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Four Models of Growth
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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
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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.

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.

This article is reprinted, with permission, from IAU Horizons 12 (44), 2006. © International Association of Universities.
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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.

**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 fur-
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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-
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.

Mobilizing Marginalized Talent: The International Fellowships Program
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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 IFP: 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

...
Internationalization Brings Important Benefits as Well as Risks

JANE KNIGHT

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

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: jane@sympatico.ca.
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.

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
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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
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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
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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.

**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.

**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-
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The number of international branch campuses has increased significantly over the past decade. Since undertaking its first study of offshore campuses in 2002, the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education has followed developments in this area and recently published a major report, identifying over 80 offshore campuses. The definition of a branch campus is still less than straightforward and lacks global consensus. The term is used in this article to designate an offshore operation of a higher education institution run by the institution or as a joint venture in which the institution is a partner and uses the name of the foreign institution. Upon successful completion of the study program, students are awarded a degree from the foreign institution.

The study shows that the majority of branch campus provision is from North to South. While American institutions continue to dominate this type of overseas delivery, institutions from more countries are engaging in branch campus development. Driving rationales for sending institutions include full control over delivery, prominence in an increasingly competitive transnational education market, greater opportunities for external funding, and changing regulations in some host countries. The sites for branch campus operations are becoming equally diverse, although findings point to a higher level of activity in countries where financial incentives are provided.

Model A: Fully Funded by the Institution

Of the 68 branch campuses for which a funding model has been identified, 37 percent have been established solely through funding from the home institution. However, this approach to offshore operations might become less common as institutions seek more collaborative approaches. The size of the investment required to establish a fully fledged branch campus and the institution’s accountability for any losses discourage many institutions from operating on this model. Advantages connected to this approach include the lack of requirements from partners regarding expected investment returns, repayment, and a time frame for the operation to break even.

Of the 16 branch campuses in Model A where a date of opening could be ascertained, 6 were opened after 2000. However, many of the projects are among the first branch campuses established (e.g., operations in Austria and the Netherlands of the US Webster University in 1981 and 1983, respectively, and the campus in Mexico of the US Alliant International University in 1970) or were established by a for-profit institution (e.g., the operations in Canada and the Netherlands of the University of Phoenix and DeVry University). Both of the latter institutions operate from multiple campuses in their home countries and have raised capital for their continued expansion through stock offerings.

A number of other projects might be best characterized as smaller-scale operations (with limited program offerings and facilities). These include the campuses in London and Singapore of the University of Chicago School of Business, which offer Executive MBA programs, and the facilities in Belgium of Boston University, which focus on business-related diploma and degree programs. The concentration on potentially profitable fields such as business and the limited expenditure of capital on campus facilities may represent attempts to accelerate returns on the institution’s investment.

Model B: External Funding

Thirty-five percent of the branch campuses in the study fall under this model, which can be divided into two main subcategories: (1) recipients of host (central or regional) government funds/support and (2) recipients of external support from private companies or other organizations in the host or home country. In some cases funding comes from more than one external source; for example, a financial contribution from the host government and support from the home government through state-approved loans. Institutions wishing to establish a presence abroad seem to be increasingly opting for funding through Model B. With the exception of three operations, all branch campuses included in this category have been established in the last decade and 70 percent in 2000 or later.

Most branch campuses in receipt of financial or other assistance from the host government have established a presence following an invitation from central or regional authorities. While there are advantages in gaining host government support and funding, an institution needs to evaluate whether the project is in line with its overall mission and institutional goals. In addition, the institution must consider whether it is willing to cover the costs beyond the host country’s contribution. Examples of projects in this category include some of the operations established under Singapore’s “World Class
universities” initiative, including the new campus of Australia’s University of New South Wales due to open next year, the branch campus of the US Carnegie Mellon University currently under establishment in the Australian state of South Australia, the campus of the UK University of Nottingham in Ningbo, China, and the campus of Australia’s Swinburne University of Technology in Sarawak, Malaysia.

A range of branch campus establishments has been created with contributions from external private and public organizations. The opportunities and challenges are almost exactly the opposite of those stated in Model A, with the advantages being the financial contribution and shared risks, and the disadvantages the expectations of the investors in terms of return on investment and their influence on the operation.

Examples of campuses in receipt of investment from public or private organizations include the operation of the University of Nottingham in Malaysia, the US Temple University in Japan, and George Mason University in Ras Al Khaimah, in the United Arab Emirates.

**Model C: Facilities Provided**

Model C is perhaps the latest development within branch campus funding models, but a category that already accounts for 28 percent of the establishments in the study. With the exception of one institution, all developments in this category have been established within the last six years.

Campuses established through Model C make use of facilities provided by a company or a national government often as an enticement to draw foreign providers to the host country. Examples include the Knowledge Village in Dubai, United Arab Emirates and Education City in Qatar. In both cases, a designated zone with academic and student facilities is provided for institutions, which depending on individual arrangements either lease or take over the facilities. The main advantage for institutions operating through this model is the reduction in the start-up funds required. The potential drawbacks include the regulatory environment for the operation (e.g., Knowledge Village operates outside the jurisdiction of the United Arab Emirates and under the guidelines of the company that owns the site) and potential changes in costs outside the institution’s control, such as rent increases.

Model C operations are currently found in the economically advanced states of the Gulf. The reasons for this concentration likely include the available public and private funding for such initiatives, lack of capacity and maturity of the domestic higher education system, and developed strategies to change the main foundation for the economy (i.e., to become less dependent on oil). Other countries (e.g., South Korea and Japan) are in the process of establishing special zones for foreign investment, including in education. However, none of them seem to have local investments on the scale of the two examples cited above.

Examples include: five US institutions (e.g., Texas A&M University and Carnegie Mellon) operating in Qatar’s University City and more than 15 institutions (e.g., UK Middlesex and Heriot-Watt Universities, India’s Manipal Academy of Higher Education, and Canada’s University of New Brunswick) in Knowledge Village.

**Conclusion**

Institutions appear to be increasingly reluctant or unable to carry the entire costs and risks associated with establishing a campus, leading to a larger number of recent operations being established under Models B and C. While the institutions included in this study are more or less spread evenly across the three models, it is suggested that with time, Models B and C will become more prominent. That being said, further reports of uncertain operating environments (for example, concerns over licenses and rent) could potentially lead to institutions being less willing to operate through a model affording them limited control over certain aspects of the operation.


---
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The cross-border mobility of students represents a crucial aspect of the internationalization of higher education. The outflow of students from mainland China has long been a striking phenomenon given the imbalance between higher education supply and demand at home. While serving as a major source of foreign students in the United States, the
United Kingdom, Australia, and Japan, mainland China also sends increasing numbers of students to Hong Kong and Macau (former British and Portuguese colonies, respectively), which became China’s special administrative regions (SARs) in 1997 and 1999. Hong Kong has US$24,000 per capita GDP and a population of 6,940,000 and Macau US$18,000 and 498,000, respectively, in 2005. As parts of China, but differing from the mainland in laws, currencies, and educational systems, the two SARs can be considered hybrid systems that combine Western elements into Chinese settings—between domestic and foreign. They play a dual role as destinations in themselves and as stepping-stones for mainland students’ international mobility.

The flow has changed rapidly with the expansion and diversification of mainland Chinese students in Hong Kong and Macau in the postcolonial era. Hong Kong institutions compete fiercely with mainland counterparts for high-quality students, raising the alarm of competition. In 2006 Hong Kong and Macau recruited 1,300 and 1,200 mainland undergraduate students, respectively, and most are fee-paying ones.

A questionnaire-based survey of 321 mainland students was conducted in 2003, searching mainland students’ perceptions. In each SAR, the focus was on two institutions: the University of Hong Kong, the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, the University of Macau, and the Macau University of Science and Technology. Among the samples, 85.9 percent of the respondents in Hong Kong were postgraduate students on scholarships. By contrast, 89.7 percent in Macau were self-financed undergraduate students. Differences were found in degree level, academic background, age and financing, which led to distinctions of their perceptions on reasons, motivations, and career plan.

**Why Students Choose Hong Kong and Macau**

The three main reasons why mainland students chose Hong Kong and Macau were different: in Hong Kong the reasons affirmed were scholarships (73.4%), the quality and reputation of host institution (55.9%), and convenience regarding home visits (25.4%); while in Macau they were the possible opportunity to go abroad (60.3%), easy admission (50.7%), and the value of degree in terms of employment (43.2%). Many students identified Macau as a stepping-stone to destinations outside China, while most students in Hong Kong were attracted by the scholarships and reputation of the host university.

The top three reasons given by respondents for not having chosen universities on the mainland were as follows: the lower value of degree in terms of employment (43.2%), the quality and reputation of host institution (55.9%), and convenience regarding home visits (25.4%). In Hong Kong, indicated that they could not gain admission in mainland China. Thus the majority of enrollments in the survey represented differentiated rather than excess demand; but this pattern was especially prominent in Hong Kong.

When asked why they did not go further afield for their studies, 80.6 percent in Hong Kong and 95.1 percent in Macau cited the difficulty of applying, getting visas, and securing places. However, these figures may reflect perceptions rather than reality: in practice it may be not so difficult to gain access to at least some overseas universities. Overseas study does, however, require language competence; and 37.8 percent of Macau respondents viewed their foreign-language competence as inadequate for study abroad, compared with 10.3 percent of Hong Kong respondents. The absence of required foreign-language proficiency in Macau and the partial absence in Hong Kong increase the attractiveness of the territories in comparison with foreign locations.

**Student Motivations**

The data show that students’ priorities varied among different groups. The postgraduate students maintained a stronger academic rationale than the undergraduates, who placed more stress on economic interests. The self-financed students paid more attention to the economic benefit than the scholarship holders, who focused more on professional and academic enhancement. However, all students cared much more about their personal interests and self-development than the broader social benefits.

Mainland students in Hong Kong anticipated these four benefits from the degrees pursued: academic ability (69.6%),
social and cultural experience (63.3%), income level (51.7%), and competitive ability in the employment market (45.2%). In Macau, students cited economic income (77.2%), competitive ability in the employment market (65.8%), social and cultural experience (51.0%), and academic ability (42.1%). Thus the mainland students in Macau valued economic factors much more than their counterparts in Hong Kong, and the students in Hong Kong valued academic enhancement. Both groups valued the social and cultural benefits.

**Career Plans**

Many respondents stated that they planned to go abroad after graduation—28.4 percent in Hong Kong and 44.8 percent in Macau. In addition, 45.2 percent in Hong Kong and 39.6 percent in Macau looked forward to going wherever they could find opportunities for personal development. In Hong Kong, 23.3 percent of respondents indicated that they would return to the mainland, while the proportion in Macau was 4.9 percent. Only 2.8 percent in Hong Kong and 11.0 percent in Macau indicated that they would stay in the host territory.

These findings reveal the distinctive characteristics of mainland students in the SARs, compared with their counterparts in mainland China and in foreign countries. Many chose to go to SARs because they saw the territories as a transit station and the several years as a stage in preparation for lifelong careers or for going abroad. Compared with students who remained on the mainland, these mobile students might be somewhat more international. However, compared with Chinese students in foreign countries, they were less distant from their homes and had a stronger potential to return.

To some extent, Hong Kong and Macau still play the role as the bridges for mainland students’ international mobility. However, this role has been challenged by the increasing direct cooperation and exchange between foreign institutions and mainland Chinese universities and by the enhanced internationalization of mainland higher education.

---
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India has a long tradition of private higher education, dating back to the Gurukul system thousands of years ago. Under this system, the select few, mostly from the Brahmins (the learned) and the Kshatriyas (the warriors), attained knowledge by staying with the guru at his private dwelling over a long period of time. They did not have to pay tuition fees, but after the completion of their education-cum-training the guru could ask for a *dakshina* (financial payment). Today, talking about private higher education in India usually involves for-profit private professional institutions.

In 1947/48, India had just 20 universities and 496 colleges. By 2005/06 the numbers grew to 348 universities and 17,625 colleges. The private sector comprised 57 percent of the total higher education system by the 1990s and rose to 75 percent in the 1990s, absorbing students but also raising the demand for higher education by making it accessible and affordable. The rise of private higher education can be seen as the fallout of the economic liberalization policy launched in 1991. Whereas the old private higher education sector depended mostly on the government for financial support, the new private institutions are basically self-financed and career oriented.

**The New Private Institutions**

Most of the new private universities—such as the National Institute of Information Technology and Aptech—have either been established under the private universities acts passed by various state governments or registered with the Ministry of Trade and Commerce. A private institution can also be established as a “deemed” university that specializes in academic fields comparable to university programs and undertakes vocational programs in emerging areas relevant to society in general.

With the massification of higher education and decline in public funding—if the goal is to provide higher education to at least 20 percent of the student-age cohort—the government has no choice but to rely on the private sector. Currently, only 11 percent of the age cohort has access to higher education.

Of the 17,625 colleges in India today, only 5,386 are government-aided; the rest are mostly self-financed. The number of students seeking professional training in the fields of engineering, medicine, management, information technology, and teacher training outside the public universities has grown from less than 15 percent in the 1990s to 50 percent today. According to some reports, up to 75 percent of higher education institutions in India are privately managed.
Some of the new private institutions—such as the Times School of Marketing and the Kirloskar Institute of Advanced Management—hardly bother to obtain recognition from the University Grants Commission’s All India Council for Technical Education. Being market oriented, these institutions have the capacity to absorb their trainees in their own enterprises. Thus they enjoy more autonomy and less accountability.

**Issues at Stake**

Notably, India’s private primary and secondary schools have greater credibility than private higher education institutions. The prevailing ambiguity about the quality of education provided by the new private institutions creates skepticism. Most have thrived primarily because of the craze among Indians for “degrees” and “diplomas.” Only a tiny number of private higher education institutions are quality conscious. They do not face mandatory evaluation by the National Assessment and Accreditation Board, nor does the system protect the interests of students under the Consumers Act.

Ambiguity prevails over the very nomenclature of “private higher education”—making it difficult to distinguish government-aided private institutions from the nonprofit public or for-profit private ones. Most of the new private institutions function under the guise of charitable trusts. Though these institutions are not allowed to earn any profits, most of them succeed in making huge profits by charging substantial fees and making underhand dealings at the time of admission. They are able to take advantage of anxious students, and their families who are not absorbed by the public universities.

The private institutions have succeeded in converting the traditional “temples of learning” into market-oriented “diploma mills.” They know how to take advantage of the surge in demand for higher education and professional training in a country with a growing middle class of 350 million and 60 percent of the population below the age of 25. The neoliberals and fundamentalists have resulted in conflicts between the central and state governments and feuds between the judiciary and the executive.

The government and the judiciary are now bent on curbing the commodification and commercialization of higher education by the new private institutions in the name of equity and social justice. In a caste-ridden and hierarchical society, higher education remains the sole hope for the vast majorities toward social mobility. That is why the current coalition government is insisting upon reservation of up to 49.5 percent for the scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, and other backward classes through the 93rd constitutional amendment act. We also find frequent judicial interventions over trivial administrative matters pertaining to the common entrance exam, fee structure, and management quota.

In fact, two bills dealing with the contentious issues of reservation and regulation of private higher education are currently under active consideration in Parliament. Though passage of the earlier bill introduced in the Rajya Sabha (upper house) in August 1995 was blocked by resistance from the private sector itself, some states—such as Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, and Chattisgarh—succeeded in passing the private universities acts in the last several years. These developments have resulted in conflicts between the central and state governments and feuds between the judiciary and the executive.

---

**Planning for Higher Education Change in Madagascar**

**Fred M. Hayward and Hanitra Rasoanampiozina**
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For the last year, work has been under way on a strategy for higher education reform, quality improvement, and a transformation in Madagascar. After some delay, that process has been joined by the major tertiary institutions.

Higher education in Madagascar developed in the 1950s as part of the French Institut des Hautes Etudes. The University of Antananarivo was established on this base in 1961 with 723 students focusing on law, medicine, pharmacy, science, and the arts. Five regional centers were established in 1975, becoming regional universities in 1988. In 1989/90 the universities were required to admit all students who passed the baccalaureate. From 1975 to 1990 the number of students more than quadrupled, to 37,000. Judging that experiment a costly failure, the government returned to competitive admissions, reducing the total number of students to an average of 20,000 from 1994 through 2002. Increases since that time have been modest. In 2006 the total student population at the six public universities was 37,152.

Private tertiary institutions developed primarily during the past decade. Most provide training in business, languages,
management, and computer science. In 2005, the 50 recognized private higher institutions had 6,778 students (19.50 percent of the total). The total number of students in tertiary education is 3 percent of the college-age group, compared to 8 percent for Africa as a whole.

Challenges
Among the most difficult challenges is to stem the tremendous loss of students from secondary school to graduation. Only half the 25,000 students who passed the baccalaureate at the end of secondary school were admitted to a university. Thirty-five percent of students fail in the first year, and 18 percent repeat—with devastating consequences for students and a waste of resources. Of those admitted, 42 percent will earn a diploma. Part of the problem is inadequate preparation in secondary school, as well as the fact that many go to universities because it is expected and because students receive little counseling about other opportunities.

Much of the university curriculum is out of date. Only 64 percent (2006) of the faculty have PhDs or their equivalent. Few do any research or publish. A recent study shows only 87 publications in major refereed journals in 2004 and 121 in 2005. Research experience is limited, which undermines the ability of faculty to train and to stimulate students. Teaching and learning are not highly valued or rewarded. There is a public perception that about half the university graduates are unemployed, although there have been no studies to verify this.

University faculty are aging. The system suffers from a hiring freeze of more than a decade. As a result, the average age of faculty members is 56 years, with only 15 faculty members in all six universities under the age of 40.

Gender equity among students is less of a problem in Madagascar than in many other developing countries, with 46 percent of students being women. On the other hand, only 29 percent of the teaching faculty are women at public institutions and only 18 percent in private tertiary institutions.

Finance is a critical problem for universities. Government commits 18.2 percent of its budget to education and only 9.4 percent of that to higher education—the equivalent of $390 per student. Government policy of scholarships for most students (82 percent in 2006) without a means test has become an automatic budget liability, and 25 percent of recipients are from wealthy families. Students pay fees, but their contribution is limited. Attempts to increase fees or reduce scholarships would pose serious political risks. Added to these problems is the growing demand for access.

The system suffers from inertia. Senior university administrators resisted suggestions for reform until 2006 when new elections of presidents brought in leaders who are aware that Madagascar is far behind most of the rest of Africa and committed to improving quality. The new administrators, too, face the challenge of mobilizing support for reform.

Planning for Change
A new minister of education, Haja Nirina Razafinjatovo, was appointed in 2004 and is committed to making major changes in higher education. He brought dynamism and a new spirit to the ministry and recognized that transformation would require broad mobilization. He made a major commitment to quality improvement that is now part of the Madagascar Action Plan (2006) with “international norms and standards” as the first priority for higher education.

The minister’s initial efforts to encourage change through the university presidents were largely rebuffed. His second initiative, a broad task force, was also unsuccessful. In the meantime, the minister worked with his staff and with some donor support in three areas. These initiatives were largely successful, including the first major faculty recruitment in more than a decade, establishment of the foundation for accreditation, a digital library, and a plan for PhD training abroad for promising MA/MS students.

The minister established a task team of ministry staff to begin work on an overall strategy for the transformation of postsecondary education. In early 2006 he began work with the newly elected presidents on an outline for change; in August he appointed a groupe de réflexion made up primarily of university presidents and a working group of vice-presidents, leaders in education, and senior ministry personnel.

By October, significant progress had resulted in an outline for higher education changes, including accreditation, faculty development, a credit system, articulation between universities, upgrading and expansion of distance education, centers of excellence for regional universities, prioritization of recruitment priorities, improved governance, and enhancement of university finances.

In addition, a great deal of thought was given to alternatives to university education—expansion of technical training, establishment of a US community colleges–type institution to provide job skills and entrepreneurial training.

Prospects
What has been impressive about the ministry leadership, the groupe de réflexion, and the working group is their commitment to change, their thoughtful exploration of options, cooperative spirit, and recognition of the difficulties ahead. Indeed, if transformation is to occur, it will require widespread support of the faculties, students, staff, the public, and government. Universities will need to improve their own efficiency, but
A country with about 1.7 million people, Botswana is generally described by development scholars as an exceptional African success story. Politically it has been a model of democracy on a continent where military dictatorship reigned for too long. It is also an economic miracle, having transformed itself from one of the poorest countries in the world at its independence in 1966 to its present status of a middle-income country. Presently, the country’s tertiary education sector consists of one university and a number of other postsecondary institutions. A key feature of its higher education landscape is public ownership and control. However, as elsewhere, the forces of globalization and internal demands for expansion of access are exerting tremendous pressures for change. Consequently, in line with global trends, a new tertiary education policy is being proposed.

Pressures on the Higher Education Landscape

As the major actor, the government sponsors almost all tertiary education students both at home and abroad through the provision of student loans. Since 1990, the government has been spending on average 1 percent of GDP on tertiary education, which is a reasonably high level compared to other African countries. However, enrollment figures at all tertiary institutions remain below the level of demand for access, with only 12 percent of the 18–24 age cohort presently at the range of institutions (awarding certificates, diplomas, or degrees)—as low as 6.9 percent of the higher education subsector.

The existing order has increasingly come under pressure for change. Proponents cite the inability of the existing university to expand access, which has already led to the idea of a second university. Designated as an international university of science and technology, the new university has been planned to introduce a new market orientation into the higher education landscape. Proponents also cite the overdependence of the university on government funding as both precarious and unsustainable. The decreasing support in the last two years is a danger signal. In the 2005/06 fiscal year, government funding provided about 66 percent of the university’s budget.

The Direction of the Emerging Policy

In 2004, the Tertiary Education Council (TEC) established a Working Group on the Tertiary Education Policy for Botswana. The TEC wants the government to adopt a tertiary education policy that will be “cognizant of global trends and pressures that are impacting on tertiary education in Botswana” and “responsive to specific societal challenges and needs.”

Although the TEC proposes wider changes in line with globalization, it also provides an affirmation of some policies and practices that are already in place. For example, some years ago, the University of Botswana implemented a restructuring policy in line with global trends of managerial-oriented leadership, privatization, the outsourcing of such services such as privatization, public-private partnership, and outsourcing of selected services.

In the education sector, the government has cautiously introduced a partial cost-sharing policy at the secondary school level as a testing ground for the future. Furthermore, ownership of tertiary education institutions has been liberalized and the extent of private providers is growing. It is estimated that in 2004, over 100 private providers registered with the Ministry of Education, mainly for the running of nondegree technical and vocational programs. However, there are other foreign private providers running professional and master’s degree programs. For example, the Limkokwing University in Malaysia has been offered registration by the TEC to run both diploma and degree programs. So far only a few private higher education providers have been registered and accredited by the TEC.
Fear of Losing the “Only Son” Status

Critics of the envisaged policy fear that funding, academic standards, state sponsorship of students, and the international character of academic staff may be adversely affected when the University of Botswana loses its status as the “only son” in the higher education landscape. Greater reduction of government support may have a negative impact on its ability to retain senior-level expatriate staff and maintain academic standards. Over the years, the University of Botswana has played a critical role in the training of the required manpower for the country’s rapid development. The university has attracted expatriate scholars, who constitute 35 percent of its academic staff. It is feared that further reductions in government funding may affect the ability of the university to maintain its competitive edge in Africa. Such a loss of status might challenge the University of Botswana’s vision of serving as “a leading academic center of excellence in Africa and the world.”

A concomitant issue concerns alternative and sustainable sources of funding. In line with globalization trends elsewhere, the adoption of a cost-sharing policy by the university is a likely option. However, this approach may be more controversial than in other developing countries, for citizens are long used to what a recent report by a government-appointed council (the Business Economic Advisory Council) called “a culture of entitlements” and of living in a “comfort zone.” The council’s characterization of Botswana as “a relatively low-income country with a high-income lifestyle” does not raise any hope that a cost-sharing policy would be easy to implement.

Violence in Pursuit of Knowledge: African Victims of Xenophobia

Damtew Teferra

On February 4, 2006, CNN featured horrific pictures of the brutal beating, maiming, and killing of African students by a fringe neo-Nazi group in Russia. While this was one of the major international media to broadcast such a story, in Russia and former Eastern European bloc countries, numerous other attacks on foreign students and scholars, typically Africans and other dark-skinned people, have been reported.

According to an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education (September 30, 2005), Russia’s minister of education and science conceded that the government could not protect foreign students from racist attacks and called on colleges to work more closely with the police in dealing with the widespread problem. In Ukraine, the former president, Leonid Kuchma, once ordered the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of Education and Science, and the city administration in Odessa to investigate attacks and killings of foreign students. In the former East Germany, students and scholars from Congo, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, Senegal, and Sudan have been beaten, stabbed, killed—and even castrated.

The Education Market

Today, around 2.2 million students in the world study outside their borders, and this trend is expected to rise significantly in the next decade. Many of these students study in institutions in the Western hemisphere. While geopolitical developments following September 11th have had some chilling effect on the mobility of students and scholars, this scenario has had a short and temporary impact across the major centers of education.

The former Eastern bloc, led by the former Soviet Union, played an important role in training a considerable number of African students during the Cold War era as part of the broader campaign to build global solidarity and influence. Many African countries sent thousands of students to these countries with full scholarships. With the decline in geopolitical influence, shift in ideology, and consequent lack of interest and capacity to train the African intelligentsia, the number of African students studying in eastern Europe has dropped dramatically.

However, many African students still pursue their studies in this part of the world. For instance, 15,000 students were reported as studying at St. Petersburg, Russia in 2005; as many as 20,000 students now study in Ukraine. Students in eastern Europe are attracted by low tuition and cost of living and relatively lax visa regulations, among other factors. Earning a medical degree in the former Soviet republics costs only a fraction of expenses in the West, and especially the United States. While it has become increasingly onerous to acquire visas for countries in the North, post–September 11th, with proper documents visas could be obtained in as short a time as 24 hours in these countries.

Beyond Lip Service

Most African governments have ignored these growing brutal attacks on their citizens. Only a few governments have expressed their concern and lodged formal complaints through...
diplomatic avenues. The deafening silence toward such xenophobic atrocities committed against knowledge-seeking citizens is obvious.

In many former Eastern bloc countries, institutions have launched programs in English largely prompted by the language’s growing popularity and benefits. Along with the low cost of studying in eastern Europe, the provision of English-language medium of instruction will attract even more students from poor countries, necessitating the need to create more awareness about the xenophobia.

**Destination Countries**

It is imperative that African students and scholars who are going to study abroad, especially eastern European countries, become fully informed about the social, cultural, and political realities in their countries of study. Guidance on appropriate precautions and informed decisions to avoid such attacks are imperative. Embassies of host countries can play an active role in providing students and scholars updated and candid information on what they should expect in the countries and regions. Moreover, such a responsibility should be fully assumed by host universities not only by providing ample guidance on “survival tools” regularly but also raising awareness on the academic, social, and financial significance of foreigners on campus. It is important that institutions make it clear that they are fully committed to the safety and security of their foreign students.

**Source Countries and Institutions**

Sending countries and institutions need to engage in the welfare of their intellectual communities abroad at various levels. The first necessity is to ensure that students not leave home without proper guidance and information to destination countries.

Foreign service staff could actively raise the awareness of their citizens to the concerns in destination countries. Embassies, consulates, and other diplomatic missions, especially in eastern Europe, could become more actively engaged. In cases where their citizens have been attacked, African diplomatic missions should lodge formal complaints and pursue investigations. African citizens could also play a role by organizing peaceful protest marches targeting respective embassies. Associations such as the Association of African Universities, the Southern African Regional Universities Association, the Association of Commonwealth Universities, and the African Union could play an active role in addressing these issues.

**Students and Scholars**

African students and scholars must be conscious about xenophobia and its serious consequences. It is imperative that they pay special attention to social, political, and cultural nuances in the countries of their study. The ultimate burden for taking care of their welfare rests on them.

Foreign students and scholars need to be advised to use a variety of communication sources as well as survival tools. Electronic communication sites are ideal means. These sites may feature, among other topics, institutions where attack is rampant, places and times where crimes are common, and the nature of attacks.

**Conclusion**

The deafening silence of African governments on attacks against their citizens searching for knowledge overseas is simply deplorable. National governments, regional and international organizations, universities in respective countries, diplomatic missions abroad (and locally), and nongovernmental organizations need to do more to curb this growing problem. Moreover, host countries must take serious measures to address this rising mobility threat. The responsibilities of source countries should also not be underestimated.

---

**The Minnow and the Whale: Singapore-China Relations in Higher Education**

**Anthony Welch**
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Most internationalization literature still focuses on advanced Western states or student and staff flows from South to North. Regional internationalization retains a narrower focus, although the rise in regional trading and political blocs—sometimes supported by student mobility schemes such as ERASMUS—can mean that student mobility becomes largely regional. One little-known regional case involves the tiny island nation of Singapore and its giant and sometimes troubling cousin, China. The changing context includes China-ASEAN (Association of South-East Asian Nations) trade relations, which is substantial and growing swiftly, and China’s accession to the WTO and worldwide rise in service-sector
The diverse Singapore-China connections in higher education trade (estimated at US$30+ billion in higher education alone).

**Higher Education in China and Singapore**

Within the Asia Pacific region, demand for higher education outstrips supply, which explains why the region contributes more international students to major host countries than anywhere else—45 percent of the total for countries that are members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Nonetheless, China and Singapore each maintain ambitious plans to extend capacity and enhance quality. With an annual economic growth of almost 10 percent from 1990 to 2000, China has shown an intense commitment to learning (common to much of East Asia), issued in key higher education reforms—notably programs to develop world-class institutions for the 21st century. From 1993, the 211 Project selected 100 institutions and key disciplines for special attention and investment. The later, much more selective 985 Program invested an additional RMB30 billion (about US$4 billion) in the top 10 or so universities. Given the more than 1,000 higher education institutions in China, most missed out from being selected, while still coping with annual enrollment increases since 1998 of about 20 percent—without much increase, if any, in staffing. Quality, then, is highly differential.

Singapore, with a population of around 4.5 million smaller than many of China’s cities, has long been a net importer of educational services. More recently, however, it announced plans to become a regional “eduhub” and invested accordingly. This policy included initiatives like the new Lee Kwan Yew School of Public Policy at the National University of Singapore; recruiting selected overseas staff (especially in the biosciences) via generous salary packages and research support; and founding the first fully owned and operated foreign campus, operated by the University of New South Wales, Australia.

**Singapore’s Failed Suzhou Venture**

Notwithstanding its militant anticomunism, Singapore’s relatively long-standing relationship with China includes a successful record of service-sector exports to the region. Around 5,000 Singaporeans live and work in China, mostly in Shanghai, while China is Singapore’s largest recipient of foreign direct investment. Nonetheless, Singapore’s early attempt to develop a joint, high-tech science park in Suzhou, China proved to be a disaster, with annual losses of US$24 million. The failure also involved a considerable loss of face and provided a lesson in differences over what constituted a legal contract. This venture remains a taboo subject (especially in front of foreigners), in Singapore: round one to the whale. Nonetheless, Singapore’s painful experience has not halted further China partnerships in higher education, which are now strong.

**Current Linkages**

The diverse Singapore-China connections in higher education consist of joint consortia membership, bilateral framework agreements, and institutional partnerships.

Regional consortia include the ASEAN Universities Network, which has commenced collaboration with Chinese institutions; and the Association of Pacific Rim Universities, which includes the National University of Singapore and Peking, Fudan, Zhejiang, and Tsinghua University, among others. The global consortium Universitas 21 brings together the National University of Singapore, Fudan, Peking, and Hong Kong University.

Framework agreements date from 1999, when the two Ministries of Education signed a memorandum of understanding, promoting exchanges between teachers, scholars, researchers, and students. A memorandum of understanding in 2002 formalized student exchange programs. Embracing 50 from each side, the agreements are directed at broadening China-Singapore ties, particularly among students. Chinese universities included the Beijing Language University, Beijing Post and Communication University, Beijing University for Foreign Studies, and Tsinghua University.

Institutional agreements focus mainly on business, administration, and the development of Asia-Pacific expertise. The National University of Singapore inaugurated its Shanghai College in 2003—with Fudan University and major Chinese firms. Offering Shanghai internships with high-tech companies (often international) of up to 12 months duration, students take entrepreneurship courses at Fudan (also in its own start-up companies). Courses and internships form credits toward a degree from the National University of Singapore. The International Master of Business Administration program is a collaboration between the National University of Singapore and Peking University, with modules in both English and Chinese. Again, the goal is to develop bilingual graduates, equipped with East-West business knowledge. Offered in Singapore and Beijing, full-time annual fees are $18,000. In December 2003, Singapore’s Nanyang Technology University, School of Business established a joint Executive MBA program partnership with China’s leading Shanghai Jiao Tong University’s Aetna School of Management. Nanyang Technology University has also investigated collaboration with Peking University and Tsinghua, in the area of humanities, as part of its plan to develop a leading Chinese studies department.

Singapore’s senior civil servants can join Tsinghua University’s Executive Program for Senior Singapore Civil Servants, which has been running for some years. The National University of Singapore’s new (2004) Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy signed letters of intent in late 2005 with three of China’s most prestigious universities: Peking University, Tsinghua University, and Fudan University. Each partner will establish double-degree public policy/public administration graduate programs; students will spend one year at their “home” institution, the second at the “partner” institution, and will earn degrees from both.
Private-sector partnerships include an exchange program of the new Singapore Management University, established in 2000 as the first publicly funded private university, with a focus on business and management. A one- or two-semester exchange is offered with three Chinese partners: Nankai University, Sun Yat Sen University, and Xiamen University. Singapore’s Ministry of Trade and Industry offers Asian Business Fellowships to such exchange students.

Conclusion
These collaborations illustrate several key points about internationalization. First, Singapore’s misplaced optimism that led to its failed science park venture in Suzhou underlines the fact that presumed cultural and linguistic affinity does not serve as an adequate basis for international partnerships (especially beyond the first-generation diaspora). Second, the fact that most of the partnerships indicated above are in the area of business and administration underlines a more widespread bias in such agreements. Thus, the prospects for developing effective partnerships in areas such as the social sciences and humanities do not appear strong. Third, the strength of regional partnerships and agreements is a refreshing reminder that not all internationalization occurs between “the West and the rest,” or between elite institutions in the West. Internationalization is a broad river, with many fascinating if still largely unexplored tributaries.

China’s Soft Power Projection in Higher Education
Rui Yang

Rui Yang is a senior lecturer in the Faculty of Education, Monash University, Australia. Address: Wellington Road, Clayton, Victoria 3800. E-mail: rui.yang@education.monash.edu.au.

Commensurate with China’s rise as an economic and political power has been a concurrent rise in Chinese soft power. China’s emerging status as a world leader has become an issue that urgently needs to be examined. The realm of higher education has been the focus of China’s most systematically planned soft power policy. Despite the significance of the subject, little attention is being directed to this rise of China’s power. There has been no research on the role of higher education in China’s projection and on the strategies and policy tools Beijing has used to boost its soft power through higher education.

The Concept of Soft Power
Coined by Harvard University political scientist Joseph Nye to mean the ability to change what others do or shape what they want, the term soft power is usually defined as culture, education, and diplomacy and providing the capacity to persuade other nations to adopt the same goals. This approach has been a fundamental part of military thinking in China for over 2000 years. Generations of Chinese leaders have adopted the strategies and long-term planning stated in Sunzi’s Art of War of the 4th century BCE—a part of statecraft that looked to an integrated strategy to “win victories without striking a blow.”

Another component of the concept, moral leadership by exemplar, also resonates in Chinese tradition. A main paradigm of Chinese governance is Confucianism, which operates on a reciprocal and ethical basis. A ruler is supposed to demonstrate moral excellence, taking wise decisions on behalf of his (very rarely her) subjects, to keep the state secure and prosperous.

Soft Power through Higher Education
Today, “winning hearts and minds” still composes an important part of the international higher education equation. Educational exchange falls under the rubric of soft power. Connections between institutions of higher education are a stabilizing and civilizing influence. China has been consciously promoting international exchange and collaboration in education. Indeed, China has been skillfully employing soft power to expand its global influence. One effective policy strategy has been the combination of higher education with the appeal of Confucianism—to offer Beijing a comparative advantage in its approach.

China’s soft power gambit is most evident in Africa. China has committed to contributing to the development of human resources in Africa. As of 2003, over 6,000 Africans had been trained as part of the program. Scholarships for over 1,500 African students are annually awarded by China, and many Chinese universities have established relationships with African institutions. China sent 10 teams of experts and launched 14 workshops in African countries over the past 5 years covering library science, dossier management, archaeology, biology, dance, and acrobatics. Chinese technical aid to Africa is becoming increasingly important in building China’s influence in the region. Medical, agricultural, and engineering teams have provided technical aid to African countries for decades to support everything from building projects to treating AIDS patients. This support for education improves China’s image, builds grassroots support in local communities, and creates a better understanding of China among the educated elite.

Soft power can be “high,” targeted at elites, or “low,” targeted at the broader public. Though soft power stems from both governments and nongovernmental actors, one can identify strategies and policy tools Beijing has consciously used to
boost its soft power and thus increase its legitimacy as an emerging superpower. Their desires for national revival include returning to the position China had before a rising Europe began to eclipse it in the 18th century. Beijing’s innovative and most systematically planned soft power policy involves a two-way strategy: hosting international students and building up the Confucius Institutes worldwide.

**Hosting International Students**

Training future generations of intellectuals, technicians, and political elites from other nations is a subtle yet important form of soft power. This was the role of Great Britain at its imperial zenith and of the United States ever since the 1950s, and now China increasingly fills this role. China is recruiting students from all parts of the world, with particular focus on developing countries. These future generations of elites will certainly be sensitized to Chinese viewpoints and interests, with knowledge of the Chinese language, society, culture, history, and politics.

Increasing numbers of foreign students are attracted to undergraduate or postgraduate study in China. The enrollment of foreign students from 178 countries studying for advanced degrees at China’s universities has tripled in 2004 to 110,800 over the past decades, surpassing the flow of Chinese students to foreign universities, marking a 10-year high—an increase of over 40 percent from 2003. The belief that to get ahead, it behooves you to go to China, represents what 10 years ago people said about the United States. China’s Ministry of Education plans to host 120,000 foreign students annually by 2007, most of them in programs of Chinese language and culture. China is investing in promotion of Mandarin as one of the global languages.

**The Confucius Institutes**

The National Office for Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language (Hanban) is establishing Confucius Institutes to spread the teaching of Mandarin and Chinese culture around the world. The goal is to quadruple the number of foreigners studying Chinese to 100 million by 2010. The first Confucius Institute was inaugurated in Seoul in November 2004. Since then, the institutes have opened in cities such as Stockholm, Perth, and Nairobi. More than 85 of these institutes have been established worldwide, and Beijing aims eventually to open some 100 of them. In many ways the institutes are patterned after the British Council, Goethe Institute, or Alliance Française. The Chinese government recently committed nearly US$25 million a year for the teaching of Chinese as a foreign language.

However, the Confucius Institutes differ in significant ways from the long-established agents of French and German culture. Those European organizations are government agencies and fully dependent on state funds for their operations, but they locate their offices in normal commercial locations, wherever their governments can rent appropriate space. There is no attempt to integrate them into their host societies via institutional linkups. In contrast, the Confucius Institutes are being incorporated into leading universities around the world as well as being linked to China not only through their Hanban connections but also by supportive twinning arrangements with key Chinese universities. The London School of Economics, for example, is setting up an institute using arrangements under which it will cooperate with Tsinghua University. Not only will the Confucius Institutes immediately benefit from the prestige and convenience of becoming parts of existing campuses, the latter will also have a vested interest in supply-
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A witty guide to prospective leaders of American public universities, this volume discusses all aspects of the university presidency, from the process of selection, to administrative structures, constituencies, management, and others. A special section on funding— including the role of the state and donors—is useful as is a discussion of the role of relating to students, faculty, and governing boards.


A comprehensive overview of Indian higher education, this working paper discusses such topics as financing higher education, the shape of the system, the research function of higher education, regulations and quality assessment, and current trends. Current statistics are included.


This interesting potpourri of essays covers three main themes—the governance of academic institutions, the organization of knowledge through disciplines and in other ways, and how universities can function in a changing social and economic environment.


A wide-ranging analysis of the growing for-profit higher education industry in the United States, this book maps the for-profit market. Among other themes discussed are the University of Phoenix, distance higher education, markets and the public good, the relationship between for-profit and nonprofit higher education, Wall Street and the higher education market, and others.


The engagingly written reflections of an experienced higher education administrator (dean at Stanford University, and president of both Wesleyan and Emory Universities), this book discusses both Chace’s experiences and also broader trends in higher education and policy. Issues such as the tenure system, diversity, the role of leadership, and professorial issues are considered.


This somewhat mistitled book concerns South African higher education developments since the democratic elections of 1994. Among the themes discussed are patterns of financing, changes in staff and leadership, curriculum and leadership, and the process of change.


Hong Kong, part of China yet governed separately, has a strong tradition of academic freedom in its well-developed university system. This book examines the idea of academic freedom and how it plays itself out in the Hong Kong context. The view of academics, policymakers, and others are discussed as well as current issues that affect academic freedom in Hong Kong.


The 2nd annual publication of the Global University Network for Innovation (GUNI), this comprehensive volume focuses broadly on accreditation and quality assurance issues, although some other themes, such as league tables, are included. A series of reports on quality assurance and accreditation in the various world regions is at the heart of the book, and there is much original data included in these chapters. Statistical data as well as analysis are provided.


The focus of this book is on the process of the implementation of reform worldwide. Case studies consider how countries, systems, and institutions have interpreted and implemented mostly government-directed reform efforts. Among the countries considered are Finland, South Africa, Mexico, the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, Norway, the Netherlands, Portugal, and others.


Focusing on aspects of change and reform in higher education and using examples mainly from the United Kingdom and Australia, this book discusses such topics as quality assurance, national policies and higher education reforms, the development of teaching and learning centers for change, the role of technology, and related themes.


This important survey of the views about the internationalization of universities worldwide provides data from 176 higher education institutions from 66 countries. Although
response rates vary—from 9 percent in Latin American to more than 50 percent in Europe—the results are illustrative. In addition, 102 university associations were surveyed, although only 18 responded. This is the second survey sponsored by the International Association of Universities—the first one was in 2003. Seventy-three percent of responding universities indicated that internationalization is a high priority. There are many reasons for internationalization—surprisingly, income generation did not have a high priority. The only study of the views of universities concerning internationalization, this is a very useful book and a benchmark for further analysis.


This study of governmental policy and its implications on universities (management, the academic profession, and other aspects) is one of the few that were designed as a comparative analysis (Norway, Sweden, and England). Based on interviews and other research tools, this book provides a detailed analysis of the impact of reform. This is the 2nd revised version of this research.


One of the center’s series of publications on countries in central and eastern Europe, this volume on Ukraine features discussion of the history of the higher education system, the organization and legal arrangements for the system, institutional governance, and related themes.


Based on a study of student health issues at Novgorod State University in Russia, this book focuses on how students see health issues on campus and how they deal with these issues. Specific health issues are discussed, including how students see medical practice.


A critical discussion of the contemporary European research university, this book includes analyses of the future of the Humboldtian university tradition in Europe, Swedish university funding and research, university research and politics, a historical perspective on European research universities, and other topics.


The relationship between law and higher education in the United States has become increasingly important, as higher education issues have been litigated in court. This book provides cases and related materials on a wide variety of legal cases concerning all aspects of higher education.


This annual survey of education indicators for the OECD countries (mainly Western Europe, North America, Japan, and Korea) is a valuable resource for accurate statistical and comparative data. Although the book deals with education at all levels, the material on higher education covers, for example, economic returns to education, public and private investment in educational institutions, tuition fees charged by postsecondary institutions, participation rates in secondary and higher education, and other topics.


The report of a survey of 40,000 students from nine EU countries, plus the Czech Republic, Norway, and Japan, this book discusses the views of university graduates concerning employment. Such issues as the process of searching for a job, early career issues, the relationship between higher education training and work, job satisfaction, and career development are discussed.


This book provides series of studies of funding patterns in Europe and the United States. Among the themes are the impact of tuition fees on access in the United Kingdom, Canadian experiments with cost-sharing, the German fee debate, access and equity in France’s state-funded system, and some others. Several comparative analyses are also included.


The focus of this book is on governance at the state level—what Europeans call “steering.” Authors consider themes such as the governing public higher education in an era of privatization, the role of governing boards, and institutional autonomy and state accountability. The book is concerned with how state and public authority can be exercised for the public good in higher education.


This doctoral dissertation discusses how GATS is affecting higher education systems and particularly the ability of governments to “steer” academic systems. Case studies of the Netherlands and the Czech Republic are included along with a broader discussion of this theme.
New CIHE Publications

We are pleased to announce the publication of two books.

Philip G. Altbach, Leslie A. Bozeman, Natia Janashia, and Laura E. Rumbley. Higher Education: A Worldwide Inventory of Centers and Programs. This book features information about 199 programs and centers focusing on higher education worldwide. It also includes a listing of 191 journals in the field of higher education and an essay analyzing the development and current status of the field of higher education worldwide. This book is published in a commercial edition by Sense Publishers, Rotterdam, the Netherlands. Readers in developing countries may request the book free of charge from the CIHE. Others may order from Sense Publishers, POB 21858, 3001 AW Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

Philip G. Altbach. International Higher Education: Reflections on Policy and Practice. A compilation of 35 essays from the Center’s publication, International Higher Education. Among the topics included are globalization and internationalization, corruption in higher education, research universities, the academic profession, and others. Readers may request a free copy of this book from the CIHE.

THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION (CIHE)
The Boston College Center for International Higher Education brings an international consciousness to the analysis of higher education. We believe that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center publishes the International Higher Education quarterly newsletter, a book series, and other publications; sponsors conferences; and welcomes visiting scholars. We have a special concern for academic institutions in the Jesuit tradition worldwide and, more broadly, with Catholic universities.

The Center promotes dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions throughout the world. We believe that the future depends on effective collaboration and the creation of an international community focused on the improvement of higher education in the public interest.

CIHE WEB SITE
The different sections of the Center Web site support the work of scholars and professionals in international higher education, with links to key resources in the field. All issues of International Higher Education are available online, with a searchable archive. In addition, the International Higher Education Clearinghouse (IHEC) is a source of articles, reports, trends, databases, online newsletters, announcements of upcoming international conferences, links to professional associations, and resources on developments in the Bologna Process and the GATS. The Higher Education Corruption Monitor provides information from sources around the world, including a selection of news articles, a bibliography, and links to other agencies. The International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA), is an information clearinghouse on research, development, and advocacy activities related to postsecondary education in Africa.

THE PROGRAM IN HIGHER EDUCATION AT THE LYNCH SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, BOSTON COLLEGE
The Center is closely related to the graduate program in higher education at Boston College. The program offers master’s and doctoral degrees that feature a social science–based approach to the study of higher education. The Administrative Fellows initiative provides financial assistance as well as work experience in a variety of administrative settings. Specializations are offered in higher education administration, student affairs and development, and international education. For additional information, please contact Dr. Karen Arnold (arnoldk@bc.edu) or visit our Web site: http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/.

Our work is supported by the Ford Foundation and the Lynch School of Education at Boston College. We are indebted to these funders for core sponsorship.