

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/2592-8813-2024-spec-19>

THE GLOBALIZATION CONTEXT OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EXPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE WORLD

Innola Novykova,
Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor,
Visit-Professor of Baltic International Academy, Latvia

Abstract. The problem of the globalization of education was analyzed and it was determined that it unfolds in three main directions: 1) the possibility of involving participants in global education in the global values of humanity, such as sustainable development and environmental protection; 2) the impact of the development of informatization and time-space boundaries on the emergence of new forms of education on a global scale; 3) the possibility of social explanation of pedagogy in the conditions of globalization, which is expressed in changes in the contexts of critical pedagogy, pedagogy of intercultural communications, etc. The trends of globalization of education, manifested in a completely new process of formation of the market of global educational services, lead to the justification of a new pedagogical system, the characteristic features of which in many respects can already be determined today, in particular: first, the processes of commercialization of education and the emergence of transnational and non-university providers on markets of educational services gradually lead to the transformation of the educational process formed during the thousand-year history of the existence of university education, which accumulated the achievements of spiritual culture; secondly, the globalization of education and the wide use of technological possibilities of communications, which are not provided with adequate didactics, contribute to the deterioration of the quality of professional education and training; thirdly, the reduction of the influence of classical institutional education with, mainly, the physical presence of the subjects of the learning process, increases the risk of desocialization of students locked in the limited space of the computer and deprived of the possibility of dialogic communication with peers and teachers, which for centuries was considered the cornerstone of education personality Globalization and export of higher education are different, but interrelated concepts. Globalization involves the circulation of ideas, resources, personnel, economic models, cultures, knowledge, goods, services and technologies on a global scale. It is determined that the export of higher education is aimed at establishing mutual understanding between nations, people, cultures, institutions and systems. During the last decades of intensive development, the scale, sphere of influence and quality of export of higher education have increased. The modern interpretation of the process of exporting higher education as the circulation of personnel does not take into account the potential threat of individual mobility, in particular in the direction of competition for talented youth between countries with the greatest shortage of scientific personnel. Secondly, the growing demand for international qualifications leads to the use of fake diplomas issued by so-called “diploma factories”, as well as to an increase in the number of “accreditation factories” that certify the fraudulent activities of unscrupulous universities. Thirdly, in a number of countries there is an excessive desire to receive income from the tuition fees of foreign students, which causes a decrease in academic standards and the development of “visa factories”. Fourth, increased commercialization of transnational franchising and joint educational programs represent a threat to the quality and relevance of higher education in some regions of the world. That is why in further studies it is necessary to pay serious attention to the definition and cultivation of values that form the basis of the export of higher education.

Key words: export of education, globalization, higher education, development.

Introduction. The world community is aware that, under the influence of technological evolution, the processes of interdependence between countries, which are now called “globalization”, have gained significant strength. Globalization as a profound multifactorial phenomenon characterizes the transformation of all types of social relations: politics, economy, religion, culture, education, which move in the direction of world openness. Taking into account the mentioned changes, in particular in

the development of free financial and human capital, information and telecommunication technologies, is a necessary condition for the participation of various countries in the globalized economy of the 21st century. and effective use of its opportunities for the integration of educational strategies and inclusion in SOP [1, p. 5].

The multifaceted nature of the globalization phenomenon consists in many manifestations, first of all, in the growing volume of exchange of material and spiritual values between different peoples, as well as in the interpenetration and so-called “mixing” of nations and languages as a result of migrations. Despite the long debate about the unification of the definition of the phenomenon of globalization, scientists define the key concept of its essence as “increasing interdependence” [2, p. 4]. It is obvious that now it is necessary to supplement the understanding of globalization as a process that transforms various parts into a single whole, transforming the world community into a world society.

Basic theoretical and practical provision. The vast majority of scientists associate the origin of globalization mostly with the post-war period of the mid-40s of the 20th century, namely with the creation of the United Nations in 1945. Indeed, over the past fifty years, the rate of spread of the “common” has significantly accelerated and continues to gain momentum. The problem of the conceptual and categorical apparatus of the study of globalization is also supplemented by the question of the content and direction of this phenomenon. J. Knight and the executive director of the European Association of International Education, H. Callan, note in their writings that it is inappropriate to consider the development of international relations only from the point of view of globalization, since other processes – regionalization or fragmentation – are taking place at the same time. However, researchers are convinced that fragmentation is not an opposite process, but exists as an organic component of globalization. After all, during the formation of geopolitical regions, individual states gradually weaken and break up into fragments, and then into individual individuals who later become citizens of regional society (for example, we can consider the process of Europeanization), and therefore, in a similar way, scientists predict, the world will acquire a global character [3].

So, globalization can be understood in different ways: as a geospatial process of growing interdependence and convergence, in which global or regional spheres of activity are being improved; as the initial stage of functioning of world markets; as an exchange of knowledge and art objects within a common space. Globalization undoubtedly affects the international development of all spheres of social life, accelerating some processes, slowing down others and changing the direction of others. It would be interesting to investigate the impact of globalization on each of them, but our attention is drawn to the genesis of social processes, which is accompanied by an awareness of the importance of the role of higher education in these conditions.

Economic and cultural globalization, as a process of “expansion, deepening and acceleration of worldwide interdependence” [4], started a new era in the development of higher education, which has always been distinguished by openness in the international arena. Higher education has been significantly transformed under the influence of globalization, turning into a kind of center of change, which, thanks to the worldwide network interaction of universities and academic exchange, is gradually changing the social, economic and cultural character of society's life. In the global economy of knowledge, higher education institutions over the past few decades have gradually turned into an environment of transnational relations, continuous global movement of people, information, technologies, knowledge products and financial capital.

The well-known researcher of globalization processes, P. Scott (P. Scott) aptly defined the role of universities in this context: “Not all universities carry out international activities, but all of them obey the processes of globalization – partly as objects and even victims of these processes, and partly as sub “objects or key agents of globalization” [5]. It is hard not to agree with these words, because for the first time in history every university is part of a worldwide research network, and leading scientists have an unprecedented influence on the development of society on a global scale. The scientific

and research activity of these institutions is acquiring an increasingly transnational dimension thanks to the increased mobility of teachers and scientists. And the creation of a global market of educational services and international rankings of universities contributed to a large extent to the emergence of a specific global criterion in the structure of the academic labor market, which affects the employment opportunities of teaching staff. All the mentioned changes caused a thorough rethinking of the strategies of higher education functioning and the development of the higher education system as a whole, both at the local (national) and international levels.

Even half a century ago, international relations were somewhat marginal in the daily activities of universities, with the exception of the scientific and research sphere. Today, the ever-increasing impact of the global environment seems an inevitable reality. In many countries, such phenomena as transnational mobility, global comparisons and rankings of higher education institutions have become key issues of strategic development, and government officials and university leaders are full of thoughts about the politics of transnational cooperation and competition.

If previously there was a trend of dominance of the Anglo-American economic and cultural essence of globalization, now a pluralistic environment with elements of globalization of the American, European, Chinese or other type is being formed. However, like any long and unfinished process, it is difficult to grasp the possibilities of globalization in a holistic way, so the Anglo-American essence of global convergence is more obvious than the convergence process itself [6]. It is worth noting that American educational traditions differ from other English-speaking countries, however, over the past two decades, Australia and Great Britain have made changes in the system of organization and financing of higher education and have come closer to the USA. The second global center in the field of education and science after the USA is Great Britain, whose authority plays a major role in matters of culture, language and the development of management practices [7]. In the context of the above, for many countries of the world, globalization in the field of higher education turns out to be a process of Anglo-Americanization, especially in the activities of universities, in which national identity is formed.

At the same time, the globalization of higher education is not a universal phenomenon, it has certain features according to the localization of manifestation (local, national, regional or global level), the use of language and academic culture, as well as the type of educational institution. In a global network environment, where information about every university and national system of higher education is open and instantly available, it is no longer possible to stay away from the influence of globalization.

The editor of the scientific magazine "Politics of Higher Education" G. Neave emphasizes the dual nature (economic and cultural) of globalization in his writings. On the one hand, the scientist claims, globalization has caused the emergence of world markets that function in real time of traditional financial systems. On the other hand, it is based on worldwide communication, information, knowledge and cultural systems that form a single world community [8, 9].

Higher education serves as the basis for conducting research and producing knowledge, is a necessary condition for the development of language, information and intercultural contacts, and is also a connecting link with mass media. Considering the fact that information and knowledge are phenomena with a high degree of mobility that easily cross borders, it can be argued that the cultural sector of higher education is becoming more globalized than the economic one. Cultural globalization is greatly facilitated by the Internet, thanks to which worldwide data repositories are developed, as well as cooperation between universities, stimulating meetings in real time and virtual space [10].

Due to its mobility, higher education and science are considered key elements in the process of shaping the global environment, producing knowledge and technologies, creating transnational associations and permanent complex communities of like-minded people. That is why scientists are unanimous in their conclusions that no national system, except for higher education, interacts with another

national system on such a scale or with similar intensity [11, p. 19]. According to P. Scott, higher education institutions, as a rule, positioning themselves as objects of globalization, also become its leaders [5, pp. 108–129]. And research universities, which are interconnected by intensive interaction within the so-called “global cities” (global cities), are, according to P. McCartney, the main nodes of the networked globalized educational space [12, p. 205–224]. D. Bloom, studying this phenomenon, noted that there is a stable positive correlation between the involvement of citizens of a certain region or country in higher education and his/her global competitiveness and vice versa [13, pp. 21–41].

The globalization of higher education varies considerably across countries, depending on national policies, leadership and management. The fact is that institutions of higher education implement their involvement in the global system within the limited space of national approaches to educational and economic policy, public administration, etc. One of the examples of the process of globalization is the spread of new state management in higher education. In world practice, the reaction of higher education systems to the challenges of globalization was determined by reforms of national systems, in particular, regarding the organization of higher education institutions, which led to the emergence of a new state administration.

The essence of the new state administration is:

- 1) modeling of national systems of higher education as economic markets;
- 2) competition between institutes under government supervision and competition between academic units of institutes under management supervision;
- 3) partial decentralization of responsibility for administration and fundraising;
- 4) stimulation of cost reduction and formation of an entrepreneurial style of behavior;
- 5) introduction of new or expansion of existing value indicators;
- 6) stimulation of relations with business and industry;
- 7) measurement of results and financing based on performance;
- 8) establishment of quasi-corporate relations with financial structures (introduction of contracts, reporting and audit procedures).

It is obvious that the implementation of the new state administration in the organization of universities in different countries contributed to the universalization of higher education systems, that is, their acquisition of a uniform form and organizational and management practices. The new public administration has spread significantly in Australia, Great Britain, New Zealand, at the same time, it was applied on a smaller scale in the countries of Western Europe and North America.

According to S. Marginson's conclusions, one of the results of the said reform is to increase the readiness of universities and higher education systems for global challenges, thanks to the introduction of competition into their activities, the achievement of effectiveness and openness. In particular, in Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand, the new state administration contributed to the development of an entrepreneurial and profit-oriented approach to transnational cooperation [11, p. 20].

It is important to realize that global relations, the subjects of which are national systems of higher education and universities, are not stable, unified and predictable, since different countries and educational institutions have different potential for perceiving globalization and functioning in its conditions. J. Douglas (J. Douglas) emphasizes that “globalization is local”, because global convergence depends on local, subnational and national influence, as well as balancing forces, which include government regulation and national academic culture [14].

Considering the above, the researchers justify three types of potential global transformations in the system of higher education with different consequences for national states and relations between the state and higher education institutions, namely:

- 1) integrative global transformation;
- 2) national-convergent global transformation;
- 3) national parallel global transformation.

Let's consider them in more detail. Integrative global transformation embodies global processes of the integration type, which, unlike the national type, are difficult to change or stop by national agents. These include, in particular, the development of Internet publications and the formation of a global market for highly qualified labor, which differs from national labor markets. National-convergent global transformation assumes that global systems and relations, which generate general changes in national systems of higher education, are under the influence of convergence and integration. That is, the question lies in the influence of transnational interaction at the national level on global harmonization. Examples of such relationships are the use of English as the language of academic exchanges or studies in master's or doctoral programs.

National-parallel global transformation assumes that parallel reforms, which are carried out simultaneously by the governments of several countries on the basis of common ideas and models, lead to convergence and promote interaction between different national systems of higher education. An example of such a transformation can be the processes of Europeanization of higher education in the European region [11, p. 24].

Integration and national-convergent transformations contributed to the strengthening of the so-called "relativistic" status of universities, which is associated with the spread of informal requirements of world standards, which are formed in the process of convergence and harmonization of the structures of academic degrees of universities, as well as procedures for recognizing diplomas and guaranteeing the quality of education; introduction of global comparison ratings of education systems and educational institutions, international benchmarking of universities and academic disciplines.

The results of the world university rankings contribute to the spread of global relativization and bring it to the institutional level, because the governments and the public of most countries are concerned about the positions of their universities in the world ranking. However, determining the place of universities in global rankings, the government and the public participate in the formation of a model of higher education as a global competition of individual universities. This model partially removes educational institutions from the supervision and control of the national government, since the state is not able to fully understand all the transnational connections of universities. At the same time, most universities continue to depend on government regulation and resource support, since the state is the main source of funding. N. Fligstein assesses the situation as follows: almost 80% of production is related to the state, which determines the limits for making political decisions in the field of higher education. Most governments delegate management functions to a lower level and carry out decentralization, but none of them takes responsibility for managing the sphere of higher education [9, p. 204].

In some countries, national authorities have a great influence on the regulation of transnational activities of higher education institutions, and in almost all countries, governments influence the transnational interaction of educational institutions by distributing resources and creating conditions for communication, cooperation and mobility [10, p. 21]. Such attention of the state leadership is connected, first of all, with the need to make higher education competitive in the era of globalization, as well as capable of bringing benefit to national development. It is a difficult task to create an appropriate toolkit and motivation system that would allow maintaining a balance between competition and cooperation between universities.

Taking into account the existing models of global transformations and the interaction of the national state and educational institutions in the conditions of the globalization of education, the researchers developed a four-zone structure for the formation of global educational policy and strategy in the field of higher education. The structure is presented in the form of four separate but interconnected zones, within which the government and universities, both separately from each other and jointly, develop strategies and policies in the field of education.

Such zones are:

- 1) intergovernmental negotiations;
- 2) global connections of universities;
- 3) conditions of functioning of national education systems created by the government;
- 4) local program of higher education institutions.

Even two decades ago, almost all strategies were formed in the lower half of the scheme. Now the situation has changed, as the creation of a global strategy has become a priority for many countries and educational institutions. Within the global space of higher education, countries and universities can be both “dependent on the situation” and “creators of the situation”. Their dependence is determined by inherited geographical features, historical, economic, political and cultural specificities, including education systems and the organization of research. In the future, thanks to their own efforts, countries and universities can complement and develop their own global potential and, accordingly, improve their position.

Given the initial “position” on a global scale (current at the time of strategy development), countries and universities are offered appropriate global steps to “create the position”.

In general, S. Marginson and M. van der Wende come to the conclusion that states and universities operating in the global arena have two interdependent goals:

- 1) to maximize the potential and effectiveness of higher education within the global space;
- 2) to optimize the benefits received from transnational activities, when returning to the environment at the national and local level.

The implementation of such political goals depends on a real understanding of the global space of higher education, the initial position of the country and the educational institution in it, as well as on internal and external opportunities for the implementation of strategies [10, p. 27].

So, economic and cultural globalization heralds a new era in the development of higher education. Transnational relationships and strategies have gained special importance for governments and educational institutions of most countries. For the first time in history, every university is part of a single global network, and educational institutions that have become world leaders in their field have unprecedented global power. In Europe, North America, and Southeast Asia, governments are seeking to develop research-friendly education policies to increase investment in university research. Global higher education represents a much more open field than national education systems, providing opportunities for innovation, partnerships and markets.

To maximize the results of activities in a global environment, on the one hand, it is essential to preserve national identity, and, on the other hand, it is important to be open and interact with other participants. For example, one of the reasons for the success of American higher education in the global space was a special combination of decentralization and centralization of its management. Thus, American universities actively operate in the almost unregulated sphere of transnational individual mobility by the government, making the most of the space for American initiatives and influence, minimizing the potential of other countries by limiting them in the process of intergovernmental negotiations. At the same time, domestically American universities are much better coordinated than it seems at first glance, because they are united by a common culture, a sense of national dignity and recognition of the American way of life, which binds them more strongly than the directives of the government. Undoubtedly, some forms of transnational activity of higher education institutions require regulation at the level of national policy. However, for effective work at the global level, higher education institutions most need increased autonomy, openness, predictability, and moderate state funding and investment. It is much more difficult to think through measures for the coordination of universities in such a way as to promote the development of their autonomous global potential and the achievement of a common strategic goal. Another difficulty lies in the unclear definition of the role of the national government in the transnational activities of the country's higher education insti-

tutions, because globalization has transformed the traditional idea of the role of the government in the development of higher education, which is concentrated within state borders.

On the one hand, the factor of changes was the introduction of a new state administration, on the other – the growth of transnational communications and activities in which universities directly interact with partners outside the country. Despite the fact that universities continue to use national resources, they partially leave the political context of the country of origin. That is, the influence of the national government on the management of higher education remains significant, but it must share its functions with other actors, including governments of other countries, international agencies and universities.

Globalization of higher education significantly affects the national educational policy of most countries of the world. Scientists note the existence of certain discrepancies between the transnational character of cultural and economic relations, which, on the one hand, is characterized by the rapid transfer of information, relatively free movement of people, educational institutions and educational programs, and on the other hand, by the dominant nature of national educational policy and higher education management, and as well as labor markets formed at the national level. In other words, there is a discrepancy between the globalized world and national governmental structures regarding the development of an effective educational policy of transnational interaction at the state and institutional levels.

In the global educational space, processes of integration and convergence have been initiated, primarily at the regional level, and regulatory, economic and political foundations are being created (on the initiative of international organizations) to ensure full-fledged transnational cooperation of countries and educational institutions. F. Altbach notes that “globalization contributed to strengthening the internationalization of universities and expanding its scope” [15]. With this statement, he updates the analysis of specific principles, approaches, strategies, types of activities and the impact of internationalization on higher education at the regional, national and institutional levels, as well as in their comparison.

S. Marginson and J. Rhoades (G. Rhoades) under the term “internationalization” or “export of education” understand interstate relations between countries or individual universities located in different countries. In their opinion, this phenomenon contrasts with globalization, which embodies the processes of worldwide absorption and convergence associated with the growing role of global systems that cross national borders. As a rule, several countries are involved in the process of exporting education, while globalization penetrates most countries and is a dynamic process of local, national and global convergence [16, 281–309].

It is obvious that globalization is more capable of transformation, as it directly affects the communication, economic, cultural and political foundations of the country, it changes the foundations of national identity, and also affects the system of higher education within the country and beyond. Instead, the export of education has a limited impact, as it involves the definition of a society as a nation-state that functions and maintains its borders in the economic, social and cultural system, even as the relationship with other countries increases. P. Scott suggests that globalization transcends the boundaries of national identities and contains the potential for hostility towards nation-states. In a certain sense, the globalization of higher education is an alternative export of education, and even the opposite. Although their mutual exclusion is not at all mandatory [5, pp. 108–129].

The export of education continues to develop in the era of globalization, accelerating within interdependent global systems and contributing to their development. The difference between globalization and the export of education is as follows: national systems become more integrated, which implies globalization, or more interconnected, according to internationalization.

H. Beerkens is sure that the trends of globalization and export of education constantly complement and stimulate each other. Such a situation implies that the relations in the “globalization – export of

education” system are better described as dialectical, not mutually exclusive, linear, cumulative. The scientist proves the dialectical nature of the relationship between the two types of transnational interactions using the example of a modern university as a certain institutional structure that functions in international and global contexts. Initially, the university's activities were regulated within the framework of pan-European mobility and university Latin traditions, which determined global relations. Currently, worldwide networks of scientific disciplines are building a powerful academic identity, which later influences the formation of national scientific schools [17].

The current stage of the development of higher education is characterized by the presence of four strategies for the export of education within the educational policy of the developed countries of the world, as evidenced by the results of the projects of international organizations-initiators:

- 1) strategy of coordinated interaction;
- 2) the strategy of attracting qualified labor force;
- 3) strategy for obtaining profits;
- 4) strategy of expansion of opportunities.

It is obvious that these strategies are rarely implemented individually, and in practice, the educational policy of a certain country focuses on a combined approach to strategy development and implementation, relying on one of them as the main one.

In our opinion, it is obvious that the choice of strategy by a certain country is determined not only by external geopolitical factors, but, first of all, by the national socio-economic and historical context, opportunities, resources and priorities. However, despite the objectivity and obvious irreversibility of the process, not all countries are ready to consider it as part of their development strategy. The reason for this, according to experts, lies in the unequal capabilities of countries to respond to the need to interact in the united world economic and cultural field.

Thus, at the current stage, many partners enter into dialogue with the aim of recruiting students at the international level, obtaining profits and achieving high positions in international rankings of universities. The main problem in partnership relations is the inability to guarantee transparency of the specified goals, and the use of a holistic approach helps to ensure honesty and transparency of intentions, goals and dialogue in the process.

Conclusions. Therefore, the importance and relevance of a holistic approach to the export of higher education is obvious and does not require additional explanations, as it ensures transparency, consistency and consistency of this process in order to improve results and increase the effectiveness of partnership interaction. UNESCO's international consultant on higher education, R. Chao, presented his own position on the development of the concept of exporting higher education in the “idealism-utilitarianism” paradigm. He explained his vision as follows: the formation of the global market of higher education over the past 25 years, the change in the system of financing higher education institutions, the strengthening of the idea of higher education as a private good, the growth of demand for it and, as a result, the massification of higher education served as an impetus for the formation of a utilitarian approach to exports higher education. In addition to training a globally competitive workforce, the export of higher education has become a powerful commercial tool, helping to finance higher education institutions, as well as strengthening immigration and higher education control mechanisms.

The rapid development of the export of higher education, international and joint educational programs, the openness of the market for branches of foreign universities have called into question the national educational sovereignty of a number of countries, which contributes to the further commercialization of higher education and strengthens the utilitarian role of the export of higher education. However, the expert believes that the higher education sector is not limited to the utilitarian tasks of producing human capital to ensure national and regional economic growth. Traditionally, universities are at the epicenter of social and scientific development, where future citizens of the world and global

leaders are trained, and the development of civil society and the fight against social problems are the basis of the mission of a modern university.

Therefore, the export of higher education has political, socio-economic, cultural and academic foundations and is a mutual process that proceeds simultaneously from the top down and from the bottom up. Moreover, the process of export of higher education takes place inside and outside the national system of higher education. Ideally, the export of higher education should focus not only on the economic component of the world, but also on political, cultural, academic processes that involve the formation of personality, improvement of society, and the development of global citizenship. In the conditions of growing interdependence of the processes taking place all over the world, the export of higher education is inevitable, but it should not destroy the local culture, instead, the differences between regions and countries should be built into the processes of internationalization and contribute to the formation of a new generation of bearers of local cultures who will make their contribution in solving such global tasks as the protection of human rights, reducing the level of poverty, protecting the environment, and achieving sustainable development.

So, idealistic and utilitarian approaches reflect different aspects of exporting higher education. The essence and functions involve a combination of both approaches, which in each country is adapted to its political, socio-economic, cultural and historical features. Despite the external pressure of globalization and regionalization, the nature and direction of the export of higher education in each country depends on the formed ideas and projected expectations. The process of exporting higher education should be considered taking into account the multidimensionality of political, socio-economic, cultural and academic aspects affecting it.

References:

1. OECD (2008). Thematic Review of Tertiary Education. Tertiary Education for the Knowledge Society: Synthesis Report. – OECD, 20 p.
2. Varghese N.V. (2009). Globalization, economic crisis and national strategies for higher education development: Research papers of the International Institute for Educational Planning. – Paris: UNESCO Publishing, 36 p.
3. Brickman W. (1950). International education / W. Brickman. – Encyclopedia of Educational Research [W.S. Monroe (Ed)]. – Macmillan: New York, P. 617–627.
4. Marginson S., Wende M van der. (2007). Globalisation and Higher Education: Education Working Paper No. 8 / Simon Marginson, Marijk van der Wende. – OECD, 85 p.
5. Scott P. (1998). Massification, Internationalization and Globalization / P. Scott. – The Globalization of Higher Education: Monograph. – The Society for Research into Higher Education / Open University Press: Buckingham, P. 108–129.
6. France A. (2016). The Adoption and Development of the Anglo Saxon Model of Higher Education Globally – the Implications for Nation States Systems and the Unification of Higher Education Systems / A. France. Retrieved from: https://www.Academia.edu/11327032/ASHE_Paper_on_the_AngloSaxon_model_of_Transnational_Education?auto=download&campaign=weekly_digest.
7. Rhoads R., Torres C. (2006). The University, State, and Market: The political Economy of Globalization in the Americas / R. Rhoads, C. Torres. – Stanford: Stanford University Press, 397 p.
8. Neave G. (2002). Editorial: Academic Freedom in an Age of Globalization / Guy Neave // Higher Education Policy. Vol. 15. P. 331–335.
9. Fligstein N. (2001). The Architecture of Markets: An Economic Sociology of Twenty-first-century Capitalist Societies / N. Fligstein. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 274 p.
10. Teichler U. (2004). The changing debate on internationalization of higher education / Ulrich Teichler // Higher Education. № 28 (1). P. 5–26.
11. Marginson S., Wende M. van der. (2009). The New Global Landscape of Nations and Institutions / Simon Marginson, Marijk van der Wende. Higher Education to 2030. Volume 2: Globalisation. OECD Publishing: Paris, P. 17–62.

12. McCartney P. (2005). *Global Cities, Local Knowledge Creation: Mapping a New Policy Terrain on the Relationship between Universities and Cities* / P. McCartney. – *Creating Knowledge: Strengthening Nations: The Changing Role of Higher Education: Monograph*. University of Toronto Press: Toronto, P. 205–224.
13. Bloom D. (2005). *Raising the Pressure: Globalization and the Need for Higher Education Reform* / D. Bloom. – *Creating Knowledge: Strengthening Nations: The Changing Role of Higher Education: Monograph*. – University of Toronto Press: Toronto, P. 21–41.
14. Douglas J. (2005). *All Globalization is Local: Counter-vailing Forces and the Influence on Higher Education Markets* / J. Douglas. Berkeley: University of California, 2005. Retrieved from: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3z26h30n#page-1>.
15. Wit H. de, Hunter F. (2014). *Internationalization of Higher Education at the Crossroads* / H. de Wit, F. Hunter // *International Higher Education: Special Issue on Internationalization of Higher Education*. № 78. P. 2–3.
16. Marginson S., Rhoades G. (2002). *Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic* / Marginson S., Rhoades G. // *Higher Education*. № 43. P. 281–309.
17. Beerkens H. (2004) *Global Opportunities and Institutional Embeddedness: Higher Education consortia in Europe and Southeast Asia* / H. Beerkens // *Center for Higher Education Policy Studies: University of Twente*, Retrieved from: http://doc.utwente.nl/50803/1/thesis_Beerkens.pdf.