INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

NUMBER 46 WINTER 2007

Four Models of Growth

Arthur M. Hauptman

Arthur M. Hauptman is a public policy consultant specializing in higher education finance issues. This article is from a paper on strategies to meet tertiary challenges prepared for the Higher Education Authority in Ireland. E-mail: hauptman_a@yahoo.com.

Over the past half century, more than a dozen countries around the world have employed varying strategies to move from elite systems of tertiary education to mass or universal ones, enrolling at least half of the traditional college-age population. Examining the strategies employed helps to assess how these and other countries in the future may keep up with a burgeoning demand derived from the increasing economic returns through additional postsecondary education and training. A review of the strategies employed suggests four models of growth.

Model One: Expansion of a public sector charging little or no tuition fees.

This is perhaps the most prevalent model of growth over the past half century. Countries make a financial commitment of public funds sufficient to expand their public sectors of tertiary education without requiring large or even significant cost sharing in the form of higher fees from students and families. In this approach, tuition fees represent 10 percent or less of the resources used to pay for instructional and operational expenses (excluding research and other activities).

In the 1950s and 1960s, the United States employed such a strategy to make a transition to a mass education system beyond the secondary level. This model included the development of a community college system as well as the creation and expansion of four-year public institutions. In the past quarter century, this strategy has been used by several Scandinavian countries including Norway, Sweden, and Finland.

The critical component for successful implementation of this strategy is a country's willingness and ability to devote substantial levels of public resources (probably in excess of 1.5 percent of GDP) to allow for expansion without significant cost sharing. In reality, most countries are not in a position to make such a commitment of public funding.

Model Two: Publicly financed fees repaid through the tax system once students graduate.

Australia established a new model for growth in the late 1980s when it introduced its Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS). This strategy recognized two realities. One was the financial reality that private resources were needed to supplement public resources to fuel the growth of higher education. The other was the political reality that many students and their families were unwilling to pay traditional fees. To deal with these realities, Australia developed an approach in which the government would initially finance fees, with most of these students repaying the fees once they graduated as a percentage of their income through the tax system. England and Thailand introduced a similar system of publicly financed fees beginning in the academic year 2006.

A key question with regard to publicly financed fees, like the model of public-sector expansion, is whether a country has enough resources to fund it. Under this approach, governments essentially are funding both sides of the tertiary financing equation—operational support of institutions and the payment of fees by students and families—until the stream of loan repayments is sufficient to provide significant private resources. Even a country as wealthy as Australia has found that it needed to reduce HECS subsidies by lowering the incomes that qualify for nonrepayment and raising the HECS fees to make the system sustainable. In addition, many Australian institutional officials would claim that public support of higher education has been reduced to make ends meet.

Model Three: Increased cost sharing combined with higher levels of student aid.

This model of growth is one in which more significant cost recovery through higher fees is introduced at a wide range of public institutions. This plan is usually combined with greater reliance on student aid to ensure that economically disadvantaged students are not discouraged from attending when higher fees are charged. Over the past quarter century, the United States, New Zealand, and Canada are examples of countries that successfully pursued this approach to expand resources to meet rapidly growing demand.

Raising fees for all public-sector students is typically thought of as the basic policy response for greater cost sharing. In reality, countries raise fees in a number of different ways to increase the degree of cost sharing. Many Eastern European countries established a system of parallel fees in which students who do not qualify for the "free seats" based on grades and merit can enroll in the same courses of study by paying tuition fees that are set at or near the full cost of education. This plan is not recommended as it introduces or reinforces system inequities.

However, other ways of raising fees selectively make a great deal of sense for spurring growth and introducing greater equity. These methods include dual fee systems in which students in state-funded fields pay low, subsidized fees, while students in high-demand fields such as business or law pay higher "market-based" fees equal or close to full costs. Australia is a prime example of a country that has moved to a dual fee structure in which HECS students pay (or repay) government-set fees, whereas all foreign students and a growing number of domestic students pay at much higher levels. Differential fees by level of study are another common strategy for increased cost sharing. Groups of students pay different levels of fees: lower fees for domestic undergraduates and higher fees for graduate students, international students, and in some instances adult learners.

Model Four: Expansion of a private sector of institutions.

This model of growth expands enrollments in private institutions to take up the slack created from restrictions in the size and growth of the public sector of tertiary education. This has occurred in a number of countries around the world either as a matter of deliberate government strategies or simply as an industry developing in response to unmet demand. In the Middle East and some countries in Asia, the number of private-sector institutions and students has grown particularly in vocational programs, although private universities have been the primary source of growth in some countries such as Japan and Korea. Poland is an example of an eastern European country that has become a mass higher education system largely through the growth of a private sector.

In some countries, the private institutions are for-profit while in others their organization is typically not-for-profit, with surpluses reinvested in the institution. What is common is that most enrollment growth occurs in the private sector while the number of students enrolling in public-sector institutions remains stable or grows very slowly as additional public funds are not made available. One way to encourage more enrollments in the private sector is to make students enrolling in these institutions eligible for the full range of student grants and loans. Another way to encourage private-sector growth is for governments to facilitate the approval of programs that meet minimal quality standards.

The four models of growth described above demonstrate that there are different routes for countries to achieve the goal of mass or universal tertiary education. ■

Universities and Development: Goals of Success

Mohamed H. A. Hassan

Mohamed H. A. Hassan is executive director of the Academy of Sciences for the Developing World (TWAS) in Trieste, Italy. E-mail: mhassan@twas.org. For additional information about TWAS, see www.twas.org.

In the 1970s, universities in many developing countries enjoyed strong support from their governments. Staffed by a youthful and well-trained faculty, equipped with adequate classrooms and laboratories, and spurred by the excitement and sense of purpose associated with new enterprises, institutions of higher education across the developing world seemed poised to gain additional strength in the future. For example, the University of Khartoum in Sudan, where I taught and served as dean of the school of mathematics for more than a decade, was one of the best universities not only in Africa but also throughout the developing world.

Throughout the late 1980s and into the early 1990s, governments in many developing countries substantially reduced their investment in higher education.

So what happened? How did such promising circumstances turn into such a dismal situation in the late 1980s and 1990s? How did universities, especially universities in the world's poorest countries, become hollow, largely destitute institutions where little learning and even less research took place?

Part of the answer lies in forces well beyond the influence of scientists and scientific communities in developing countries. Political instability often accompanied by deadly violence; declining investments in higher education by both governments and international lending agencies; the rise of HIV/AIDS and other public health issues; and many other critical concerns, which demanded immediate responses, distracted attention from higher education and, more specifically, adversely impacted investments in science and technology in the developing world.

At the same time, aid agencies increasingly concluded that developing nations should focus on getting their economic house in order, usually by reducing governmental expenditures to curb public debt. They also came to believe that scientific research was a luxury that developing nations could not afford in light of the critical social and economic issues that they faced. The science and technology that developing countries needed, aid agencies reasoned, could be acquired from others.

As a result, throughout the late 1980s and into the early 1990s, governments in many developing countries substantially reduced their investment in higher education. Aid agencies, meanwhile, devalued the importance of building indigenous capacity in science and technology in the developing world.

The irony of this strategy was this: The critical issues that developing countries faced—whether a desire to reduce hunger and malnutrition, provide greater access to safe drinking water, curb disease and improve public health, or construct reliable energy systems—all necessitated the widespread applications of science and technology. Indeed, such efforts required not just any science and technology but appropriate homegrown science and technology that could effectively address critical indigenous problems.

Why, then, were universities not turned to as ideal places to study, research, and demonstrate science-based solutions to critical problems? Universities and professors in developing countries bear part of the responsibility for their marginalization. Having trained in universities in the developed world; having pursued dissertation topics of interest to the developed world; having forged joint research projects with colleagues in the developed world; and having defined a successful career by standards set by their counterparts in the developed world, scientists in the developing world—more often than not—found themselves disengaged from their societies.

After more than two decades spent largely exiled in developed countries or as castaways in their own nations, scientists in the developing world are now being welcomed back into their societies. This time, however, governments are insisting that investments in science and technology provide a payoff in terms of improvements in economic and social well-being. And this time, scientists are increasingly recognizing that they need to be responsive to their societies' concerns if the funding is to continue.

This rapprochement between science and society in the developing world has not been easy. Yet many signposts along the way have signaled the advances. These signposts include, for example, Brazil, China, and India's success in promoting science-based development; the growing maturity of university systems in these and other countries that has led institutions of higher education to embrace long-term responsibilities for education, research, and community service; and expanding efforts at South-South cooperation marked not only by exchange programs such as the South-South fellowship program of the Academy of Sciences for the Developing World for postgraduate and postdoctoral research, which provides some 250 fellowships a year, but the China-Brazil Earth Resources Satellite program, begun in 1998, which has led to the launch of two Earth-imaging satellites, with two more launches planned by 2008. Indeed signposts, both large and small, abound, creating a sense of positive direction and optimism for the future of higher education in the developing world that is unprecedented.

Despite the recent progress, we must examine and evaluate on an ongoing basis what individual scientists and scientific institutions are contributing to society—in terms of improved nutrition, better health, more reliable energy supplies, enhanced communications, a cleaner environment and, perhaps most importantly, overall efforts to break the cycle of extreme poverty that has afflicted too many places in the developing world for decades.

Nevertheless, the key to success, especially for university departments and faculties of science lies in excellence. That's because science without excellence is not science. But success, as I have argued here, also lies in relevance. That's because without responding to the needs of society, university science departments will find it difficult to sustain society's support. Moreover, without educating and training students in ways that make them employable within their own countries, young scientists and technologists will not stay home once they graduate.

As recent history in the developing world shows, successful institutions of higher education without societal purpose will not be successful for long.

Exam Trends and Global Talent Flows

Johnette Peyton and Veronica A. Garcia

Johnette Peyton is a manager of applied research at the Graduate Management Admission Council®. Address: 1600 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 1400, McLean, VA 22102, USA. E-mail: jpeyton@gmac.com. Veronica A. Garcia is research writer/editor at the Graduate Management Admission Council®. E-mail: vgarcia@gmac.com.

In a recent issue of the *Harvard Business Review*, Richard Florida identified students as the leading indicator of global talent flow, stating that countries and regions that attract students have an advantage on retaining them and attracting additional pools of talent. If Florida's statement holds true, then new data from the Graduate Management Admission Council (GMAC) appear to demonstrate evidence of this new competitive landscape.

GMAC, a global not-for-profit education organization of leading graduate business schools and owner of the Graduate Management Admission Test (GMAT), publishes Geographic Trend Reports identifying migratory trends among GMAT examinees. Findings are based on voluntary responses to the GMAT background information questionnaire along with score report and registration information in a given testing year. The most recent report data include 212,532 examinee records in 2001 and 200,503 in 2005. Approximately two-thirds had US addresses at the time of registration in both years.

Test report submissions are used to gauge interest in studying in a particular region, as GMAT scores often accompany applications to graduate business programs. GMAC findings suggest geographic trends for examinees shifted drastically in some regions from 2001 to 2005. Data from both years identify a strong preference for US programs overall with a slight decline from 2001 to 2005, as well as increasing interest in programs located in England, France, India, and Greece.

However, changes in Greece are primarily linked to increased examinees from Greece.

North Americans Stick Close to Home

US citizens sent nearly 99 percent of their score reports to programs in the United States both years. Canadians, though slightly more diverse, sent 95 percent of their score reports to programs in North America (about 62 percent to Canadian programs and 32 percent to US programs).

Among US citizens, schools located in England made the greatest gains, and Spain doubled their percentage. Canadians, though consistent in their preference for North America, did show slightly increased interest in England, France, and Hong Kong from one year to the next.

Major Shifts in Western Europe, Central Asia, and the Middle East

Citizens of Western Europe, Central Asia, and the Middle East displayed dramatically reduced interest in US programs between 2001 and 2005. (Regional categories by country divide the continent of Asia into two categories: Asia and Central Asia.) Among all citizens of Western Europe, the data show an increasing desire to remain close to home. Programs in Greece experienced the greatest percentage gain among all examinees from Western Europe, moving from sixth to fourth overall.

From citizens of Central Asia, which includes India according to the GMAC regional breakdown of the report, India gained the most market share from the decreased interest in US programs. In addition, citizens of Central Asia displayed increased interest in studying in England, Singapore, and Canada from 2001 to 2005.

The majority of GMAT examinees from the Middle East region, as defined in the report, are from Israel. Perhaps that explains why examinees from the region place programs located in Israel at the top of their list. Citizens of the Middle East region additionally displayed increased interest in programs located in Canada, Lebanon, and England. Also, the United Arab Emirates, which was not ranked in 2001, ranked seventh in 2005 for Middle Eastern examinees.

Minor Shifts in Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America

Test takers from eastern Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America consistently prefer US programs, but slight declines were noted from 2001 to 2005. In eastern Europe, this decline in US programs was countered by increased interest in programs located in England and France.

Asians, who include Chinese, continue to place Canadian programs as a distant second to programs in the United States. In third place, however, England replaced Hong Kong among Asian citizens between the two years, and Thailand, which was not in the top 10 in 2001, ranked 10th among Asian citizens in 2005. Asian citizens also displayed increasing interest in England, China, France, the Netherlands, and Singapore.

For Africans, England replaced Canada as second behind the United States, and South Africa, Kenya, and Egypt continue to be popular. Declining interest in US programs from citizens of the Mexico/Caribbean/Latin America region was primarily replaced by increasing interest in Canada, England, France, Spain, and the Netherlands. Germany also debuted for the first time among citizens of Mexico/Caribbean/Latin America in 2005.

Oceania Bucks the Trend

Contrary to trends noted for all other world regions, citizens of Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific Islands (Oceania, collectively), displayed increased interest in US programs over the years reported, but other countries also witnessed increased interest from this region. The percentages of examinees sending scores to England, France, and Ireland all increased while the percentage of score reports sent to schools in Australia, Hong Kong, and Canada decreased. Interest in New Zealand programs also rose for the Oceania group overall.

US business programs, which have long been the primary destination of GMAT examinees, are facing increasing competition from England, France, and India.

Discussion

US business programs, which have long been the primary destination of GMAT examinees, are facing increasing competition from England, France, and India. Interest in Canadian programs, though consistently second on the list overall, is fluctuating by region, and programs in the Middle East and western Europe are experiencing the greatest increases from their own citizens in recent years.

If these trends are indicative of long-term talent flows, as predicted by Florida, then we may in fact be witnessing subtle shifts in market advantage around the world. A comparison of companies listed in the top 100 of the Fortune Global 500 list for 2005 shows US companies generated nearly three times the revenue of their nearest competitors combined—in Germany, followed next by those in France, the United Kingdom (particularly England), and Japan. Given the current separation between revenues, it may be difficult for any one area to overtake the lead position in the near term, but there is certainly evidence of opportunity if talent continues to favor a more diverse distribution. And this opportunity will be particularly evident if the population of students educated abroad grows from 1.7 million in 2001 to more than 8 million by 2025, as estimated by UNESCO.

The full report, including regional category descriptions and further information on trends in specific European and Asian countries, is available at www.gmac.com/researchreports. ■

The Dominance of English in Global Scholarly Publishing

Mary Jane Curry and Theresa Lillis

Mary Jane Curry is assistant professor of education at the Warner Graduate School of Education, University of Rochester. Address: PO Box 270425, Dewey Hall, Rochester, NY 14627, USA. E-mail: mjcurry@warner.rochester.edu. Theresa Lillis is senior lecturer in language and communication in the Centre for Language and Communications at the Open University, UK. For more information on their project see www.paw.open.ac.uk.

In an era characterized by globalization, the enterprise of academic research would ideally capitalize on contributions from scholars all over the world. Yet language barriers can present a considerable obstacle to the global circulation of research findings. The dominance of English as the language of scholarly publishing means that scholars around the world are under increasing pressure to publish their research in English. This situation is problematic in two important ways. First, scholars outside of English-dominant contexts face issues of equity in their access to publishing venues, particularly high-status English-medium research journals. While such scholars experience increasing pressure to publish in English (as a major criterion for promotion and research grants), they often have uneven access to the means to do so, including monies for conference travel and research collaboration, library and other resources, and time to write in English. Second, even as multilingual scholars' material conditions may hinder their English publishing, the global research community suffers from not receiving their research findings, insights, and methodologies. The result may be the emergence of what Polish scholar Anna Duszak calls an "academic monoculture."

The Challenges of Publishing in English

Since 2001 we have been conducting a study of some 50 scholars in southern and eastern Europe to understand the effects of the dominance of English on global academic knowledge production. Multilingual scholars attempting to publish in English face a number of challenges, the least of which may be their technical competence in English. Typically, publishing in English entails more than direct translation of academic writing. Rather, a key to scholars' success in publishing is their interactions with "literacy brokers"—gatekeepers such as journal editors and peer reviewers as well as disciplinary and language specialists who may help at various points in the trajectory of writing and publishing research articles.

Gaining access to literacy brokers can be difficult but may happen through participation in local, regional, and international scholarly research networks, whether formal or informal. The most useful types of "brokers" appear to be disciplinary specialists who are attuned to the key research questions, current discussions, and debates of the field and methodologies preferred by linguistic "center"-based journals. However, the interventions of some brokers may result in pressure on multilingual academics to skew their writing to achieve publication by matching the preferences of center-based journals. Our research provides evidence of the relegation of periphery scholars to roles in which they consume and confirm center-based research but are not allowed access to platforms from which to contribute different perspectives and findings.

The Global Politics of Language

The global dominance of English in scholarly publishing has implications for international higher education along two main lines: (1) for gatekeepers of scholarly publication and participation in international academic conferences to understand the challenges that multilingual scholars confront; and (2) for national governmental and institutional policymaking bodies to consider the effects of the premium placed on English-medium journal publishing.

First, in terms of the gatekeeping activities of journals and conferences, it is important for journal reviewers and editors, conference organizers, and proposal reviewers from the English-dominant center to understand the burdens of time, money, and access to research that may hinder multilingual scholars from disseminating their work in English. These constraints may be reflected in submissions that do not reference the most up-to-date literature from English-medium journals, or use nonstandard features of English. The topics and questions that periphery scholars engage with may also not be perceived as "relevant" to current center academic debates because what counts as relevant is often determined by Anglophone center scholars and institutions. Anglophone con-

The dominance of English as the language of scholarly publishing means that scholars around the world are under increasing pressure to publish their research in English.

texts are often more valued as objects and sites of research than research coming from periphery areas. To respond to the growing institutional and governmental pressures to publish in English-medium outlets, multilingual scholars writing from the periphery may need support in the form of bibliographic resources and guidance on shaping manuscripts to meet the conventions of particular journals. Scholars from the periphery may also need support in finding ways to collaborate with scholars in center contexts. At the same time, center gatekeepers should examine the preferences given to particular research contexts, topics, and questions.

Second, English-medium publications increasingly function as criteria for a range of institutional evaluations of individual scholars, their departments, their institutions, and research grant awards. While using English-medium publications as a marker of quality may offer policymakers the sense of creating uniform standards, such policies may not take into account the challenges facing scholars. Such policy innovations are not always accompanied by the resources needed to support scholars in attaining these goals. Discussions of English-language dominance therefore need to be placed on policy agendas for international higher education.

As the academic sphere becomes increasingly globalized, the question of linguistic imperialism and the premium of English in scholarly publishing needs to become a topic of discussion at international and national governmental and institutional levels. These discussions should include raising awareness of how native English speakers or those working in Anglophone contexts are highly advantaged in the global academic marketplace compared with multilingual scholars writing from the periphery. Questions about the effects that privileging English may have on the evolution of local languages, particularly the development of academic registers, and on local research cultures should also be explored further. While the dominance of English as an academic lingua franca is unlikely to shift in the near future, consideration can be given to ways to renegotiate the conditions under which global knowledge is produced and disseminated. Under globalization, the multidirectional circulation of knowledge from academic research has greater potential for benefit than does a unidirectional flow outward from Anglophone countries. ■

> *Anglophone contexts are often more valued as objects and sites of research than research coming from periphery areas.*

Mobilizing Marginalized Talent: The International Fellowships Program

Jürgen Enders

Jürgen Enders is professor at and director of the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS), University of Twente, Enschede, the Netherlands. Address: CHEPS, University of Twente, POB 217, 7500 AE Enschede, Netherlands. E-mail: j.enders.utwente.nl.

In November 2000, the Ford Foundation and the International Institute of Education created the International Fellowships Program (IFP) to provide graduate fellowships for individuals from 22 countries in the "Global South." This 12-year, $280 million program is the largest initiative in the foundation's history and has recently been extended by another 2 years and $75 million in supplementary funds. IFP gives talented students from excluded or marginalized backgrounds the opportunity for advanced study in universities at home and abroad. In 2002, CHEPS was asked to implement an evaluation of the program regarding its implementation and development.

A Different Approach

IFP supports mobile scholarships of up to three years of postgraduate study at accredited universities anywhere in the world in a variety of academic fields so that students may choose where and what to study. Fellowships are reserved for talented individuals from the South lacking systematic access to higher education for reasons such as poverty, geographical isolation, ethnicity, race, or gender. The program defines its target group of undergraduates based on their leadership potential, commitment to the development of their countries or communities, as well as academic performance and potential. The fellows, through their further training and scholarly work, are expected to contribute to academic fields relevant to the economy and social justice and to take a leadership role in these areas in their own countries and worldwide.

An innovative and challenging approach has been chosen for IPF: finding and attracting bright students from marginalized backgrounds in the South for international graduate work who want to make a difference in their societies.

CHEPS Findings

Surveys and interviews by CHEPS show that the IFP has so far been successful in the implementation and development of the program. IFP has received nearly 100,000 applications in the competitions of 2001–2005. In addition to fulfilling unmet demand and potential among excluded communities and groups, IFP attracts and mobilizes interest in regions ranging from the Anambra State in Southeastern Nigeria, to the Mixtec

Indian community in Mexico, and to China's Guizhou Province.

The program mainly recruits fellows from among people with a sociodemographic and sociobiographic profile that fits the program's goals. The target group criteria of "exclusion" and certain regional and local contexts are well reflected in the profile of the fellows. About 90 percent of them are first-generation students with a poor socioeconomic background who had to overcome experience of social injustice to achieve their undergraduate studies. IFP supports the fellows through various voluntary and paid community services as well as related leadership activities in a broad range of areas including community-based organizations, social movements, and nongovernmental organizations.

The program offers pre-placement training and support to study at more than 400 universities in some 40 countries. Surveys among fellows—most of them outside their countries for the first time—show that they highly value their postgraduate study experience and maintain contact with their home communities while building up a network that includes other IFP fellows. The graduation rate of IFP alumni is 85 percent, and so far 75 percent of them have returned to their home countries while most of the others continue their studies or go for further studies/training abroad.

Factors of Success

The IFP can rely on a financial commitment made via the establishment of the International Fellowship Fund. The biggest postgraduate fellowship program ever, the program needed to establish structures and processes on a global scale that focus at the same time on local context. This achievement would probably have been impossible without a substantial and long-term financial commitment.

IFP has created a worldwide partnership of organizations around its central unit in New York. This partnership involves 20 organizations in the IFP countries or regions (e.g., the Association of African Universities, the Indonesian International Education Foundation, and the Economic and Social Research Foundation in Tanzania), international placement partners (e.g., the Institute of International Education, NUFFIC in the Netherlands, and the British Council) as well as strategic partnerships with certain universities. Global outreach and local presence are thus based on a network of organizations, building upon their expertise and contacts.

The IFP has not developed a detailed standard framework to carry out its target group criteria on a global scale. Instead, it has set up an intense and ongoing process of consultation in each country and region to discuss the nature of access to higher education and to identify target groups and communities that lack access. In this process certain cultural, social, and economic indicators of exclusion have been identified as priorities for country or subregion. Techniques were discussed and implemented for the outreach of the IFP to the respective target groups. Ongoing exchange on "lessons learned" and "good practice" forms part and parcel of the challenging further development of this global/local program.

What IFP will achieve in the long run needs to be examined—for example, by studying the progress of the alumni and growing networks. The IFP's experiences and established practices will represent information of great interest concerning international student exchange and sustainable development on a global scale. ■

Internationalization Brings Important Benefits as Well as Risks

Jane Knight

Jane Knight is adjunct professor at the Comparative, International and Development Education Centre, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. E-mail: janeknight@sympatico.ca.

While the process of internationalization affords many benefits to higher education, it is clear that there are serious risks associated with this complex and growing phenomenon. According to the results of the 2005 International Association of Universities (IAU) Survey there is overwhelming agreement (96 percent of responding institutions from 95 countries) that internationalization brings benefits to higher education. Yet, this consensus is qualified by the fact that 70 percent also believe there are substantial risks associated with the international dimension of higher education. (Information on the 2005 IAU Global Survey Report on the Internationalization of Higher Education: New Directions, New Challenges is available at iau@unesco.org.)

The top three risks associated with internationalization are commercialization and commodification of education programs, the increase in the number of foreign "degree mills" and low-quality providers, and brain drain. It is a sign of the times that each of these risks relates more to the cross-border aspects of internationalization than the campus-based activities. It is somewhat surprising that both developing and developed countries identified commercialization as the number-one risk over brain drain—a clear testimony to its importance.

It is also revealing that the loss of cultural or national identity, jeopardy of the quality of higher education, and the homogenization of curriculum were identified as the least important risks. When these results are compared to a similar 2003 IAU Internationalization Survey, brain drain was considered as the greatest risk. Thus, we are seeing a definite shift over the last three years toward mounting concern about commercialization, commodification, and marketization trends. It is fascinating, but also of some concern, that about 60 percent of the institutions were not aware of the General Agreement on Trade in Services, which proves that GATS is not the primary catalyst for the distress about the commercialization of internationalization.

Regional Views of Risks

Eighty-one percent of the universities in Africa, versus only 58 percent of those in North America, indicated the importance and existence of risks related to internationalization. This is probably a sign that more African institutions are vulnerable to the threats of commercialization and low-quality cross-border providers than their counterparts in North America.

Latin America stands out from the rest of the regions as it ranks commodification and commercialization lower in importance than brain drain, elitism, and loss of cultural identity. This perception may be related to the fact that private education at the domestic level is a fundamental and long-term part of higher education provision, and to date for-profit cross-border education is not as prevalent in Latin American countries as in other regions of the world. In the Middle East, the loss of cultural identity is definitely the number-one risk attached to the process of internationalization. Increasing attention is being given to the importance of the international dimension of higher education in the Middle East. It will be revealing to see whether increased involvement in internationalization brings new and different threats to higher education in this region over the next three years when the IAU Internationalization Survey will again be distributed. This triannual survey meets the imperative need that we have a long-term perspective and regular monitoring of changes and challenges facing the international dimension of higher education institutions around the world.

Benefits on Student and Faculty Development

The two most important benefits identified by higher education institutions are more internationally oriented staff/students and improved academic quality. The three least-important benefits according to these same institutions are national and international citizenship, revenue generation, and brain gain. To some, it may seem hard to believe that revenue generation is seen as such a low-priority benefit (and rationale). One might ask whether this was a "socially desirable response" on the part of the responding universities. While this is a fair question, a more accurate explanation may rest on the fact that institutions from 95 countries responded to this survey—58 were from developing and 37 from developed countries. When all responses are tallied, they show that income generation is still not a primary reason or a benefit associated with internationalization. Little evidence exists at this time that internationalization is seen primarily as a profit-making enterprise for the majority of universities around the world. While internationalization is a top priority for some institutions, this policy perspective is limited to probably 8 or 10 out of the 95 countries.

Again, there are noteworthy differences among regions in terms of perceived benefits. Of interest is the high priority given to academic quality in both Africa and Latin America. The benefit to foster national and international citizenship is generally seen to be of low importance, but more institutions in North America see it as an important benefit than in any other region of the world. Revenue generation also has an overall low ranking, but more universities in Asia Pacific see it as both an important rationale and benefit. Brain gain ranks lowest for the majority of the regions, except the Middle East.

Perspectives on Benefits in Developing and Developed Countries

A gap between developing and developed countries exists in terms of the importance attributed to the benefit of more internationally oriented students and staff. Developed countries see it as the number one benefit but developing countries rank it in fourth place. The developing countries put more emphasis on the benefits of academic quality, research, and curriculum, which are fundamental elements of any higher education institution. Developing countries may assume that these elements need to be firmly in place before it is possible to reap the benefits of more internationally oriented students and staff.

Interestingly enough, there is no difference in the low importance given to brain gain between developed and developing countries. One might have expected developed countries to see internationalization bringing more benefits in terms of bright foreign students and promising faculty members or researchers. There are active campaigns in developed countries to attract the best and brightest to augment national human resource capacity and to replace retiring and mobile faculty. Many experts believe that international brain drain/gain, a term that most educators are uncomfortable with, is one of the most critical issues for the next five years as the higher education sector faces demographic changes, increased labor mobility, and growing national competitiveness for knowledge production and distribution.

Little evidence exists at this time that internationalization is seen primarily as a profit-making enterprise for the majority of universities around the world.

The findings from the IAU survey paint a relatively positive picture of the sustained importance attributed to internationalization and the increase in the number of institutions that have moved to a planned approach to internationalization. The picture is less encouraging at the national level as institutions believe that national governments are giving inadequate attention to international education and do not play the role that they should in terms of national policy and funding to facilitate international research, mobility, and development projects. The benefits are clearly articulated but so are the risks. The future of internationalization faces many challenges as the trends of commercialization and commodification are seen to threaten the human development, research, and national capacity benefits of internationalization. ■

Entering International Markets: New Zealand's Problems

Ma Xiaoying and Malcolm Abbott

Ma Xiaoying is lecturer in the English Department at the North China Electric Power University, in Beijing, China. E-mail: amxiaoying@126.com. Malcolm Abbott is a research associate at the Center for Research in International Education, 28A Linwood Avenue, Western Springs, Auckland, New Zealand. E-mail: mabbottnz@hotmail.com.

In recent years a number of universities have sought to take advantage of the increased willingness of students to study abroad. In the New Zealand case, the number of international students at the universities rose from 3,402 in 1998 to 28,195 in 2004. The total number of international students in New Zealand at all educational institutions rose from 26,021 in 1998 to peak at 115,197 in 2003. Since 2004, international student numbers have declined sharply in New Zealand, reducing an important export income for the country and forcing a number of universities to retrench staff.

The international student market is a potentially lucrative one but one that is also more unstable than that of most domestic markets. For the universities of New Zealand, the income from international students has proved to be rather unstable. Not only do universities face stiff competition in international markets, but they also face exchange rate risks that can affect their potential income.

International Students in New Zealand

The presence of international students at New Zealand's educational institutions is not a recent phenomenon. From the 1950s until the late 1980s the country hosted a number of international students. Some of these students came to New Zealand under formal assistance schemes such as the Colombo Plan, while others came privately, mainly from Malaysia and Singapore. These students did not, however, pay full fees for their tuition, and it was only after changes in 1989 that educational institutions were able to recover costs fully.

Through the 1990s the eight universities in New Zealand (all publicly owned) attempted to recruit full-fee-paying international students. At the same time vocational education, foundation studies, secondary schools, and English schools (both public and private) also began to attract international students. With slow growth in domestic student numbers and the New Zealand government keeping a fairly tight reign on grants to educational institutions, many of them sought to supplement their revenues by actively attracting international students.

International students are attracted to New Zealand because of the lower cost of living in that country compared to Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom. As well, a number are attracted through the possibility of immigrating and because of the ease of entry to students with low standards of English. In the New Zealand case there is no English standard for entry whereas in countries such as Australia students must have an IELTS (International English Language Training System) score of 5.0 to enter an English school.

Growth in international student numbers in New Zealand was promoted by the government to create additional export income. In 2003 and 2004 export education generated over $NZ 2 billion per annum in foreign exchange, making it the country's fifth-largest export earner after dairy, tourism, meat, and timber products.

Relying on China

Despite its strong growth, New Zealand's education export industry was very narrowly based. In the late 1990s nearly all of the growth in international student numbers in New Zealand came from China. Rapid growth in incomes in China over the past 20 years, coupled with a sharply rising level of high school participation and a lagging supply of places in state universities and colleges in China led to a surge in the numbers of Chinese students seeking an education abroad. In New Zealand, Chinese student numbers in the universities rose from only 93 in 1998 to peak at 16,523 in 2004. From virtually zero, Chinese student numbers rose to 58 percent of all international students at universities in New Zealand and 10 percent of overall university enrollments.

> *The year 2006 has been a traumatic one for the export education industry in New Zealand as the impact of the retrenchment and closure of English schools has gradually begun to flow up to the universities*

The universities in New Zealand became overly dependent upon this single market. The universities were dependent upon a supply chain that reached down through the secondary, vocational, English, and foundation schools of New Zealand. (A foundation school prepares students for university-level study.) The majority of international students in New Zealand attend these preuniversity schools. In particular, English schools, vocational diploma schools, and foundation schools enroll a very large part of international students in New Zealand. A number of the secondary schools have also been very active in recruiting international students. The universities recruit mainly from the English, foundation, secondary, and diploma schools. In recent years the numbers in these schools (of all types) have dropped sharply, especially the number of Chinese students, which peaked in 65,999 in 2003 and fell to 49,569 in 2005. Indications are that in 2006 the figure had fallen further.

A combination of factors has led to this downturn. In the last few years there has been substantial investment in higher education by both state authorities and private entrepreneurs in China, leading to the creation of many more higher education places in that country. Competition for Chinese students in international markets has also intensified, and a rising exchange rate in New Zealand has choked off the country's reputation as a low-cost country.

Downturn

The year 2006 has been a traumatic one for the export education industry in New Zealand as the impact of the retrenchment and closure of English schools has gradually begun to flow up to the universities, which for perhaps the first time in their histories have seen their student numbers and income decline. Retrenchment of staff in a number of the universities has taken place, and this process could quite easily continue into 2007 as the number of students studying in the various schools in New Zealand are far smaller than they were a few years ago.

Given that New Zealand's universities have relied upon recruiting international students from educational institutions within New Zealand, growth in numbers at universities could take a few years before it picks up again. Even when it does the universities are going to have to broaden their attraction away from China if they are going to be able to regain the position they held just a few years ago. ■

US Accreditors Should Not Evaluate Foreign Colleges

Alan L. Contreras

Alan Contreras has been administrator of the Office of Degree Authorization of the Oregon Student Assistance Commission since 1999. His views do not necessarily represent those of the commission. Address: ODA/OSAC, 1500 Valley River Dr. No. 100, Eugene OR 97401, USA. E-mail: Alan.L.Contreras@state.or.us. Web site: http://www.osac.state.or.us/oda/.

The recent dispute between Hawaii's Office of Consumer Protection and the American Academy for Liberal Education, as well as the supporters of each side, raises questions worthy of attention. As the *Chronicle of Higher Education* reported ("Accreditation of College in Former Soviet Republic Raises Questions of Oversight," September 8, 2006), the academy accredited the American University for Humanities, Tbilisi Campus College, in the Republic of Georgia. That entity is linked to a Hawaiian degree mill, the American University of Hawaii.

> *Accreditation is a minimalist exercise, conducted for the purpose of limited quality control.*

The American Academy for Liberal Education did what several US accreditors do: it accredited a school in a foreign country. That is not illegal. However, there is no federal oversight of American accreditors' work with any foreign college. Although they must operate within certain parameters when they accredit an American college or university, they are not obligated to do so when they evaluate a foreign institution, and the US Department of Education has no jurisdiction over their activities outside the United States. Most people, even education officials in other countries, do not know this.

US accreditors that operate in foreign countries are doing so *only* as private organizations with *no* US government connection. That is not widely known in other countries. In fact, there is no such thing as a federally recognized accreditor once the accreditor steps outside the United States, and any accreditor that refers to itself that way in a foreign country is coming close to deception. Non-US governments should not allow US accreditors to call themselves "federally recognized" when recruiting members outside the United States.

Should Foreign Evaluators Accredit US Colleges?

If American accreditors continue to operate outside their country, foreign accreditors may want to do the same. If an American accreditor offers its good name to Monash University in Australia, should the Australian Qualifications Framework operate in the United States so that it can make sure that degrees from Oregon State University meet Australian standards? That kind of entanglement poses problems because degrees and institutions vary so much from country to country.

Even inside the United States, accreditorial oversight can be nominal, and many other countries have very limited capacity for meaningful oversight. It is impossible to do more than scratch the surface of a large institution. We cannot expect American accreditors to do more than a basic walk-through of foreign institutions, and our accreditors have no way to use the mechanisms of foreign governments to check on key points as time passes. The recent uproar over operations of Indianapolis

University in Greece provides a fine example of why oversight at a distance does not work.

Accreditation is a minimalist exercise, conducted for the purpose of limited quality control—although it is better suited for financial oversight than for academic quality assurance. Even on the financial side, I am aware of a case in another state in which an accredited institution moved millions of dollars into its accounts before a reapproval and afterward moved the money right back out again. That review was one of the regular evaluations conducted by a state government; states, not accreditors, have the power to decide whether institutions can operate within their borders and what degrees they can offer.

Meaningful Evaluation Is Neither Easy Nor Cheap

Genuine, meaningful oversight is expensive. The natural inclination of governments and organizations is to want to do it quickly, cheaply, and infrequently. This is a recipe for poor enforcement, lack of awareness, and substandard educational outcomes. Within the United States, accreditors have only limited knowledge of changes in faculty composition, financial policies, and the award of credits during the typical 10 years between accreditations. That is one reason why states generally use a much shorter review cycle: Oregon, for instance, reviews every program under our jurisdiction every three years and after two years for a new program.

All an American accreditor can really do for foreign colleges and universities is to rent them its reputation. The institutions get to mention the accreditor's name, though the standards that the accreditor chooses to apply overseas may be extremely low. Who will know?

Genuine, meaningful oversight is expensive.

The Tbilisi case shows how complex international evaluation can be. The government agency that screens foreign degrees in the Netherlands and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, which does the same for many American universities, consider degrees from the American University for Humanities to be invalid or substandard. The American Academy for Liberal Education considers the program to be acceptable. National education officials in Sweden treat the degrees as legally issued but are not yet convinced they are equivalent to Swedish degrees.

The bottom line is that American accreditors should not evaluate foreign colleges and universities. Other nations have the right to set their own standards, whether high or low. American colleges should be free to use customary academic norms and their own standards to decide whether a foreign degree is suitable for purposes of admission or employment. Do not rely on unsupervised accreditors that freelance in foreign lands.

This essay is revised from a version that first appeared in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, December 1, 2006, and is printed here with permission from the *Chronicle*. ■

Internationalizing Canada's Universities

Roopa Desai Trilokekar and Glen A. Jones

Roopa Desai Trilokekar is a doctoral student and Glen A. Jones is a professor in the Higher Education Group at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5S1V6. E-mail: gjones@oise.utorontol.ca. This article reflects some of the discussions at a recent conference on Internationalizing Canada's Universities: Practices, Challenges and Opportunities, held at York University (Toronto) in March 2006.

In Canada education is the responsibility of the provinces, and unlike many other federal systems, no national ministry or legislation exists that establishes a national framework for higher education. Several federal departments invest in specific international education program initiatives within their overall policy framework. For example, the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, as part of its public diplomacy portfolio, supports bilateral educational exchange agreements, international scholarship programs, the Canadian studies initiatives abroad, international youth programs, and international marketing initiatives. The Department of Human Resources and Social Development Canada invests in international academic mobility programs within North America and Europe. The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) contributes to university international initiatives by funding development projects—for example, through the University Partnerships in Cooperation and Development program. More recently, through its new Canada Corps initiative, CIDA supports international internships for students and joint projects delivering governance programming in developing countries engaging both faculty and students in Canada and partner countries. Several other federal departments such as Industry Canada and Citizenship and Immigration Canada also contribute to the overall international education and research portfolio.

While a range of federal departments support initiatives in this area, the overall level of federal government support is extremely modest. In a 1994 report the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade estimated that Canada's per capita investment in international cultural relations and education was CDN$3.08, while France spent CDN$26.58, Germany CDN$18.49, United Kingdom CDN$13.37, and Japan CDN$12.60. International student recruitment receives almost no support and the budgets for international scholarship programs are frequently threatened.

The Canadian system needs to provide policy coordination and communication across federal departments and agencies. The absence of a federal ministry with responsibility for higher education means that leadership in this policy area becomes an enormous challenge.

Federal-Provincial Relations and Responsibilities

While education is the responsibility of the provinces under the Canadian Constitution, the federal government plays a major role in a variety of policy areas that intersect with the internationalization agenda—including research and development—and has explicit responsibility for Canada's international relations. Federal and provincial governments find themselves, almost constantly, in conflict over issues of territory and responsibility for international education.

While most provinces have developed some form of international education policy or invested in specific initiatives, these initiatives have emerged independently of one another without an overall national framework or policy context or a "Canadian" brand. The initiatives are regional in their objectives and approaches. A classic example is the provincial government of Quebec, which is one of the larger investors given its unique rationale and approach to international education and cultural programs. Without a formal "Canadian" policy approach to internationalization, what is defined as a Canadian approach is in fact a piecemeal combination of various federal and provincial departmental initiatives. Further, given the Canadian federal context, governments are cautious in considering any national policy that would facilitate pan-Canada funding and program initiatives.

> *While education is the responsibility of the provinces under the Canadian Constitution, the federal government plays a major role in a variety of policy areas that intersect with the internationalization agenda*

Canadian University Approaches

Since Canadian universities operate within a highly decentralized policy environment, each institution constructs its own institutional policy framework. Institutions vary in terms of the role of internationalization in strategic plans and priorities, the level of institutional investment, and the overall approach. At some institutions internationalization approaches are being critically examined within the context of broader pedagogical principles, in particular their relation to aboriginal, diasporic, and postcolonial education. Both curriculum and teaching practices are challenged, and strengthened, to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse domestic student body, while also attempting to internationalize higher education. The ethics of "internationalization" is a core debate at several Canadian campuses as the agenda for internationalization expands to include newer stakeholder groups from government and the public sector with a more neoliberal agenda.

Contested in part by the task of defining and articulating this complex phenomenon, internationalization also relates to the Canadian challenge of addressing the needs of an increasingly diverse, multicultural, and multiracial domestic student population. The boundaries between international/global and local objectives begin to blur.

> *Canada needs to engage higher educational policymakers and researchers in the debate and discussion on internationalization and to integrate internationalization into higher education policy.*

Lack of a National Policy Framework

Most universities would concur that the absence of national funding and policy initiatives weakens their ability to accomplish objectives. For example, with international marketing efforts, universities operate with little if any organizational and structural support at the provincial or national level. The Canadian Educational Centers established by the Canadian federal government, based on Australia's educational centers model, have now become private nonprofit enterprises. Unlike most developed countries, Canada lacks official educational and cultural centers, other than the ad hoc activities sponsored by individual Canadian missions abroad. Canadian universities depend on their own resources to establish credibility and market educational resources, even though the Canadian government at both the federal and provincial levels has determined international educational marketing as a key strategic priority. Canadian institutions receive limited national funding to promote international scholarship and research, international study programs, or international student mobility.

A diverse range of institutional practices and initiatives have emerged in a way that a focused, directive national policy framework might have prevented from occurring. In some respects Canada's federal structure may act as a buffer and essentially prevent governments from directly steering international educational policy objectives and outcomes.

Internationalization as a Policy Agenda

Internationalization seldom represents an issue of higher education policy. In fact, the international education and higher education policy communities in Canada remain relatively dis-