

lic discourse. The Conservative government in the United Kingdom is still struggling with the consequences of Brexit on British universities' participation in the European programs, and with the importance of international students and faculty for its knowledge economy.

COUNTERVAILING TRENDS?

While there are increasingly powerful political, economic, and academic challenges to the internationalization process in Europe and North America, the non-Western world shows an increasing interest in internationalization. But, even there, there are problems. The two largest players, China and India, present some challenges.

Many have commented that China, in some respects, is becoming more "academically closed," in spite of significant increases in inward student mobility. Increased restrictions on internet access, increased emphasis on ideological courses, problems of academic freedom (especially in the social sciences), and other issues are indicative.

For the first time, India has made internationalization a key goal of national higher education policy. But India lacks relevant infrastructure, and it struggles with problems in shaping its academic structures to host large numbers of international students. The logistical challenges are considerable.

It is likely that students seeking foreign academic degrees or an international experience will, to some extent, shift their foci away from the major host countries in North America and Europe, which are seen as less welcoming. But these potential beneficiaries have their own problems.

NEEDED PERSPECTIVES

The first thing that is required is that all involved with international higher education explicitly recognize that realities have changed and that current, and likely, future developments are beyond the control of the academic community. These new realities will have significant implications for higher education in general and for internationalization specifically.

The current criticism about the unlimited growth of teaching in English, recruitment of international students, and development of branch campuses, is coming from two completely opposite sources. On the one hand, there is the nationalist-populist argument of anti-international and anti-immigration. More relevant are concerns about quality, academic freedom, and ethics in the higher education community itself. The call for an alternative approach, with stronger emphasis on "Internationalization at Home" by the rector of the University of Amsterdam, as well as by Jones and de Wit (UWN 486) for a more inclusive internationalization, may be seen as an opportunity for internationalization, with a shift from quantity to quality. If the na-

tionalist-populist argument prevails, though, then indeed this might lead to the end of internationalization. Leaders in higher education around the world must make a strong stand in favor of the quality approach. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10377>

Higher Education Leadership and Management Training: Global Maps and Gaps

LAURA E. RUMBLEY, HILLIGJE VAN'T LAND, AND JULIETTE BECKER

Laura E. Rumbley is associate director at the Boston College Center for International Higher Education, US. E-mail: rumbley@bc.edu. Hilligje van't Land is secretary-general, and Juliette Becker is programme and membership development officer at the International Association of Universities, Paris, France. E-mails: h.vantland@iau-aiu.net and j.becker@iau-aiu.net.

Successful leadership of higher education institutions in the contemporary context worldwide requires a remarkably sophisticated set of skills, knowledge, and sensibilities. Yet, globally, there is limited information about how higher education's leaders, managers, and policymakers are provided with the training they need to carry out their work. Furthermore, where information about such training and capacity-building programs is available, the picture remains incomplete and often disheartening. In fact, the structured opportunities on offer to build leadership and management capacity in higher education are limited in number, almost universally small in scale, and largely unable to offer systematic accounts of the long-term impact of their efforts. This is a critical concern in the face of the myriad opportunities and imperatives facing higher education institutions and systems around the world, now and into the foreseeable future. Without question, the vast majority of higher education leaders and managers enter their positions with no training whatsoever—they learn "on the job"—or run the risk of failure.

UNCHARTED TERRITORY

Two recent studies—one by the Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE), on behalf of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and German Rectors' Conference (HRK), and another by the International Association of Universities (IAU) on behalf of

the World Bank—have mapped various dimensions of the global landscape of higher education management and leadership training programs. In the case of IAU, the goal was to identify training programs around the world focused specifically on leadership (typically in mid- and senior-level administrative positions) in higher education. CIHE’s purpose was slightly different, given its aim to make sense of major players offering management training schemes specifically in relation to international development cooperation efforts (i.e., for capacity building in lower-income and emerging country contexts).

In exploring the existence and profiles of such training schemes worldwide, both IAU and CIHE discovered that very little work has been done to date to take stock of these types of programs at a global level. Extensive networking and dogged online research were required to identify programs, and to piece together fundamental characteristics of training program size, scope, design, delivery, evolution, and aims. Unlike postgraduate degree-granting programs focused on different aspects of higher education, which are typically offered by single universities (or clearly defined university partners), training programs geared toward higher education professionals may be delivered by a wide range of providers. Some are also characterized by what might be considered a chain of providers, whereby different actors are separately responsible for funding, managing/organizing, and/or delivering specific training programs. To date, there is no clear “typology” for the global field of higher education management, training providers, or approaches.

YOU NAME IT, THEY DO IT

There is significant diversity in the way that training programs approach their work. This diversity is apparent across such dimensions as the ages of programs, the sizes of their cohorts, the frequency with which program iterations are offered, the target audiences they aim to serve, the “pedagogical approaches” they employ, the length of programs, and the topics on which programs focus, among other key characteristics.

This diversity presents an interesting panorama across the global training landscape. Programs range in age from decades old to the very recently launched. In terms of target groups, they may cater to senior leadership or middle- and upper-middle level managers and administrators, or to specially identified populations, such as promising early-career individuals, administrators with specifically defined roles and responsibilities, or members of underrepresented groups, such as women.

Program modes of delivery may involve workshops, conferences, seminars, lectures, case studies, site visits, internships, group projects, personal projects, or indepen-

dent research. Training schemes may even be anchored in long-term institutional partnerships, as seen particularly in some European initiatives focused on international cooperation for development. Trainings may feature face-to-face and/or online delivery.

The frequency and duration of trainings may also vary from a matter of days or weeks, or—more unusually—to months, and even a year or longer. Some programs consist of quite standardized “off the shelf” offerings in terms of structure and content, while others may be more specifically tailored to client or participant needs. There is, quite literally, a world of possibility when it comes to training content, approaches, target audiences, and rationale.

EMERGING CONTOURS IN A WORLD OF VARIETY

Although training programs in higher education worldwide display significant variation in their form and function, several key trends are apparent from the data now available about these schemes.

First, the training of higher education leaders and managers stands out as a “growth industry” globally. This is indicated by the significant numbers of training programs and schemes that have been initiated in the period since 2000.

To date, there is no clear “typology” for the global field of higher education management, training providers, or approaches.

Notably, however, higher education training and leadership development programs are predominately on offer in the world’s wealthier countries, or are delivered (or otherwise made possible) by providers, funders, and/or partners who largely hail from the Global North.

Where data exist, we see that most programs feature small numbers of participants, often under 50 per group. Additionally, cohorts tend to be rather “homogenous,” in the sense that they tend not to include different kinds of participants in the same training groups (for example, at different levels of seniority). Little evidence exists that much special attention is being paid to the training or leadership skill cultivation of women in higher education, despite their significant representation in student enrollment and (at least early stage) faculty ranks globally.

Training programs are also relatively short in duration, most often ranging from several days to one or two weeks. They are typically fee based and do not tend to award any kind of credential, beyond merely documenting attendance.

Finally, there is very little indication that training programs are undertaking the kinds of assessment activities that yield clear evidence of their mid-term outcomes or longer-term impact. Often, assessment rests on the testimonials of beneficiaries or the organizations offering the training courses, without providing information on the monitoring tools developed to measure the impact of these courses on participants or their respective professional environments. One of the most commonly cited impacts is the importance of the networking opportunities provided, a result that is difficult to translate into any kind of impact assessment.

IS MORE NEEDED? YES

The majority of higher education leaders and managers around the world receive no formal/specialized training for their work. As higher education systems continue to grow and diversify, increasingly pressured to meet key performance indicators while also achieving excellence in education and innovation production, the need to train effective managers and leaders becomes more widespread and more urgent. Yet, the current picture of training opportunities on offer to meet this massive need falls desperately short. Indeed, the CIHE and IAU inventory exercises, albeit tailored to seek out some kinds of programs and not others, collectively identified fewer than 120 such training schemes worldwide. Relatively short, small-scale programs, clustered in (or provided largely by actors based in) the Global North, operating without clear evidence of mid- or long-term impact—collectively, these do not provide a viable roadmap for the kind of large-scale support needed by higher education systems, particularly in the world's low-income and emerging economy countries. There, the needs are urgent to scale up management and leadership capacity through the provision of high-quality, relevant, and equity-enhancing training mechanisms. Significantly more research is needed to make sense of the full census of management and leadership training actors around the world, as well as the scope and real-world impact of their efforts, in order to ensure the deployment of skilled higher education managers and leaders for the twenty-first century. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.93.10368>

International Higher Education would like to thank the Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY) for its support of coverage of higher education in Africa and for its general support of our publication. CCNY has long recognized the importance of higher education in Africa and beyond, and this generosity significantly enables both our work as well as that of our partner at the University of Kwa-Zulu-Natal in South Africa, home to the International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA).

Predatory Conferences: A Case of Academic Cannibalism

JAMES McCROSTIE

James McCrostie is a professor in the Department of Business Administration, Daito Bunka University, Tokyo, Japan. E-mail: jamesm@ic.daito.ac.jp.

Less than 20 years after appearing in the groves of academe, predatory conferences now outnumber legitimate congresses held by scholarly societies. Today, one can attend multiple predatory conferences every month of the year in nearly any major city, from Tokyo to Toronto and Sydney to Helsinki. Competition between predatory companies has become so fierce that even smaller cities have become targets. There are even conference alert websites devoted entirely to promoting predatory events. The sheer number of predatory conferences, sometimes called questionable conferences, combined with the increasing sophistication of the organizing companies, means any unknown conference should be viewed as predatory until proven otherwise.

WHAT IS A PREDATORY CONFERENCE?

To be classified as predatory, the conference organizer needs to meet three criteria: the organizer holds low-quality academic meetings for the primary aim of making money—not supporting scholarship; there is no effective peer review, allowing anyone to purchase a speaking slot; the organizer employs deceit, the most common forms being false claims of peer review, hiding the company headquarters' true location, and concealing the for-profit nature of the company.

With few exceptions, this paper will avoid naming specific predatory conference organizers, for two reasons. First, many companies closely follow what is written about them and quickly make cosmetic changes to their websites in an attempt to escape the predatory label. Second, companies frequently change names or rebrand their conferences. For example, OMICS International, currently being sued by the US Federal Trade Commission for deceptive trade practices, organizes conferences under at least four different brands, including: Conference Series, Pulsus Group, EuroSciCon, and Life Science Events.

Some predatory organizers started out as predatory publishers and expanded into conferences. Others focus exclusively on conference organizing, though they may also funnel papers to predatory publishers. University faculty