

internationalization is identified as the top-societal risk by respondents in Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean. In the Middle East, respondents identified the brain drain and the loss of cultural identity as the first- and second-ranked societal risks, respectively.

FUNDING LEVELS AND ALLOCATION CHOICES

The 4th Global Survey continues to demonstrate that internationalization is still largely driven by the top institutional leaders, with the presidents, vice chancellors or rectors.

The responses that result in near-complete consensus are rare, but respondents from higher education institutions across all regions almost unanimously point to a lack of funding, as the most important barrier to advancing internationalization. This result is also consistent over time, since a similar response was found in the 3rd Global Survey. However, questions that probe this issue more deeply present a much more diverse view of the availability of funding for internationalization. When asked how the level of overall funding to support specific international activities has changed over the past three years at their institution, the largest number of respondents in all regions indicated that their institution has *increased funding* for student mobility. Similarly, the largest number of respondents in every region, except in North America, indicated that their institutions have increased funding for research collaboration.

Additionally, the institutions in Middle East and Africa have increased their funding for almost half of the areas of internationalization proposed in the questionnaire, which included a dozen specific activities as options. This is in sharp contrast to institutions in Europe or North America, where funding increases were reported by the majority of respondents in the case of only two internationalization activities, among the 12 possibilities.

The distinct strategic choices being made by institutions in different regions can also be seen by looking at the allocation of funds for specific internationalization activities and most particularly by examining which type of activity has seen increased funding. In the Middle East, Africa, and Asia and Pacific, for example, institutions are investing more in marketing and promotion of their institutions internationally, while in Latin America and the Caribbean there is a stronger focus on out-going mobility of faculty and staff. These results are very much in line with the pri-

ority activities and challenges identified by the institutions elsewhere in the survey.

A COMPLEX PICTURE

It is important to keep in mind that the results of such a comprehensive survey reveal a lot more than a few key findings. This survey, like the earlier International Association of Universities survey reports, presents data on the many different dimensions of internationalization and compares results across world regions as well as changes over time. The report covers a wide variety of aspects of internationalization: such as, infrastructural supports that institutions have put in place; the expected benefits and perceived risks of internationalization; drivers and obstacles; institutional mobility patterns and targets; as well as issues related to curricular change and learning outcomes. ■

International Students: The United Kingdom Drops the Ball

SIMON MARGINSON

*Simon Marginson is professor of International Higher Education at the Institute of Education, University of London, UK. E-mail: S.Marginson@ioe.ac.uk. (This article has appeared in *The Australian*.)*

The United Kingdom has long been a powerful attractor of international students; and its higher education sector, from local colleges to venerable global universities, has become almost as dependent on international students, as Australian institutions.

In 2011–2012 the University of Manchester enrolled 8,875 non-European Union students, which are the high fees international students, mostly from Asia, that generate surplus (EU students pay home country tuition fees). University College London enrolled 7,565 non-EU students, Edinburgh 6,045 and even Oxford 4,685. In the United Kingdom, 81 institutions draw more than 10 percent of revenue from this source. The export sector generates nearly £20 billion a year in fees and other spending.

DOWNWARD TREND

Yet, after a long period of growth total full-time students from EU and non-EU countries dropped by 1.4 percent in 2012–2013. In taught postgraduate programs—such as the one-year UK business master's degrees that are short in

content but a lucrative money-spinner—EU entrants fell 8 percent and non-EU entrants fell 1 percent.

EU student numbers were down because of the £9,000 fee regime, as expected. It is the trend in high-fee non-EU students that is generating most of the ripples. The number of students from India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh plummeted, though this was partly balanced by increases from China and Hong Kong.

The downturn has occurred in the number of students entering the United Kingdom from the subcontinent contrasts, with the partial recovery of Indian student numbers in Australia and major increases in the number of Indian students entering the United States.

The UK authorities have cracked down on rogue colleges and immigration scams in the subcontinent, but that is not the only cause of the downturn in numbers.

In sum, international education in the United Kingdom is being undermined by the consistent set of policy moves that are designed to slow inward student mobility and retard the progression from a student to migrant.

VISA AND COSTS

The cost of UK visas (US\$520) is high, compared to \$360 in the United States and only \$124 in Canada. Non-EU students are subject to individual interviews designed establish “student integrity.” Lecturers must report on non-EU students on a monthly basis.

Many universities describe the present visa regime seen as unwelcoming, discriminatory, burdensome, and intrusive. Universities UK estimates the total cost of institutional compliance at £70 million per annum.

Worse, in 2012 poststudy work visas, which allowed graduates two years of looking for work to defray the cost of their education, were scrapped. Graduates must now find jobs worth £20,600 a year within four months if they want to stay and work in the United Kingdom. This compares to two–four year poststudy work visas in Australia and three years in Canada, which is emerging as a serious competitor for the United Kingdom.

In sum, international education in the United Kingdom is being undermined by the consistent set of policy moves that are designed to slow inward student mobility and retard the progression from a student to migrant. The sole goal is to reduce immigration. The government is run-

ning scared in the face of migration resistance in the electorate.

POLITICS AND IMMIGRATION

The raw and chaotic UK debate on immigration shows no sign of ending. It is like the 2010 antimigration reaction in Australia, which also triggered a choke in international student visas, but the antimigrant feeling in the United Kingdom is more protracted.

The change agent is Nigel Farage’s UK Independence Party, now polling at 10–20 percent. Farage is a folksy communicator who complains about foreign languages on the streets and pitches to “the white working class male,” said to be crowded out of the labor market by East European migrants and neglected by Westminster.

The UK Independence Party’s position is building in the lead-up to European elections (2014) and national elections (2015). The major parties are on the defensive in relation to both EU membership and migration.

The David Cameron government has promised to hold a referendum on EU membership and cut migrants from 213,000 in 2013 to less than 100,000. International students are almost 40 percent of the migration count.

Polls show that there is much more public concern about asylum seekers and illegals than about international students, but bearing down on non-EU students is the quickest way to reduce migration.

There is much concern about the effects on export earnings, the financial viability of universities and the inward flow of global talent—for example, in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields. In a gloomy report earlier this month on the trend in international student numbers, the Higher Education Funding Council of England (HEFCE) concluded: “The recent slowdown points to increasing challenges in recruitment following a long period of growth. With education continuing to become more globalised, competition from a wider range of countries is only likely to increase....”

HEFCE says that whether there is “an enabling environment for collaboration with a wide range of countries in research, teaching and knowledge exchange” will decide if “higher education in England continues to be a key global player.”

In other words, open the door in full again or lasting damage will be done. But the UK Independence Party has the political momentum. In the present environment, the best option is to remove international students from the net migration target, and no less than seven select committees of the Houses of Commons and Lords have now called for this decision.

■