

The percentage of HEIs having a dedicated budget has grown in the first three editions of the Global Survey, from 50 percent at the time of the 1st Global Survey (2003) to 73 percent at the time of the 3rd Global Survey (2009), then dropped to 61 percent at the time of the 4th Global Survey (2014) and slightly increased again to 64 percent in the 5th Global Survey (2018). The decrease of the presence of a dedicated budget between 2009 and 2014 can be interpreted as an effect of the global financial crisis and of related funding cuts at HEIs. The changing political climate of the past years does not seem to have had a negative impact. Still, overall, in the last 15 years as many as one-third of respondent HEIs have not had a dedicated budget for internationalization.

Regarding the percentage of HEIs indicating that they have a monitoring framework, the 5th Global Survey indicates a new record with 73 percent. However, the increase seems to have happened between 2005 and 2009, while in the last eight years the figure has stabilized. Almost one quarter of the responding institutions do not have monitoring framework in place.

---

**The decrease of the presence of a dedicated budget between 2009 and 2014 can be interpreted as an effect of the global financial crisis and of related funding cuts at HEIs.**

---

#### INCREASING INEQUALITY

The results of the 5th IAU Global Survey show that the presence of an institution-wide policy/strategy for internationalization, as well as the presence of a dedicated office or team to oversee its implementation, are becoming the norm at HEIs around the world. However, in terms of financial resources and monitoring and evaluation, the results, although encouraging, show that there is still room for improvement. While the allocation of dedicated financial resources may have been hindered by the consequences of the global financial crisis, the stagnation in the development of a monitoring framework in the last nine years suggests that there is a group of HEIs for which strategic internationalization is not yet a reality.

The majority of the respondents to the survey attach a high level of importance to internationalization, which is an increase over the last three years. However, this increase

has happened mainly at HEIs where the level was already high. This might signal a growing inequality between HEIs, and is further reflected in the risks of internationalization identified by survey respondents. Indeed, the main institutional risk cited by respondents is “international opportunities accessible only to students with financial resources.” This expresses a concern among HEI representatives that disadvantaged students may be left out as a result of globalization, and that institutions should be more inclusive.

The question is: does this matter, and if it does, how? According to the results of the EAIE Barometer of 2018, there is a positive correlation between the presence of a strategic approach to internationalization and its perceived success. The definition of “success” in internationalization is controversial, but the benefits of having a strategic approach and the reasons why it is a reality at some (but not all) HEIs is worth further thought and investigation. It will also be interesting to see in the coming years, as well as in future surveys, whether the current global political climate has an impact on inequality. ■

---

## What Do We Know about Student Mobility in Mexico?

MAGDALENA L. BUSTOS-AGUIRRE

*Magdalena L. Bustos-Aguirre is associate professor at Universidad de Guadalajara (UdeG), Mexico. E-mail: magda.bustos@gmail.com.*

*Patlani*—which means “to fly” in Nahuatl—is a survey of student mobility in Mexico published biennially since 2012 by the National Association of Universities and Higher Education Institutions (ANUIES). It presents information on international outgoing and incoming credit mobility, as well as on incoming degree-seeking mobility. It gathers data through an online questionnaire sent to Mexican higher education institutions (HEIs), with responses integrated in each report. It constitutes to this day the only publicly available source of statistics on student mobility in Mexico. It has survived changes in administration and funding during the last decade and its reputation and reliability have grown consistently over the years. Since the base survey is only sent to ANUIES members, its answers represent approximately 10 percent of Mexican HEIs; although it often includes data on outbound degree-seeking mobility from other sources, that data point cannot be seen as comprehen-

sive as it includes only selected institutions from among non-ANUIES members. More limited than Open Doors of the International Institute of Education (IIE) in the United States, this report is unique in the Latin American context.

Patlani's most recent edition reported 29,401 outbound credit-earning students for the 2015–2016 academic year, which represents less than 0.5 percent of the national HE enrollment and close to 1 percent of the enrollment at surveyed HEIs. Now up to 15,941, the number of outgoing students has almost doubled since academic year 2012–2013. Further, outgoing credit mobility in Mexico reflects mobility trends in other parts of the world: the majority of Mexican students abroad are women (55 percent), credit seeking (86 percent), undergraduates (79 percent), and studying social sciences, management, or law (40 percent). In terms of destination countries and regions, most Mexican students

---

**On average, the group reported having studied foreign languages as an extracurricular activity for four years in total.**

---

travel to study in Spain (26 percent), the United States (17 percent), France (6 percent), Canada (5 percent), or Germany (5 percent); three out of five outbound students (17,763) choose Europe as their destination abroad, and two out of five study either in North America (6,701) or in Latin America and the Caribbean (5,911). In the 2015–2016 academic year, Tecnológico de Monterrey (“Tec”) was the leading institution with regard to outbound credit mobility with 7,331 students, followed far behind by Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) with 3,786 students, Universidad del Valle de México (UVM) with 1,826 students, Universidad de Guadalajara with 1,672 students, and Universidad de Monterrey (UdeM) with 1,156 students. Although public HEIs—like UNAM and Universidad de Guadalajara—enroll approximately 65 percent of Mexico's students, elite private HEIs, such as Tec, UVM, and UdeM have the highest mobility ratios.

#### FEATURES OF MOBILE MEXICAN STUDENTS

Aside from statistics provided by Patlani, little is known about Mexican students studying abroad for credit. In a search for answers, the author conducted a survey among Mexican students participating in international credit mobility and collected 533 responses from six HEIs, one private and five public.

Most students participating in the survey are women (60 percent), undergraduates studying social sciences, management, or law (54 percent), and single with no children (95 percent); they have on average 1.8 siblings, with students from the public HEIs belonging to larger families than their peers at the private HEI. The average daily family income was US\$29, almost 6 times the minimum wage and well above the global poverty line. Income among students in the private HEI was four times higher. Half of all participating students reported that their parents had a university degree (51 percent of the mothers and 57 percent of the fathers), with a subset of at least 10 percent holding a graduate degree. Four out of five parents of students at the private HEI had a university degree vs. one in every three parents of students at the public HEIs. On average, the group reported having studied foreign languages as an extracurricular activity for four years in total; 25 percent had studied a foreign language during elementary school; and 45 percent reported being proficient in one foreign language, 18 percent in two foreign languages, and 3 percent in three or more. The ratio of students from the private HEI vs public HEIs who reported proficiency in at least one foreign language was 4 to 1.

Many of the students reported having experienced some form of “foreignness”: 41 percent had changed their residency to enter higher education; 87 percent reported having friends who studied abroad; 29 percent had temporarily hosted someone from a different culture or country, who was not related to their family; 20 percent had lived close to a border; 4 percent had a dual nationality and 7 percent had parents, siblings, or children of their own with a nationality other than Mexican; 96 percent reported having already traveled internationally and 34 percent had lived in a foreign country for at least two months; 6 percent reported previous international academic experiences. These same mobile students had taken on average 2.5 trips abroad in the previous four years and showed a good degree of independence: 32 percent had traveled with companions other than their nuclear family and 15 percent had traveled alone. As seen throughout the survey, there were more features of mobility capital among students from the private HEI.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

Results indicate that outgoing student mobility in Mexico requires some measure of economic stability, higher levels of social and cultural capital, and some familiarity with “foreignness,” all common characteristics among middle and upper social classes. This is confirmed by statistics in Patlani, which reveal that one in every three Mexican students abroad during 2015–2016 was enrolled in one of the top elite private HEIs. Credit mobility in Mexico seems there-

fore to be an option only for a very small group of privileged students. Nevertheless, statistics also reveal that public HEIs have been successful, to a certain degree, in compensating a lack of financial capital with well-resourced internationalization offices that make study abroad possible for their less affluent student body.

Finally, the study discussed here confirms research on credit mobility in other parts of the world, in particular in developing and emerging countries that do not have supportive programs like ERASMUS+ in Europe: credit mobility is still a luxury that only a small elite of students can afford. ■

---



---

## The Challenges of Attracting and Retaining International Faculty

**WONDWOSEN TAMRAT**

*Wondwosen Tamrat is associate professor, founder-president of St. Mary's University, Ethiopia, and PROPHE affiliate. E-mail: wondwosentamrat@gmail.com or preswond@smuc.edu.et.*

The value of international faculty in terms of infusing talent and diversity and improving the status of any given higher education system, is widely acknowledged. Despite the similarity of interest in attracting such faculty, the purposes for which international faculty are hired differ from one context to the other. Inevitably, this difference of purpose is reflected in the operational tasks of attracting, recruiting, hiring, and retaining international faculty.

Ethiopia is a country that has never been colonized, but the history of its modern education reflects a heavy and systemic dependence on foreign personnel. The indelible marks of foreign expatriates are noticeable in areas such as the establishment of schools, the design of policies and curricula, and their employment as advisers, officials, principals, and teachers in the various levels of the education system.

When Ethiopia's first Western modern institution, Menelik II School, was opened in 1908, it had to rely on Egyptian Copts. Both the principal and the teachers involved in the Teferi Mekonen School, which was set up later, in 1925, were similarly international faculty who

came mainly from French Lebanon, while the position of administrator was left to Hakim Workneh Eshete, a foreign educated Ethiopian. Ethiopia's modest attempt to kickstart its modern education system before the beginning of the Italo-Ethiopian war in 1935 was staffed by a few hundred teachers, including foreign faculty. Before the war, French was the dominant foreign language used in schools.

After the Italian occupation (1935–1941), which was responsible for annihilating or forcing into migration a large number of local intelligentsia, Ethiopia had again to rely on foreign professionals to rebuild its modern education system from scratch. As a result of the Allied Forces' assistance in liberating Ethiopia in 1941, the period from 1942 until 1952 was dominated by the significant presence and influence of the British in the education sector and other government ministries. British experts and teachers were replaced by Americans in the second half of the 1950s, due to Ethiopia's strengthened links with the United States through what was then called Point Four Program of Technical Assistance (later renamed as Agency for International development–AID). In the next two decades, the United States had a huge influence in many sectors, including education, where it was involved in reorganizing the ministry of education, supplying needed manpower, materials, and textbooks, and setting up the first higher education institutions (HEIs) in the country.

When the University College of Addis Ababa (UCAA, the first institution of higher learning in the country) was established in 1950, the teachers and its president were Jesuit Canadians. As a matter of fact, UCAA had no Ethiopian faculty during the first four years of its existence. The same was true about a handful of colleges that were founded from 1950 to 1960. The number and nationalities of international faculty recruited in these HEIs were influenced by how they were established, the nationalities of their leaders, and the employment policies of each particular institution. Although there was some change toward the end of the Imperial government, as a result of the deliberate “Ethiopianization” policy it pursued, the Haile Selassie I University (HSIU, now Addis Ababa University) remained dominated by international faculty. In 1973, 54 percent of the HSIU staff were foreigners.

The balance between international and local staff in Ethiopian HEIs changed significantly after the 1974 revolution, which drove many foreign staff out of the country owing to the country's adoption of a socialist policy and its subsequent relation with countries of the Eastern bloc. The huge gap created by the departure of Western expats was filled by staff recruited from socialist countries, but the dependence on foreign faculty continued for as long as a decade after the socialist government assumed power. Out