theoretical method of conceptual and comparative analysis of research and strategic documents and the latest scientific publications on issues of global internationalization of higher education, analysis of foreign and local experience, conceptual approaches to studying HEI were depicted modern internationalization forms at global level. Interviews initiated with heads of international affairs offices enabled us to find out HEI state at local level. Questionnaires with international students, focused on likes and dislikes concerning infrastructure, teaching methods, communication with local students, future plans helped to identify the level of students’ satisfaction and attractiveness of Sumy universities. Main priorities of stakeholders are defined. Recommendations concerning further possible development of higher education internationalization are given.

Keywords: *Higher education internationalization (HEI), trends, universities, perspectives, international students, mobility.*

How to cite: Chyrva, A., Statsenko, O., & Kyrychenko, T. (2021). Modern State in Higher Education Internationalization at Global and Local Levels (by the Example of SSU, SNAU, SSPU. Ukraine). *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 13(3), 508-529. <https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/13.3/464>

1. Introduction.

Globalization and intensive development of international educational space stipulate essential changes in the sphere of higher education. Social needs in professional training of specialists adapted to international labour market and able to interact with representatives from different cultures, based on poli-cultural thinking, to solve the problems outgoing the borders of national interests expect internationalization of higher education at all levels. Internationalization is a phenomenon rapidly becoming popular in developing countries around the world. More and more of higher educational establishments in developing countries consider the phenomenon as the condition and guaranty of existence and development. Nowadays many universities of the world take the aim to internationalize their own education.

During recent years, development of higher education internationalization is taking place under influence of globalization of higher education. Discourse of scholars from different countries concerning interpretation of HEI is controversial and in addition, it is being changed with the time as internationalization mostly reflects impact of political and economic factors. Besides, stakeholders treat the notion, as it is suitable for them. Some researchers consider the phenomenon only from point of view of priorities and such elements as crossing borders, student mobility, and recruitment of foreign students outlined by authorities or by institution leaders. Therefore, the reality lies in the fact that there exist only few elements of HEI appropriate for all engaged subjects and objects. There is no internationalization model suitable absolutely for all parties. HEI is not a static phenomenon but it always stays in dynamics – new forms of HEI and new pedagogic paradigms appear. That is why knowledge require constant renovation. The problem draws attention of scientists and international organizations from different parts of the world.

It is very important for developing countries to study positive theoretic and practical experience of HEI, cumulated in developed countries. Necessity of scientific working up of theoretic, normative, organizational, process fundamentals of higher education internationalization at world universities is strengthened by available contradictions. The first - growing requirements of modern globalized society to have higher education with international dimension and insufficient preparedness level of national higher educational systems to corresponding changes. The second - necessity to adapt national graduates for work under conditions of multi-

cultural environment and insufficient level of development of their intercultural competence. The third - the need of higher education content improvement under conditions of labor market internationalization and traditional approaches to elaboration of educational programs.

Rapid economic development of Asian and African countries together with growing of global needs in higher education caused appearance of such trends in higher education as massification and diversification. Growing availability to global higher education advanced such trends as marketization and commodification of HE. HEI was traditionally used to be considered as traditional response to the global trends, but internationalization itself is also influenced by global rationales. In the light of modern changes and challenges came the time to reinterpret and renovate conceptual understanding of the notion higher education internationalization (HEI), the state in global internationalization and locally.

2. Methodology.

2.1. General characteristics

The aim of the research was:

- to reveal the state in higher education internationalization (HEI) at global level: concretize the meaning of HEI at modern stage and depict modern internationalization forms;
- outline the most important internationalization forms at local level, define weak points on the example of three universities.

2.2 Sample of research.

To reach the second part of research aim we turned to three heads of international affairs offices to initiate interviews and selected 118 international students, who agreed to participate in questionnaires, from three universities, namely: Sumy State Pedagogical University named after A.S. Makarenko (40 students), Sumy State University (44 students), and Sumy National Agrarian University (34 students). We decided to use quote of two academic groups from each university. The choice of groups was casual. The number of representatives from each university was different due to different number of students in academic groups. Most of selected international students were representatives from China, Turkmenistan and African continent. It can be explained by the fact that they compose the majority of international student body in Sumy. The data saturation was achieved by collecting the responses and disposing them into the tables for the following processing and analysis.

3.3 Methods and materials

To reach the aim of the article the following research methods were used.

- theoretical methods: research document analysis conducted to collect current information concerning the state in higher education internationalization (HEI); synthesis of conceptual approaches to studying HEI allowed to concretize the meaning of HEI at modern stage; method of conceptual-comparative analysis of foreign experience, which contributed to define the state of the investigated issue and find out actual questions which have not been solved yet; generalization and systematization of theoretical material, which allowed to outline modern trends in higher education internationalization.

- empirical methods: diagnostic tools (interviews initiated with heads of international affairs offices to find out HEI state at local level; questionnaires with international students, were used to identify the level of students' satisfaction and attractiveness of Sumy universities).

- statistical: percentage indicators of the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of interview data were chosen as units of measurement.

We developed and used our own diagnostic methods – written interview paper and questionnaires. Written interview paper was elaborated for people responsible for internationalization processes in the universities. The decision concerning the question inclusion in the interview paper questionnaire was taken on the basis of theoretical analysis of world HEI state. Thus, theoretic results were fundamental for empirical part of our research. The following issues were included in the interview paper: availability of “HEI strategic document and department responsible for HEI”, “Priority directions”, “International students and lectors” “Local students going abroad for study”, “Lectors with intercultural experience”, “Joint research and publications in foreign editions”, “Joint academic programs and special programs for foreign students”, “Internationalized curriculum”, “ICT for HEI”, “Assessment of HEI results”. Questionnaires were focused on students satisfaction: likes and dislikes concerning infrastructure, teaching methods, communication with local students, future plans.

3. Results.

Survey of global state and trends in higher education internationalization is highlighted regularly by scholars of such international organizations as International Association of Universities (<https://www.iau->

aiu.net) and European Association for International Education (<https://www.eaie.org>). One of the main HEI form, student mobility, both vertical and horizontal, long-term and short-term, is revealed by Teichler U. (2017), Caruso R. & De Wit H. (2018), Cavalli A. & Teichler U. (2015). Others, Crăciun D. (2018), Yudkevich M., Altbach P. & Rumbley L. (2016), Jones E. (2016), De Wit H. (2017) studied changes in global and institutional academic policy and practice. Leask B. (2015), Green W. & Whitsed C. (2013) and others, researched transformation of education content within limits of internationalization, in particular curriculum. Such scholars as Kuroda K. (2016), Knight J. (2017) investigated phenomenon of HEI regionalization. Jonathan Crichton et al (2004) studied internationalization mostly from the point of intercultural competence acquisition. All mentioned scientists treated and interpreted the notion of HEI, mainly, according to the interests of different stakeholders on different stages of internationalization development. Of course, there were attempts to introduce a universal understanding. However, vision and approaches to the concept of HEI are being changed steadily with the time and therefore require renovation, specification and systematization for the whole perception of HEI. Analysis of the literature will lead to better understanding of the phenomenon at modern stage and contribute to renovation of the notion.

Having analyzed a mass of literature concerning understanding and interpretation of the notion higher education internationalization we conclude that different interpretations of the notion HEI reflect realities of the time, within limits of which the phenomenon was explored. At the broadest level of discourse, internationalisation was characterised in a variety of ways. The most common internationalisation meanings associated with: the presence of international students; study abroad/international mobility programs; internationalising the curriculum; off-shore academic programs; international cooperation and joint research; international knowledge and skills such as cultural awareness, second language acquisition, and interaction across cultures and so on. Of course, the meanings may be used at further development of the concept.

As Australian researcher Jonathan Crichton stated, most definitions are couched in terms of objectives or spheres of activity. For instance, the definition provided by Notre Dame University includes a specific focus on interaction among people across cultures. It is as follows: 'broadening the experience and perspectives of all students regardless of geographical origin (but especially for local students) to encompass a wide range of learning environments, as well as aspects of social and professional interaction with

people from other races and cultures....'. (Crichton et al., 2004, p.120). This definition emphasises intercultural goals of internationalisation where international activity is sufficient. It does not describe qualitative indicators of internationalisation process but focus on intercultural competence development.

But we fully agree with Australian researchers Jonathan Crichton and his colleagues who noticed that the desire for a definition, the challenge of fully conceptualising not only the scope but also the nature of internationalisation, and the difficulties in gaining full acceptance from staff for the process of internationalisation would suggest that, as institutions engage with the process of internationalisation, continuously expanding the range of activity in quantitative terms, increasing attention will need to be given to ways of conceptualising the process in qualitative terms. This points to the need for a conceptualising framework that captures all aspects of internationalisation and provides some sense of coherence in what would otherwise appear to be a list of fragmented objectives or activities. (Crichton et al., 2004). It is clear that internationalization should be understood both at global and institutional levels.

The most complicated stage of the notion development is the need of its universality, we mean possibility of its application in different countries, cultures, educational systems. It should be noted, that universality of the notion is not connected with understanding rationales, gains, incomes, actors, activity and stakeholders, as they can be different from nation to nation and in different institutions. It is very important that international dimension concerns all aspects of education and its role in society. To our mind, the most universal interpretation of the notion is proposed by Canadian scientist Jane Knight (2004). She accentuates that: "Internationalization is a process of integrating an international, intercultural and global dimensions into the goals, primary functions and delivery of higher education" (Knight, 2004). This notion interprets internationalization as continuous and steady process of creating something international but not one separate kind of activity. It covers different aspects of internationalization such as institutional strategy, mobility of students and lectors, curriculum and learning process, including issues of curricular transformation and quality improvement, research activity, projects of international development, personnel development and export of educational services abroad.

However, this universality is not enough nowadays. Modern realities required renovation of internationalization vision and J. Hudzik (2015) has proposed the notion "comprehensive internationalization" which defines the

concept as intentional, institutional commitment and action to infuse and integrate international, global, and comparative content and perspective throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education. Beyond such basic functions of higher education institutions, he argues that the comprehensive approach is the overarching intention to integrate internationalization into the core institutional ethos, values, and mission (Hudzik, 2015).

Trying to connect the notions of two mentioned above scientists Japanese researcher O. Hiroshi (2018) explains internationalization as a multifaceted and multidimensional process integrating international, intercultural, and global content and dimensions into the functions and aims of higher education institutions and systems. We agree with such combined interpretation of the notion but would like to add modern vision of another scholar, who sees internationalization as active engagement with the design of policies, plans, programs, strategies and approaches at various levels of decision-making so as to promote the idea of internationality in higher education (Crăciun, 2018).

Thus, on the basis of the literature analysis we consider it necessary to renovate the meaning of HEI and synthesize modern notion which will combine universality and comprehensiveness. We propose the notion “complete internationalization”. Our interpretation of complete internationalization is the following: It is engagement, devotion and commitment of both all education management levels and teaching staff to multifaceted process of intentional long-lasting infusion and integration of international dimensions with comparative constituent into all functions and missions of higher education and active designing of policies, plans, programs, strategies and approaches for promotion of internationality in higher education.. We consider this combined vision to be universal, multifaceted and comprehensive enough, applicable for our further research and it may be applied in different countries with different educational systems and different level of development.

3.1. Global HEI state. One of the main trends at global level is orientation of universities on institutional ratings provided by international assessment agencies. The main indicators of successful higher education internationalization are availability of joint international research projects, joint international scientific publications, presence of international teaching staff, international students, and availability of internationalized curricula. Most universities engaged in internationalization indicate availability of departments responsible for internationalization and develop official

strategic statements and documents concerning HEI. At modern stage of global development of HEI under conditions of social and economic challenges, caused by quarantine, the highest actuality receive innovative forms of internationalization connected with the usage of ICT-means/technologies. Among them are virtual mobility, distant academic mobility, electronic internationalization.

So, analysis of research provided by representatives from International Association of Universities (<https://www.iau-aiu.net>), European Association of Distant Teaching Universities (<https://eadtu.eu/about-eadt/ueadtu>) for the last three years and also scientific literature: J. Crichton et al (2004); J. Knight (2004); R. Caruso (2015); J. Hudzik (2015); B. Leask (2015); K. Kuroda (2016); J. Knight (2017); U. Teichler (2017); D. Crăciun (2018); O. Hiroshi (2018); O. Lvova, (2019) allowed us to outline the most important classic and innovative higher education internationalization forms at all levels (table 1).

Table 1. The most important higher education internationalization forms.

Main classic forms	Main innovative forms
Development of strategic documents	Virtual mobility
Academic mobility	Distant academic mobility
Joint international research and publications	Electronic internationalization
Internationalized curriculum	

Source: Authors' own conception

Main classic forms include: development of strategic documents – official papers including internationalization aims, tasks, missions, statements; academic mobility – recruitment of international students and lectors as well as local students and lectors going abroad for studying and gaining international experience; joint international research and publications – cooperative scientific investigations and publication of research results in foreign editions; internationalized curriculum – availability of joint academic programs, special academic programs for foreign students, international and internationalized disciplines (with international content), English-speaking courses. Main innovative forms are: virtual mobility, distant academic mobility and electronic internationalization

Virtual mobility is developing rapidly side by side with student and academic staff physical mobility, which became an integral part of HEI in economically developed countries. This form of HEI is not restricted in

space and time, and it opens opportunity to all willing students and lectors to enrich their portfolio with international experience and gain international and intercultural competence. And higher educational institutions can elaborate innovative educational programs. More over virtual mobility assists cooperation of individuals from different cultures, countries and spheres inside of virtual society. Example of regionalized virtual mobility may be European Association of Distant Teaching Universities (<https://eadtu.eu/about-eadt/about-eadt>). Anticipating on new developments in mobility European wide, EADTU established a Task Force Virtual Mobility in 2018, focusing on mapping blended and online mobility in the context of international collaboration.

Distant academic mobility means opportunity for students to receive educational services online on relative websites. It contributes to broaden mental outlook of students, join the treasure of global knowledge, look at different events and phenomena from different points of view, and understand cultural and national differences and peculiarities, feel themselves a part of global society. As a rule, tutors recommend suitable sites to students or the last ones can search themselves but results of educational steps are discussed with the lectors. The main challenge for this form of HEI stays the language of international communication, English. As the level of mastering by international students is desired to be much better, for exception students from English-speaking countries. In a result one can observe the following trends of HEI development:

1. Emersion of specialized resources providing adequate translation, gaining, mastering and improving language skills.
2. Strengthening of competitive positions at global market of educational services, rising attractiveness of national educational establishments abroad and improvement of own efficiency as exporter of educational services. To reach this aim universities use more and more innovative ICT-technology.

Electronic internationalization provides internet resources of educational institutions in English, including sites with corresponding information (at least about institution, its history, acceptance rules, educational programs, library, mission and strategic goals, contacts) and reports about higher educational establishment in English-speaking social nets (Lvova, 2019).

In general, international scholars, representatives of international organizations such as International Association of Universities during the last 30 years outlined the following features of HEI:

- More focused on internationalization abroad than on internationalization at home.
 - More ad hoc, fragmented and marginal than strategic, comprehensive and central in policies.
 - More in the interest of a small, elite subset of students and faculty than focused on global and intercultural outcomes for all.
 - Directed by a constantly shifting range of political, economic, social/cultural, and educational rationales, with increasing focus on economic motivations.
 - Increasingly driven by national, regional, and global rankings.
 - Little alignment between the international dimensions of the three core functions of higher education: education, research, and service to society.
 - Primarily a strategic choice and focus of institutions of higher education, and less a priority of national governments.
 - Less important in emerging and developing economies, and more of a particular strategic concern among developed economies.
- (de Wit, 2018).

3.2. Local HEI state. Vision of global trends in HEI supports studying the phenomenon at institutional level as the aims are similar though stakeholders are different. According to information presented by Ukrainian universities in their strategic documents we can observe steady growing of interest to HEI at institutional level. Most institutions go on using strategic approaches to HEI. More than 90% of universities indicated availability of internationalization in their strategic plans. The institutions with high interest to HEI in the past state growing of internationalization importance. This trend may lead to growing inequality between institutions. The principal rationales are – institutional leadership and international offices. The main barriers are insufficient financial resources, bureaucratic difficulties and poor knowledge of English (Chyrva, 2013).

According to information regularly revealed by International Association of Universities (<https://www.iau-aiu.net>) we can state that these trends are also characteristic for global level. Educational purposes, academic freedom and autonomy are indicated as principal values of HEI. The most important forms are student mobility, strategic partnership and international research cooperation. Assessment of internationalization is becoming general practice for universities, however only part of them use complex approach.

At their official documents, leading Ukrainian universities mention most frequently the following principal forms of higher education internationalization: effective cooperation between universities-partners,

intensification of academic mobility for students and teaching staff, development of language courses for students, inviting international scholars for lecturing intercultural content and increasing the number of English-speaking courses in curriculum (Chyrva, 2013).

Regionally, the situation may look different, so we decided to conduct in-depth analysis of three Ukrainian universities in Sumy region. The choice is simply explained - we live and work there.

Based on the data analysis from interviews initiated with heads of international affairs offices at three universities of Sumy region, namely Sumy State University (<https://sumdu.edu.ua/int/en/>), Sumy National Agrarian University (<http://www.snau.edu.ua/>) and Sumy State Pedagogic University (<https://sspu.edu.ua/>), we got the vision of real HEI picture in Sumy region which is depicted in table (table 2). The table was composed according to the order of the questions asked during the interviews. First question was included due to its prior importance in the global scale, and most leading universities pay much attention to elaboration or development of internationalization strategies (strategic documents).

Table 2. Internationalization at local universities. (Sumy, Ukraine)

	SSU	SNAU	SSPU
Availability of HEI strategic document	Internationalization strategy	Internationalization statements	HEI plan
Departments responsible for IHE	department of international relations, international education, internationalization of educational activity, agency on student mobility	department of foreign affairs, department of international students support	department of foreign affairs
Priority directions	International cooperation, education quality, intercultural competence (comprehensive internationalization)	International cooperation, research and publications, recruitment of international students	international cooperation, academic and research programs, mobility, intern. ranking
International	1616 (8610) 18,7%	500 (3700) 13,5	374 (4100)

students			9,1%
Local students going abroad for study	2%	About 1%	Less 1%
International lectors	3,2%	Less 1%	Less 1%
Lectors with intercultural experience	About 10 %	About 2%	Less 1%
Joint research	100+	30+	8
Publications in foreign editions	400+	280+	120+
Special acad. programs for foreign students	68	5	3 (Russian, nursing, visagist)
Joint acad. programs	5	2	3
Internationalized curriculum	-	-	-
ICT for HEI	-	-	-
Assessment of HEI results	-	-	-
Future plans concerning HEI development	Complex (comprehensive) internationalization	cooperation, recruitment of international students	cooperation, attracting more international students

Source: Authors' own conception

According to interviews initiated with heads of international affairs offices, we could outline the following internationalization features at local level. All the interviewees proved that universities are devoted to the process of internationalization but not equally. All three universities developed strategic internationalization documents. (SSU – strategy 2019-2025, SSPU - HEI plan, SNAU – internationalization statements) and have departments devoted to the process of internationalization. Here, we have to state that level of university devotion to the process is different. As we can judge from the interviews, SSU takes the lead. It has the biggest number of departments responsible for IHE: department of international relations, department of international education, internationalization of educational activity department, agency on student mobility. SNAU takes the second place having two departments: department of foreign affairs and department

of international student support. Concerning priority directions, all three interviewees pointed out number one priority - international cooperation. As for the second and third ones, interviewee from SSU outlined education quality and intercultural competence, interviewee from SNAU - research and publications as they influence on international ranking most of all and recruitment of international students, interviewee from SSPU - academic and research programs, mobility. Incoming international students is of high importance for all three universities. Statistical method of quantitative characteristics counting allowed us to show percentage indicators of academic mobility. SSU takes the lead – 18,7% of international students from the total student body, SNAU – 13,5% and SSPU – 9,1%. Thus, according to interview data analysis we can affirm that recruitment of foreign students stays to be one of the main trends in HEI at local level. General percentage (13,7 %) of international students in the region allows to state that all three universities are rather attractive for foreigners. It also can be proved by the level of university attractiveness and international students' satisfaction, which was defined by us with the help of questionnaires focused on students' satisfaction: likes and dislikes concerning infrastructure, teaching methods, communication with local students, future plans. The questionnaire data collection is depicted in the table (table 3).

Table 3. University attractiveness level for international students.

Question	SSU (44 students)	SSPU (40 students)	SNAU (34 students)
Likes about infrastructure (5 point assessment)	«3» - 4 «4» - 36 «5» - 4	«3» - 4 «4» - 10 «5» - 26	«3» - 4 «4» - 10 «5» - 20
Satisfaction with methods of teaching (5 point assessment)	«3» - 2 «4» - 20 «5» - 22	«4» - 14 «5» - 24 «3» - 2	«4» - 20 «5» - 11 «3» - 3
Easiness of communication with local students?	easy - 30 with problems - 6 hard - 8	easy - 24 with problems-10 hard - 6	easy - 12 with problems -18 hard - 4
The biggest challenges	weather cond.-13 kitchen - 17 language barrier-7 other - 7	weather cond. - 6 kitchen - 14 language barrier-14 other - 6	weather cond. - 11 kitchen - 13 language

			barrier-5 other - 5
Dissatisfactions (multiple choice)	No - 16 Medicine level-24 Hostels – 20 Kitchen - 12 Other - 16	No - 20 Medicine level-19 Hostels – 18 Kitchen -14 Other - 7	No - 8 Medicine level- 22 Hostels - 13 Kitchen – 9 Other - 9
“Will you recommend the university to your compatriots?”	«yes» - 42 «no» - 2	«yes» - 40	«yes» - 33 «no» - 1
Future employment planning	«Abroad» - 16 «Home» - 28	«Abroad» - 14 «Home» - 26	«Abroad» - 18 «Home» - 16

Source: Authors' own conception

According to questionnaire data analysis we can confirm that most of international students from three universities are satisfied with infrastructure and methods of teaching, though they face such challenges as difficulties in communication with locals, adjusting to the weather, kitchen. Despite dissatisfaction with hostels and medicine care, they are ready to recommend the universities to their compatriots, and many of them are going to look for a job in Ukraine. Thus, international students assisted in revealing weak points to be improved by university authorities.

We also should emphasize some weak points related to internationalization in the regional universities. The percentage of outgoing students at these universities is low 1-2%. Financial barriers and low incomes of most Ukrainian families, which cannot afford studying abroad, can explain this trend. Percentage of international lecturers at Sumy region is also rather poor, in general about 1,5 %. Lecturers with intercultural experience indicated a little higher figure - about 4 %, mostly thanks to the figure of SSU (about 10%). Number of joint academic programs in the region is very small, only 5 at SSU, 2 at SNAU and 3 at SSPU. All three interviewees admitted the absence of internationalized curriculum and main innovative forms: virtual mobility, distant academic mobility, electronic internationalization as the weakest points of HEI. Elaboration of internationalized curriculum has to be started by the Ministry of education of Ukraine as universities have not enough autonomy for it. We also have to ascertain the fact that assessment of results of higher education

internationalization is not carried out at Sumy region. Concerning special academic programs for international students, they are not popular within SNAU and SSPU, they have only 5 and 3 such programs accordingly. Only SSU is constantly developing special academic programs for international students and has 68 of them for now. All three universities are engaged in joint research to different extent (SSU – more than 100, SNAU – more than 30, SSPU - 8). And all of them are devoted to publications in foreign or international editions. Again, SSU takes the lead – more than 400 publications, SNAU and SSPU – over 280 and 120 accordingly. Nevertheless, all universities have plans concerning HEI further development.

4. Discussion.

Related to the research ethics, we would like to thank all the participants who kindly agreed to help us. It should be mentioned that research was previously approved by foreign languages department of SNAU. All the participants were told about the purpose of the study and were gallantly asked to take part in interviews and questionnaires. They were informed that participation was voluntary and anonymous, therefore they could withdraw with no consequences on their status.

In fact, there are up to a dozen of higher education institutions in Sumy region, but most of them train specialist with bachelor degree. (colleges, technical schools, special schools). Moreover, these institutions train students of younger age and practically all of them are not engaged in internationalization and do not train foreign students. Some rare exceptions are students from post-soviet area who know Ukrainian or Russian. And this situation is actual for the whole Ukraine, exceptions are only some colleges, dominantly in Kyiv. That is why we focus on establishments training full-time students including foreigners which aim to get master degree – universities. Most universities of Ukraine try to be compatible and therefore are involved in internationalization to different extend. There are only three universities in Sumy region really engaged in HEI and besides this, they provide higher education (master degree) to the majority of students studying in the region, so we consider it correct and relevant to draw the conclusions based on the study results of only three universities.

We would like to emphasize the international significance of the article as a combined universal, multifaceted and comprehensive vision of the phenomenon, applicable in different countries was proposed. For the first time was introduced and interpreted the notion of “complete internationalization”, which may be worthy in the further development of

higher education field at international level. The most important classic and innovative higher education internationalization forms were outlined. All the issues connected with the outlined forms were included in the interview paper. Besides this, an issue of measuring and assessing HEI results could not be ignored while approaching internationalization as it became rather actual necessity at modern stage of global HEI development, so it was also included. With the help of interview and questionnaire data analysis we have done a small-scale evaluation of HEI at universities of our region. The paper proposes analysis of HEI state in one of twenty-four regions of Ukraine and identifies strong and weak points. From scientific point of view, these results can be valuable for the stakeholders interested in complete internationalization not only within Ukraine but also around the world in particular in developing countries where similar situation may occur. The conducted research of HE internationalization state in the region will allow to predict its potential. The data we referred to may be comprehensive at the regional level and as a potential extension they may refer to the national, and international level

It was mentioned earlier that most universities of the world accept HEI as an aim itself. However, Holland scholar Hans De Wit (2018) does not share such position. In his scientific paper, he argues that HEI is mistakenly taken as an aim itself but not the means of education and science quality improvement. Internationalization has to influence improvement of education and research for all students and teaching staff and make significant contribution to human society. Usually economic and political rationales become the main reason for distortion of main internationalization idea. Researcher outlined the following global and controversial trends affecting the HEI policy: massification from one side and knowledge economy from the opposite one; autonomy and academic freedom confront reputation and rates, and also changes in economic and political climate (de Wit, 2018).

As we can see, understanding of HEI is being changed from reactive to proactive that is at modern stage HEI for universities is not only a declaration, concept or statement, but action and reality. Initiatives are changing from imitation to attempts to act and stay in the same level with successful universities, taking into consideration own peculiarities.

Besides this, at modern stage there appear thoughts concerning expediency of deviation from generally accepted westernized conception of HEI, and English-speaking paradigm. A number of scholars of new generation rise their voices for protection of non-English-speaking

paradigm: Jones E. & de Wit H. (2014), de Wit H., Gacel-Avila J., Jones E. & Jooste N. (2017), Proctor D. & Rumbley L. (2018).

In one of her recent studies of global situation around HEI German explorer Daniela Crăciun (2018) stated the fact that only 11% of world countries have official strategies of internationalization and in addition, mostly well-developed countries. The leaders are European countries, which promote strategic thinking concerning internationalization at national level. Two thirds of all national strategies of the world belong to European countries, and their programs Erasmus+ and Horizon 2020 resulted further harmonization of higher education systems. (Crăciun, 2018).

As we can judge on the literature reviewed, the presence of international lecturers at universities is considered all around the world to be important dimension of higher education in a global knowledge economy. However, according to the data of IAU (<https://www.iau-aiu.net/>), international teaching staff compose only small part of total personnel. 20% of higher educational establishments have no international lecturers at all, and 34% of them have less than 5% of international lecturers from total number of teaching staff. Regionally, the lowest percentage of international staff has Latin America and Caribbean region, at the same time, the highest in Asia, Pacific region and Northern America.

Another important dimension of the phenomenon is internationalization of research, as they require international cooperation and competition. Long-time planning of research infrastructure, growing number of research works, development of new research platforms and better coordination between research subdivisions, all this require more strategic approach for increase of research number and for policy of international research. Rising of financing, growing number of patents, publications and citations require development of research teams of global origin. Talented post-graduates and scholars are international human capital, on which research, development and innovations are based. All this, together with international rates explains growing attention to elaboration of national and institutional strategies of research internationalization. Consequently, we can state that principal rationales of HEI at universities are rates and qualitative internationalization indicators, which they are based on: number of international students, lecturers and publications with international co-authors.

Because of the mentioned quality indicators of international agencies universities face with such challenges of the present time as pressure in the direction of necessity to generate income, competition for talents, branding and reputation (rates), international research and publications, recruitment of

international students and engagement of international scholars, usage of English as a language of research and teaching. This pressure is controversial to more inclusive and less elite approach to internationalization, which is based on the needs and possibilities of local students and teaching personnel. In other words, there exists tension between short-term neoliberal approach, which is focused mostly on mobility and research and long-term one – comprehensively qualitative approach of global education for all. Such values of rate agencies move to backside such forms of internationalization as internationalized curriculum, internationalization of teaching and learning and generate negative phenomena such as fragmentation and marginalization.

With the aim to overcome negative phenomena of HEI - fragmentation and marginalization, Canadian scientist John Hudzik (2015) proposes to take into consideration more centralized, integral and systematic approach to HEI. The researcher introduces the notion «comprehensive internationalization», which provides deliberate benevolence and actions directed on implementation and integration of international, global and comparative content, and perspectives in teaching, research and goals of higher education. He accents, that this comprehensive approach is all-embracing intention to integrate internationalization into the heart of institutional ethos, values and missions (Hudzik, 2015).

At global level, as it is mentioned by representatives of IAU, the most expected advantage of HEI for all regions, except for Northern America, is broadening of international cooperation. By our research, it is also proved to be true for local level. We believe that main social risks are commodification and commercialization of educational programs together with brain drain. The principal external rationales are: needs of business and industry, inquiries from foreign universities and governmental policy. The most important barriers are difficulties at recognition of qualification equivalence, educational programs and credits.

Under conditions of COVID pandemic especially current is development of collaborative international online learning. One of the most expedient recommendation we consider implementation of exactly this paradigm. It provides creation of joint poly-cultural educational environment for development of intercultural competence. Collaborative international online learning due to innovative online pedagogy, combines main dimensions of virtual mobility: collaborative practice for students and lecturers, applied usage of online technologies and interaction, international dimensions, integrity in educational process.

In Ukraine, the concept of virtual internationalization of higher education may be considered as an attempt of virtual internationalization at national level. The project Tempus «E-internationalization for Collaborative Learning» gave opportunity to state that virtual HEI is – including different international aspects into research, teaching and administrative activity of higher educational establishments based on usage of modern informative technologies. This project includes examples of virtual internationalization of higher education in Ukraine. In particular, international web-seminars and e-practicums, international video-conferences, video-lectures, video-seminars, work in virtual groups on conducting joint situation tasks, participation in international professional internet-forums, online cooperation in preparation of scientific articles, remote usage of research and laboratory equipment, student participation in international contests, business games and so on (The Concept of virtual internationalization of higher education of Ukraine).

Analysis of interviews initiated with heads of international affairs offices enabled us to reveal weak points of internationalization at institutional level in the region. For improvement of the situation, based on the research conducted, we can draw the following recommendations for university policy makers in Ukraine, which also can be valuable for global, regional, local and institutional stakeholders interested in internationalization, in particular in developing countries where similar situation may occur: engaging all possible human resources in the process, elaboration of marketing, program, organizational and academic strategies of higher education internationalization; teaching general and special disciplines in foreign languages. Broadening of institutional connections between universities abroad; conducting joint scientific and technical research with foreign laboratories and institutions; development and implementation of aiming language courses for teaching staff, implementation of internationalized academic programs into educational process may contribute significant to HEI. Development and implementation of special courses with intercultural content and invitation of foreign scholars to teach disciplines; conduct seminars, organize trainings, round tables on current issues of international higher education, academic mobility, internationalization of higher education systems in EU for lecturers from Ukrainian institutions must become a strategic institutional issue. Main innovative forms: virtual mobility, distant academic mobility, electronic internationalization should also be taken as tools for higher education internationalization.

We have to admit some limitations of the work. Small number of respondents, only 118 international students from 3 universities were engaged. The scope of questions is not broad enough. Study of the situation at the whole national level was geographically restricted. So, we stress on the need for detailed study of HEI at national level, in particular implementation of internationalized curriculum. Under conditions of Ukraine, as universities have no enough autonomy and depend on ministry of education and science of Ukraine concerning curricular, therefore they can internationalize the content of education only by transformation of working academic programs and individual disciplines.

5. Conclusion.

So, main general modern HEI trends are: strengthening of global competition for international students; growing necessity in curriculum internationalization, internationalization of teaching and learning results, further development of international cooperation in research.

Strategic approach to HEI becomes more general phenomenon, but this approach is not taken as a tool by all institutions. More characteristic is availability of internationalization policy or strategy, and it becomes the norm. Together with internationalization of research appears more global approach to HEI. Curriculum internationalization is considered to be very important form of internationalization, however, in practice student mobility retains to be the most important activity. Accordingly, less than 5% of students receive advantages of higher education internationalization. International teaching staff retains to be minority. Even if universities appreciate international experience, they consider it more helpful than necessary.

The scope and nature of academic mobility remains insufficiently studied, in particular at regional level. An issue of HEI assessment requires deep and detailed studying, as there exist necessity of developing highly efficient methods of evaluating results of internationalization for efficient distribution of recourses. The whole educational system of Ukraine should be addressed from the prospective of internationalization.

References

- Cavalli, A., & Teichler, U. (2015). Mobility and migration in science. *European Review*, 23(1), S1-S5. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798714000751>
- Caruso, R., & De Wit, H. (2015). Determinants of mobility of students in Europe: Empirical evidence for the period 1998-2009. *Journal of Studies in*

- International Education*, 19(3), 265-282.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315314563079>
- Crăciun, D. (2018). National Policies for Higher Education Internationalization: A Global Comparative Perspective. In Curaj, A., Deca, L., & Pricopie, R. (Eds.), *European Higher Education Area: The Impact of Past and Future Policies* (pp. 95 – 106). Springer. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77407-7_7
- Conceptsia virtualnoi internationalizatsii vyshchoi osvity Ukrainy. Proect «E-internationalizatsia dlia navchannia u spivpratsi» [The Concept of Virtual internationalization of higher education of Ukraine. The project «E-internationalization for Collaborative Learning»]. Retrieved September 15, 2020: http://www.eicl.kharkiv.edu/upload/E-internationalization%20concept_Ukraine.pdf
- Chyrva, A. (2013). *Tendentsii internatsionalizatsii sodержania vyssheho obrazovaniia Kanady. Monografia* [Trends of higher education content internationalization in Canada. Monograph]. LAP LAMBERT. Academic Publishing.
- Crichton, J., Paige, M., Papademetre, L., & Scarino, A. (2004). *Integrated resources for intercultural teaching and learning in the context of internationalisation in higher education. Report to Teaching and Learning Committee*. University of South Australia.
<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.116.5500&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- De Wit, H. (2018). Evolving Concepts, Trends, and Challenges in the Internationalization of Higher Education in the World. *Educational Studies, Higher School of Economics*, 2, 8-34. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1814-9545-2019-2-8-34>
- De Wit, H., Gacel-Avila, J., Jones, E., & Jooste, N. (Eds.). (2017). *The Globalization of Internationalization: Emerging Voices and Perspectives* (1st ed.)
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315657547>
- Green, W. & Whitsed, C. (2013). Reflections on an alternative approach to continuing professional learning for internationalization of the curriculum across disciplines. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(2), 148 - 164.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315312463825>
- Hiroshi, O. (2018). Internationalization of Higher Education: Global Trends and Japan's Challenges. *Educational Studies in Japan: International Yearbook*, 12, 91-105. <https://doi.org/10.7571/esjkyoiku.12.91>
- Hudzik, J. (2015). Comprehensive Internationalization: Institutional Pathways to Success. *High Education*, 72 (1st ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9948-9>
- Jones, E, Beelen, J., Coelen, R., De Wit, H. (Eds.), (2016). *Local and Global Internationalisation*. Internationalisation of Education. Springer.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-301-8>

- Jones E., & De Wit, H. (2014). Globalized Internationalization: Implications for Policy and Practice. *IIE Networker*, 28-29. Institute of International Education
https://www.academia.edu/6528914/Globalized_Internationalization_Implications_for_Policy_and_Practice
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization Remodeled: Definition, Approaches, and Rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315303260832>
- Kuroda K. (2016). Regionalization of higher education in Asia. In C. Collins, M. Lee, J. Hawkins, & D. Neubauer (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Asia Pacific Higher Education* (pp. 141-156). https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-48739-1_10
- Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the Curriculum. Internationalization in higher education*. Routledge.
- Lvova, O. (2019). ICT-tools for internationalization of continuous education. *RUDN Journal of Informatization in Education*, 16(1), 56-63.
<https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8631-2019-16-1-56-63>
- Proctor, D., & Rumbley, L. (Eds.), (2018). *The Future Agenda for Internationalization in Higher Education: Next Generation Insights into Research, Policy, and Practice* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Teichler, U. (2017). Internationalisation trends in higher education and the changing role of international student mobility. *Journal of international Mobility*, 5(1), 177-216. <https://doi.org/10.3917/jim.005.0179>
- Yudkevich, M., Altbach, P., & Rumbley, L. (Eds.), (2016). *The Global Academic Rankings Game. Changing Institutional Policy, Practice, and Academic Life* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580918791974>