

SOCIETAL ROLES OF INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Tetiana Kostiuik, Olha Vyhovska, Iryna Mankovska

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University (Ukraine)

Abstract. The article is devoted to the main challenges relevant in the context of the internationalization of higher education (IHE) as an undeniable part of Bologna process, unification of strategies and QA and verbalized by the societal paradigm of human development.

IHE as part of the university's strategy is based on the core values of higher education and contributes to their observance. In addition, IHE has its own societal narratives traditionally including the development of soft skills, multiculturalism, polylingualism, tolerance, leadership, stress resistance etc. IHE serves both the HEIs and the countries, which got expressly clear in scope of the knowledge society. However, is there a downside to IHE impact and a risk to the academic systems of nation-states? What can be called unethical while implementing IHE? These and other issues have been addressed in this publication.

Keywords: higher education; values; internationalization of higher education; social development; cross-border cooperation.

INTRODUCTION

One of the main challenges of the modern age shaping the visions and missions of modern universities is socio-cultural processes and diversification. The vision of the leading free economic zones defines the university as an institution with a high culture, which constantly develops leadership potential and strives for excellence. The knowledge society/ economy require HEI to effectively carry out a threefold task: innovation in education, research and progress for sustainable development and social responsibility. So, universities must adhere to and preserve both university and national educational traditions, but at the same time introduce innovative technologies and practices, promote internationalization, which a priori aims to remove any barriers, unify approaches and requirements, and promote multiculturalism.

Most researchers of such a broad and influential phenomenon as IHE justify its importance for the development of leadership potential of future professionals, expanding their cultural horizons and communication skills, increasing the ability to work in a multicultural society, get out of comfort zone and communicate in foreign languages. EU academic exchange programs aim to spread European values and promote European integration processes. The practical value of IHE does not require proof and has been tested for decades of cross-border cooperation. Much more important is the value aspect of this process, which includes tolerance and openness, impartiality and equality. However, the issue of the IHE values and ethics is little studied, so in this article we have concentrated all the views of scientists and researchers, and we can consider it as the first multifaceted review of the societal paradigm of IHE implementation and some negative consequences of incorrect IHE execution.

The Industrial Revolution and the change in the socio-political paradigm of human development necessitated a revision of the doctrinal principles and terminology of many sciences. Theorists of sociological science, which, in fact, deals with the study of conditions and processes in society, patterns of its development and social transformations, at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In the sociological discourse they begin to use actively the term "societal" instead of "social", arguing that the latter does not cover the whole essence and nature of the new stage of transformation processes.

American sociologist, professor at Yale University (USA) W. Sumner (1992) considered this notion as a number of collective or group regulations of any individual activity (Sumner, 1992).

His follower, anthropologist A. Keller (2018) in his research focused on the study of organizational aspects of society and sought to standardize a holistic theory of societal evolution (Keller, 2018).

Another American sociologist, a supporter of the structural functionalism, T. Parsons (1988) distinguishes "societal" and "social" analogically to the interpretation of the categories "public" and "social". Among other things, T. Parsons paid special attention to the educational processes and trends, emphasizing the role of the educational revolution, which "has a profound and ever-increasing impact on the social structure of employment, especially regarding general adaptability <...> revolution in education through the development of the academic complex and channels of practical application of scientific developments made the transformation of the modern society structure begin" (Parson, 1988, p. 131).

The founder of the socio-cultural dynamics theory and one of the leaders of social mobility theory P. Sorokin (1947) described the social system as a macroscopic, integral and dynamic cultural and social complex (Sorokin, 1947).

Thus, societal values can be defined as a set of moral principles due to the dynamics of society, institutions, traditions and cultural landmarks. These values are essentially implicit guidelines that influence subject-object relations within the social system in order to ensure adequate coexistence between participants and promote sustainable development. They are progressively formed during people's lives and in framework of the corporate culture, making distinctions between acceptable and unacceptable, desirable, and permissible, and are best implemented under the collective agreement conditions produced and accepted by all participants. The managerial context of the societal values is important concerning the development and implementation of basic functions. At the institutional level, universities rely on societal values in defining their mission and developing a corporate culture pertinent for all stakeholders and types of educational services. The primary functions of the State are regulatory and controlling as it regulates the general paradigm of development within the limits of healthy relations between subjects and objects of public relations. Government and legislative activities, among other things, should be aimed at preserving social values through law enforcement procedures, so the judiciary and government agencies contribute to ensuring the proper functioning of society.

Hence, it seems quite reasonable to analyze educational processes, and especially such its revolutionary part as IHE, through the prism of their socio-value significance. First, higher education is an important part of public life, along with economic, political, etc.; secondly, according to T. Parsons (2007), "societal" means "a complex network of interacting groups and bodies that form a system of support for social hierarchy and expression of loyalty for an individual" (Parsons, 2007), which accurately characterizes the order and nature of interaction and communication in higher education regarding the internationalization; third, the analysis of processes in the field of higher education involves the study of their impact on society as on the entire system.

RESEARCH METHODS

To cover all issues of interest within the stated topic, we have chosen a system of methods, which provides crossdisciplinarity and includes general, general scientific, intra- and interdisciplinary methods (bibliographic, linguistic, contextual, legal etc.). In general, the methodological tools of the study are characterized by complexity and include: analysis, synthesis, historical, logical and comparative and generalization method. An important tool for preparing this research was the method of processing different literature that was worked out in the original language to avoid misunderstandings due to inadequate translation.

DISCUSSION

The realities of the civilization modern age face the field of higher education the requirements of creating and permanently renewing a paradigm able to answer all the challenges for humanity in a globalized world and the trends to integrate and monetize all processes. The ethos of knowledge society/ economy determines the higher education at the core of the hierarchy and relationships of XXI century society and empowers the control over their societal determination and relevance. Ukrainian researchers M. Romanenko, E. Vengerova, O. Panfilov and others (2015) devoted their works to understanding of the societal determinants of the modern education (Romanenko et al., 2015). Their paper proclaims that the main societal determinants of the current stage of the world education are a number of educational revolutions, the processes of globalization and digitalization. The authors further state that the first revolution in education began with the emergence of a special institution of socialization of the younger generations, which ensured the purposeful accumulation, systematization and inheritance of knowledge. This created the spiritual preconditions for the first economic revolution - the Neolithic revolution, which marked the transition from appropriation-type management to production management. The second revolution in education was associated with the invention of writing, mathematical symbolism and methods of complex calculations, it took place in the era of slavery and manifested itself in the emergence of a separate field of activity – the school and consequently - a new group in the labor division - the teachers. This revolution prepared the beginning of the "Iron Age" and became a major factor in the ancient culture flourishing. The third revolution in education contributed to the knowledge transfer and a critical way of thinking and prepared the

ground for the liberation and rise of the human spirit in the Renaissance, reformist-Protestant ideas that reflected the interests of the European bourgeoisie as well as rethinking of traditional value systems. The fourth revolution in education caused by the first industrial revolution was technocratic, gave fundamentally new properties to the workers and became one of the main causes of the second industrial, or rather, scientific and technological revolution that began in the mid of XX century.

Social responsibility and social inclusion as background of the university mission and the core values of its functions have existed for decades, but IHE which added much to the list of missions is mainly studied in terms of its impact on the university community and rarely in context of its contribution to the district development. The indirect and direct IHE impact on society and the formation of societal foundations and prospects for state building require additional study and analysis. In addition, IHE theorists often constrict the understanding of the general infrastructure of international education to academic mobility, without taking into account the fact that it is closely linked to values and excludes any manifestation of intolerance in international communication, and these values are best nurtured through properly standardized internationalization at home. Therefore, the spread of hatred and chauvinism, Nazism, racial intolerance should cause serious concern in academic and social environment and the immediate response as the universities possess tools for articulation of such basic values as openness to changes, universalism, peace, and ability to mobilize society for social, political and economic resistance. In addition, the challenges of modern society like numerous environmental catastrophes and climate changes, environmental disasters, global warming, economic inequality, globalization of the labor market, anti-globalization are hidden reasons for nationalism, radicalization, anti-intellectualism, populism. All mentioned above shape the states' policies and social moods and push up some related problem areas: the growth of far-right political forces in Europe, Brexit, trade wars etc. They also provoke controversy in the media, shape social and academic relevant issues, setting goals for the internationalization of research. Thus, the priority for IHE ideologists and implementers today is to conceptualize it and introduce to the overall strategy of university education with an emphasis on such its components as social responsibility. With an adequate IHE strategy there should be no imbalance between the HEIs duties before the local community (national level) and before international partners (international dimension).

The analysis of value systems makes it possible to identify dominant values and their ability to change within certain cultural paradigms, as well as to observe the IHE manifestations in order to identify their norms and roles for state building. IHE clearly stresses 2 areas: the processes involving IHE and the methods of implementation of the IHE related actions, such as capacity building, cultural environments open to diversity, lifelong learning and interaction with different cultures for effective intercultural dialogue. Almost all modern IHE definitions focus on these aspects while regulating the activities of universities and students without paying enough attention to the value priorities that define, criticize, educate and organize the internationalization itself.

The connection of value and cultural aspects with the experience of internationalization is important for several reasons. First, it normalizes critical analysis of cultural paradigms and value priorities as the last ones motivate individual and collective action, form a willingness to change, a tendency to perceive changes as desirable and define rules and procedures to acquire and disseminate knowledge. Second, highlighting the role of value and cultural priorities in the IHE development not only focuses on its internal structures, but also considers the provision mechanisms for providing, institutionalizing and perpetuating such values. Third, the transition to a value-oriented understanding of internationalization raises the issue of gender, racial and ethical inequality.

Such complexity and multifaceted nature of the IHE concept, on the one hand, significantly complicates its understanding, leads to terminological ambiguity, and, on the other, stimulates the search for concepts to explain and adequately use IHE for effective state building. To this end, it is appropriate to consider IHE in terms of neoliberal concept and liberal-humanistic perspectives. The neoliberal concept due to the economic imperatives of globalization has contributed to the fact that universities are becoming more focused on the consumer and the market, because neoliberal paradigm proclaims the market and the economics dominance in all aspects of public life. Within this paradigm governments reduce their regulation of the economics and allow self-regulation of the market forces. In the field of higher education, individuality (autonomy), entrepreneurship and competition become the main goals. In the public sector, students become consumers and buyers of the HEIs' services. This field got influenced in a way to increase managerial capacity, greater "transparency" in the form of additional administration and supervision of employees and an emphasis on measurable results. Researcher Ron Barnett (2000), referring to Lyotard's concept, argues that marketing has become a new universal theme, manifested in the co-modification of

teaching and research processes and in any other way in which universities meet new criteria for functioning locally and globally, focusing on measurable results (Barnett, 2000, p. 316).

To fully reveal the neoliberal perspectives, it should be noted that the neoliberal economic discourse has a strong influence on higher education around the world and in terms of defining the values of the concept of global citizenship and its internationalization. Due to the fact that higher education is often understood as a commodity under the GATT, there is a trend to commercialize free economic education and the pursuit of accountability in higher education. From this point of view, one of the main principles of modern higher education - university autonomy - gets violated and in turn it reduces the range of opportunities for ethical IHE implementation, creating a temptation to use the university as a management mandate to ensure institutional and/ or national competitiveness.

Within the neoliberal paradigm, the societal role of universities focuses on the training of universal specialists who will be in demand in the labor market and the IHE role previews providing of conditions and competencies for further employment in the world market. R. Barnett's research expresses the vision that it's a kind of transition to performance, when less is worth what people know and more - what they know about the way to do (Barnett, 2000, p. 321). Focusing on specialized and professionally oriented knowledge and capacities (hard skills) and creating degree programs in the areas of successful monetization of acquired knowledge in accordance with market conditions (e.g., business management) strengthens the justification of the social role of free economic education in promoting employment. Given the current pressure on universities including the need to diversify funding sources because of constant limitation of the access to public funds and increased international competition for both students and resources, the movement towards the entrepreneurship and management in higher education seems reasonable. Managing complex organizations, such as universities with rather large budgets, human capital, physical and intellectual property, requires universities to strike a balance between economic imperatives and their perceived social responsibilities.

A key critique of neoliberal views on higher education is that they do not take into account a number of issues that the modern world poses to students and graduates. It is obviously caused by too complex realities in which modern universities operate. R. Barnett notes that "the very framework by which we orient ourselves in the world is constantly being questioned. Supercomplication means a fragile world, and its fragility is caused not only by social and technological changes; it also depends on how we feel the world, how we feel ourselves and how we feel protected about our actions in the world" (Barnett, 2000, p. 323).

The perception of the world and any person's role in it corresponds to the liberal-humanistic concept, forming the view that the purpose of universities should be an appropriate training for students so that they could comprehend the complex world around them, understand their identity within it and have the possibility to prosper. In other words, it means to prepare people for an active position in society. Therefore, universities are considered responsible for creating public areas for initiating and developing discussions on a number of issues, as well as for the development of a broad worldview among graduates. These goals are related to approaches to teaching and learning that encourage critical thinking and active discussion, rather than prioritizing the getting certain knowledge or skills for employment. In addition, in a neoliberal-focused university, as V. Caruana (2010) notes, the characteristics of the graduate correspond to the liberal idea of a citizen who is individualistic, passive and private, depoliticized or interprets political participation as the right to exercise depending on individual desire or need and has sound skills and knowledge necessary for guaranteed employment (Caruana, 2010, p. 4). From a liberal-humanist point of view, this set of qualities and abilities is supplemented by a set of societal values, i.e. life skills, to be able to be realized not only as a specialist in a certain profession, but also as citizens in society (the soft skills).

The soft skills are interpersonal skills helping to build communication with other people, fulfil creative work, to work in stressful conditions and to overcome them, etc. These are not professional competencies, but the personal traits, communication skills and abilities, as well as personal qualities that distinguish people with the same set of professional skills from each other. So, soft skills are a personal unique code of success, adaptation to working conditions in a multicultural and polylingual borderless world, something that gives each person a competitive advantage over others in the workplace and in life. Such soft skills as communication ones, leadership, work ethic, creative approach to problem solving, time management, ability to work in a team, cosmopolitanism define the IHE strategic goals.

Having studied the state of scientific development of the issue, we'd like to stress the double IHE estimation regarding the development of soft competencies: on the one hand, a multicultural environment best promotes the development of the ability to work in a team, increase tolerance, overcome difficulties in

the language barrier, and develop intercultural communication skills; on the other hand, the academic publishing demonstrates an opposite point of view concerning IHE impact on values and competencies.

Further it seems sound to consider the aspects of problem-based learning (PBL) and its advantages over the traditional approach to getting the professional skills. There are more publications about the PBL development and implementation than about tracking the actual group dynamics, for example, how members agree on differences in opinions and how they regulate their emotions when difficulties arise. Canadian researchers conducted a study involving 160 graduates who participated in the PBL experiment in a multicultural group. 32% of respondents clearly mark this experience as negative and negative emotions were associated with personal conflicts and emotional tensions within the group and it was difficult to manage on their own (Fenwick, 2002). The dynamics of group interaction becomes even more complex when groups are diverse and members are not ready to participate in situations while the rules are unknown. Despite the fact that intercultural learning is one of the main goals of internationalization, the resourceful potential of international multicultural groups for the development of intercultural competencies is not always beneficial. If the students insist on staying with the group of the same or similar cultural, religious, linguistic attributes and if the teachers believe that students will work better in such group, then representatives of different cultural groups will not meet during the learning process, and opportunities for intercultural learning will be lost.

Group work in culturally diverse groups in framework of IHE was also the subject of a study by Australian scientists S. Volet and G. Ang (1998), who found five types of barriers: cultural and emotional kinship; language; pragmatic approach; prejudice or apathy; contextual factors. The most frequently mentioned barriers were those related to cultural, emotional and linguistic attachments and similarities, which can be explained by similar thinking, identical style of communication and sense of humor (Volet & Ang, 1998, p. 10). Both local and international students said that interacting with acquaintances who they understood well was much easier because they could anticipate their reaction and be able to dispute if the vision did not match, that's why prefer to complete tasks in a peer group of the same cultural and ethnic background.

The importance of cultural dimensions as factors inhibiting the interaction of small groups of local and international students was also emphasized in a recent study by S. Wright and D. Lander (2003). They found significant differences in the speed of verbal interaction in bi-ethnic groups compared to mono-ethnic entities. Their results cannot be explained solely by linguistic issues, but some argue that mixed groups just need extra time and motivation to overcome their diversity (Wright & Lander, 2003).

The relationship between intercultural experience and attitudes toward group performance in mixed groups has also been studied empirically. This experience is interesting within the research topic, as the results can be used in the motivational part of the IHE strategies (both national and institutional) and in the power distribution based on previous experience and socio-cultural attitudes. The report on the results of the above-mentioned S. Volet's research of more than 600 students experience states that students with significant intercultural experience, most of whom are bilingual or multilingual, had a much more positive attitude to group work in general and group work in mixed groups of local and foreign students compared to the students from monocultural groups (Volet, 2004). A group of monocultural and monolingual students expressed the least positive attitude to the principles of group work. The correlation of the degree of intercultural experience and attitudes toward tasks in groups with different socio-cultural backgrounds was reflected in students' assessments of the motivational and emotional aspects of group work respectively.

In general, these results confirm that motivation, socio-linguistic and socio-emotional connection is an important determinant and its absence is an inhibitory factor for mixing people of different cultures and languages, even as part of the IHE implementation. From the point of view of self-regulation, it can be expected that if to demonstrate the advantages of international groups in terms of expanding intercultural experience, they will be considered dominant over socio-emotional discomfort and longer adaptation period compared to other factors. The international students will continue to choose a less emotionally costly option of forming peer teams of identical gene pool, leveling the IHE values.

The given conclusions actualize the issues of the basic IHE values and formulate the need for carefully developed and controlled social engineering. Most students interviewed within various experiments agreed that universities are responsible for enhancing social cohesion and intercultural learning as part of their own ethical policies. In other words, they are responsible for the observance and dissemination of societal values by IHE means. While developing IHE strategies, it is important not only to prioritize the physical mobility, but also to adhere to the strategy of internationalization of curricula. In such a way we'll avoid fragmentary internationalization, making it be comprehensive on the basis of a common conceptual

framework for leadership initiatives promoting intercultural competence, skills and confidence for effective intercultural activity within the learning process.

This context crystallizes another aspect which is a counter-strategy of internationalization as a subtype of the strategy of global assimilation in education. It touches the issues of identity preservation in a multicultural space at the personal, institutional and state levels. The IHE sector has undoubtedly contributed much to the HE in terms of cultural development and understanding, and simultaneously created certain challenges linked to changing teaching and research strategies, the rapid development of international academic mobility, campuses and education for foreign students and, consequently, affecting the socio-cultural identity.

From the point of view of the IHE societal roles as a way to increase the international component in national structures of higher education, which is integrated among other things via natural demographical processes and the languages spread, it is important to note that identity is a product not the source of the semiotic practices, and therefore is a social and cultural phenomenon, not a personal internal psychological position. The growth of socio-cultural identity in terms of entering a multicultural and polylinguistic environment is more often a natural than a conscious reaction, the construction of perception and observation of other people, and partly - the result of the influence of stronger and dominant (based on various historical, situational and/ or value factors) ideological processes and structures, as well as of various linguistic interactions. So, in a very general and broad sense, identity is the social positioning of oneself and others.

Thus, it can be concluded that IHE, which at the macro level traditionally acts as an accelerator of mobility, assimilation, adaptation and development of common industry requirements and standards, at the micro level can act as a catalyst for increasing national self-identification and sociocultural identity of its participants. Based on such considerations, researchers R. Roads and K. Szelényi (2011) call universities "one of the last frontiers for a globally oriented population" (Roads & Szelényi, 2011, p. 42). A similar view is shared by M. Karlberg (2010), who argues that "the university is known as one of the bastions of nationalism and activism in the country, so there are scholars who are very careful about how the university defines internationalization - especially since there is a general idea that internationalization should be focused on foreign institutions, Western education and the neoliberal agenda" (Karlberg, 2010, p. 131).

It is obvious that universities have two options to perform the outlined functions within the IHE framework: international academic mobility and internationalization at home. Academic mobility in turn creates a certain inequality in access due to financial, linguistic, religious, political and other reasons. Internationalization at home is a tool for leveling such inequalities. By preparing local students to be aware of global challenges and processes and at the same time to be resistant to nationalist manifestations that may potentially arise while implementing academic mobility, public policy aims to influence more open, tolerant and conscious generations even if aptly. T. Garton-Ash (2016) notes that "many international organizations and even the HEIs themselves are working in this direction. However, the neoliberal undertaking of globalization could move towards the establishment of "globalization of anti-globalization, internationalization of nationalism, the popular front of populism" (Garton-Ash, 2016). Given the current outlook, universities must remain a bastion for cooperation between peoples and nations, regardless of their political and geopolitical position. Only by using global diversity, shared knowledge and research focused on the common good that the universities can build bridges to bypass any political, economic and ideological wall that divides the world and perpetuates its current inequalities, affirming the IHE societal values.

In the context of the IHE due to the globalization trends in industry and trade, the level of movement of people and services has increased and the labor market prefers workers with internationally recognized diplomas. The European Education Strategy, approved by the Bologna Declaration (1999) and a number of agreements regarding academic degrees and HE quality assurance, as well as the IHE priority among other educational practices formulate requirements for foreign languages, especially English, for all the scholars. In this regard, public authorities in many European countries have approved norms for English language proficiency levels as defined by the six-level scale of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2001).

In addition to IHE positive impact on the dissemination and observance of societal values by integrating international, intercultural and global aspects and perspectives into the purpose, functions of universities and providing education and upbringing of students as global citizens experienced in intercultural co-optation and understanding of other sociocultural paradigms, we have to mention a negative impact caused by a distorted understanding of its purpose. The most common reason for its negative perception is certain fraudulent mechanisms for cross-border cooperation, like so called "diploma/ degree mills" which significantly undermines the intrinsic IHE values.

Cross-border educational activities involve crossing cultural, linguistic, legislative national and often intercontinental borders. Given the difficulties in adapting and harmonizing different systems working with different benchmarks, the main implications are, on the one hand, the creation of excellent international transnational universities, which may, however, face difficulties in spreading their courses abroad, and on the other hand, the emergence and functioning of unrecognized and illegal institutions, the so-called "degree mills", which can operate in different national contexts simultaneously.

To overcome this undoubtedly negative phenomenon a possible solution could be the introduction of rules prohibiting the activities of "degree mills" into the European law. However, this may contradict the norms of national education systems, putting at risk their autonomy. It is interesting to note that countries with open regulatory frameworks, such as Austria, the Netherlands or Norway, have fewer problems with the implementation of international education, as such open systems tend to absorb non-formal higher education, subordinate it to formal higher education and control.

The academic discourse often uses the terms "degree mills" and "diploma mills" as interchangeable, but they must be distinguished: "degree mills" issues diplomas from unregistered institutions, which may be legal in some states, but the most often illegal, while the "diploma mills" issues fake diplomas from real universities [23]. Such institutions and their policies undermine the authority of higher education as the highest value of the knowledge society and offset other benefits of cross-border international education.

Such negative IHE aspects have forced theorists, researchers and the HEIs authorities around the world to gather to develop the principles of "ethical internationalization" to guarantee the preservation of the IHE fundamental societal values. The international team of the project Ethical Internationalism in Higher Education Research Project, EIHE, implemented at the University of Oulu (Finland) in partnership with 20 universities from nine countries in 2012-2015, studied the ethical issues that arise in process of IHE implementation. The project contributed to elaboration of the general principles of the ethical internationalization, and they are the markers for institutions in their practices. They include:

- clarity: to understand the causes of inequality in higher education and to make a list of causal reasons, hypothesis and contradictions;
- dissent: involvement in complex tasks of confronting the rules, principles and regulations that cause inequality, recognizing their complicity in these same structures;
- solidarity: meetings with different groups of participants [24, p. 785-786].

Dr. K. Pashby, a representative of the University of Alberta (Canada), one of the EIHE project partners, former president of EAMO, suggests that "ethical internationalization should be based on fair treatment of international students, completely transparent admission practices aimed at support for diversity and multiculturalism in audiences, scholarships based on needs and manifestations of humanism" (Pashby & Andreotti, 2016, p. 370).

Another one societal value disputed by IHE researchers is an equal access to university education and the opportunities. Many scholars attribute the inefficient distribution and direction of international educational initiatives to the unfair IHE practices, which only contributes to growing inequality and injustice in terms of access and opportunities. In addition, the scientists consider being unethical and violating the IHE value concepts both the trends to obtain increased economic benefits from the provision of educational services to foreign citizens and the preservation of some imperialistic views at the universities of North. The implementation of all IHE activities of the university is not directly related to the issue of epistemological imperatives, but faces its manifestation in the form of "brain drain", which is also the result of uneven world development. F. Altbach and J. Knight (2007) note the uneven direction of student flows within international degree programs from South to North, which undoubtedly bring potential benefits to higher education seekers, but not to their educational systems in terms of content and quality control or economic point of view (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 291).

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, we can see that it is generally believed that international education should contribute to the growth of intercultural awareness and experience with the inevitable preservation of national cultural and linguistic traditions, academic achievements. However, relations between different countries of the world have never been parity for the recognition of different sociocultural paradigms, there is the presence of epistemological orientations of an imperial nature, characterized by one-sided glorification of a particular

educational system/ strategy and glorification of certain cultures, forming a discourse on the form of global citizenship and responsibility.

Based on this, it seems logical to conclude that the need for carefully thought-out strategies for cross-border educational cooperation and its ethical implementation should be recognized, as international student exchanges have the potential and high chances to participate productively in complex and interconnected processes affecting global and local contexts. identity and advocate for a fair distribution of resources and educational programs.

In this context, we fully share the views of those researchers, who identify several ways to implement the practice of global responsibility in IHE implementation through:

- internationalization at home: to teach students to critically identify and address global manifestations of inequality (for example, through the introduction of the discipline of global responsibility in the curriculum);

- quality of educational services: inclusion of normative, applied and strategic basis for “global responsibility” as an indicator of quality;

- Code of Ethics: development of codes governing the transfer of educational services abroad, such as “export” education (more focused on inbound academic mobility, curriculum internationalization, campus internationalization), cross-border education (IVE) and agency education (stakeholders, stakeholders) between actors in the education market);

- national codes for international students: to protect the interests and rights of international students and to delimit areas of responsibility, accountability and influence (already actively practiced in Europe, for example, the Netherlands and Denmark have already established national codes);

- research: publication of research results, scientific papers in books and journals under open access, adhering to the basic values of internationalization of research (internationalization of research) and knowledge transfer (knowledge transfer) and requiring users of these intellectual works to adhere to the rules of integrity;

- standardization of joint research: conducting joint international research on the basis of bilateral / multilateral agreements and common values.

It follows that the challenge for all participants and stakeholders involved in the market of educational services to ensure ethical internationalization is to understand, articulate and maintain integrity and integrity, which will promote ethical interaction within the ideology of global responsibility and international co-evolution in cross-border education. In addition, international cooperation in higher education and its international dimension should not become purely economic and neoliberal, international practice should be based on futuristic concepts of biodiversity, universal training and sustainable development, and implemented worldwide.

REFERENCES:

- Sumner, W. G. (1992). *On Liberty, Society, and Politics: The Essential Essays of William Graham*. In Robert C. Bannister (ed.). Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 466.
- Keller, A. G. (2018). *Societal Evolution: A Study of the Evolutionary Basis of the Science of Society* (Classic Reprint). Forgotten Books, 360 p.
- Parsons, T. (1988). *Social system*. Routledge sociology classics, 448 p.
- Sorokin, p. (1947). *Society, Culture, and Personality: Their Structure and Dynamics, A System of General Sociology*. Harper & Brothers Publishers: New York & London. 723 p.
- Parsons, P. (2007). *American Society: Toward a Theory of Societal Community*. Routledge, 537 p.
- Romanenko M., Venherova E., Panfilov O. (2015). *Sotsial’ni determinanty rozvytku suchasnoyi osvity*. *Visnyk Natsional’noho universytetu «Yurydychna akademiya Ukrayiny imeni Yaroslava Mudroho»*, № 3 (26).
- Barnett, R. (2000). *Thinking the University, Again*. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 32:3, pp. 319-326, DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2000.tb00457.x
- Caruana, V. (2010) *The relevance of the internationalised curriculum to graduate capability: the role of new lecturers’ attitudes in shaping the ‘student voice’*. In Jones, E. (ed.) (2010) *Internationalisation and the Student Voice: Higher Education Perspectives*. London: Routledge.

- Fenwick, T.J. (2002). Problem-based learning, group process and the mid-career professional: Implications for graduate education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 21(1), 5-21.
- Volet, S. & Ang, G. (1998). Culturally mixed groups on international campuses: An opportunity for intercultural learning. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 17(1), 5-23.;
- Wright, S., & Lander, D. (2003). Collaborative group interactions of students from two ethnic background. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 22(3), 237-252.
- Volet, S. (2004). Challenges of internationalisation: Enhancing intercultural competence and skills for critical reflection on the situated and non-neutral nature of knowledge. In P. Zeegers & K. Dellar-Evans (Eds): *Language & Academic Skills in Higher Education*, 1-10.
- Rhoads, R.A., and Szélenyi K. (2011). *Global citizenship and the university: Advancing social life and relations in an interdependent world*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. p. 42.
- Karlberg, M. (2010). Education for Interdependence: the university and the global citizen, *Global Studies Journal*, 3(1), 129-138.
- Garton-Ash, T. (2016). Populists are out to divide us. They must be stopped. *The Guardian*, Nov., 11. URL : <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/nov/11/populists-us>.
- Pashby, Karen & Andreotti, V. de O. (2016). Ethical internationalisation in higher education: interfaces with international development and sustainability, *Environmental Education Research*, 22:6, 771-787, DOI: 10.1080/13504622.2016.1201789
- Altbach, P., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 290-305.