circulation emphasizes the potential benefits for both the sending and receiving countries as a consequence of the continuous and circular moves of scholars. Previous studies have discussed the benefits of short-term brain circulation, such as the development of international scholarly networks, knowledge transfer and exchange, and the addition of human capital through return mobility. In order to fully realize the potential benefits from the circular moves of the international visiting scholars, further studies and policy arrangements on the population are crucial.

From the perspective of the internationalization of higher education, international visiting scholars are relevant in some key approaches in internationalizing universities. As participants in the international scholarly exchanges at universities, they can potentially stimulate international connections of scholars at universities in other countries. They might also engage in international research collaborations during their visits. In addition, their international experiences create important learning opportunities to broaden their professional and personal perspectives. As faculty members, their international academic experiences could influence university education through their instruction and curriculum, which directly or indirectly affects the education of their students. At universities that host international visiting scholars, they can be resources for internationalization by effectively integrating themselves in the community.

From the perspective of the internationalization of higher education, international visiting scholars are relevant in some key approaches in internationalizing universities.

Although brain circulation and internationalization highlight potential uses of international visiting scholars, current institutional and national initiatives have not paid much attention to international scholar exchange—as compared with international student exchange. Although there are some governmental initiatives for international visiting scholars, such as Fulbright visiting scholar programs or the China Scholarship Council, many international visiting scholars move individually with little relevance to the institutional and national policies on the internationalization of higher education. The development of a more coordinated system of scholarly exchange through international visiting scholars will be meaningful—not only for the individual scholars but also for the institutions to enhance the research and teaching capacities, as well as the overall internationalization of the universities. ■

Global Student Mobility: The Changing Landscape

Philip G. Altbach and David Engberg

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu. David Engberg is executive director of the Global Opportunities Group, a consulting firm. E-mail: dave@g-o-group.com. This article appeared in the New Statesman, London.

Student mobility is at the heart of higher education globalization. While massive open online courses (MOOCs), branch campuses, and education hubs may be au courant, students who cross borders to study remain the single, most-important element of internationalization. Over 4.3 million students studied abroad in 2011, more than double the number of mobile students a decade earlier. Based on the large majority for degrees, however, many stay for a semester or year of overseas experience. The flow of international students is mainly from South to North, and particularly from Asia to the main English-speaking academic powerhouses of the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, although large numbers also study in France, Germany, and other countries.

Contrary to popular wisdom, the majority of these students are self-sponsored—they shoulder the entire cost of their education—often bringing large amounts of money to the major host countries and their universities. At the same time, they are costing their families and their country's balance of payments large sums. Overseas study is now big business, with the United Kingdom and the United States each earning around US$24 billion per annum. International mobility is a significant expense for the sending countries, mainly for the students and their families and to some extent for governments.

Why do students study abroad? The reasons are manifold and include obtaining knowledge—and credentials—unavailable at home, gaining the prestige of a foreign degree, gaining access abroad when the doors may be closed at home, and, of course, emigration. For example, about 80 percent of overseas students obtaining doctoral degrees in the United States, from both China and India, do not return home immediately after graduation.

Contemporary Trends

There are a number of discernible trends in the world of global student mobility. Among these are:

• The commercialization of international mobility: Host countries increasingly see international students as revenue generators. The United Kingdom and Australia have been most aggressive in this respect—charging overseas students higher fees than domestic students (except for students from the Bologna countries in Britain's case) in the hope of earning income for cash-strapped higher education systems. At least two American states, New York and Washington, and many universities, have identified foreign students as income generators. State legislators in Washington have proposed adding a 20 percent surcharge to international students' tuition fees. At two well-known universities in the midwest United States, international students pay additional fees beyond tuition.

Contrary to popular wisdom, the majority of these students are self-sponsored—they shoulder the entire cost of their education—often bringing large amounts of money to the major host countries and their universities.

• The expansion of undergraduate mobility: Traditionally, most students studying abroad were postgraduate or professional students. These still constitute the large majority, but the biggest growth area is among undergraduate students. In the United States, international undergraduate enrollments outpaced graduate enrollments for the first time in 2011, with the gap continuing to grow.

• The ongoing commitment of Europe to student mobility: The European Union stands out globally as a region, where the mobility of students and staff is a high priority for policymakers. Notable evidence of this is the European Union's newly launched "Erasmus+" program, with a budget of €14.7 billion, which aims to provide opportunities for over 4 million Europeans to study, train, gain work experience, and volunteer abroad, in the period 2014–2020. However, there are immense differences across Europe in terms of national-level policies, support mechanisms, and practical outcomes of student mobility initiatives. These discrepancies across the region have been exacerbated by the economic crisis of recent years, which has posed particularly difficult challenges to many European countries trying to expand, and even sustain, tertiary education mobility opportunities for their citizens.

• More diverse geographical patterns of mobility: While global mobility remains mostly a South to North phenomenon, flows have become more varied and complex. Several sending countries have become receiving nations as well. An example is Malaysia, which hosts approximately 58,000 international students and has positioned itself as an "education hub," while at the same time 54,000 Malaysians study abroad. Singapore and Hong Kong are hubs as well. Egypt hosts students from elsewhere in the Islamic world. China, the world's largest sending country, also hosts 77,000 international students, a significant portion of them taking advantage of government scholarships to study for free.

National Scholarship Programs

Our recent research, sponsored by the British Council and the Deutsche Akademische Austauchdienst (Germany Academic Exchange Service), looks at government-funded, outward-mobility scholarships in 11 countries—Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Mexico, Pakistan, Russia, Saudi Arabia, and Vietnam. Key questions include: Why are they established? How are they administered and funded? Who participates? And what impact are they having? Preliminary results reveal both similarities and differences in approaches.

In terms of scale, Brazil, Saudi Arabia, and China have made the largest commitments. Brazil's Ciência sem Fronteiras (Science Without Borders) program, launched in 2011, aims to send a total of 101,000 graduate and undergraduate students abroad, for full- and partial-degree training, by 2015.

Saudi Arabia's King Abdullah Scholarship Program is even more ambitious. It is providing full-degree scholarships for more than 164,000 students, the majority of whom study in the United States. It is funded through 2020.

Since 2007, China has created doctoral, master's, and bachelor's scholarships that send approximately 11,000 students abroad each year. No end dates have been announced for these programs, meaning their numbers could dwarf the Brazil and Saudi Arabia schemes in time.

In each of the remaining countries, we are studying mobility scholarship totals that equal around 1,000 per year. India was the lone exception. Despite enrolling more than 20 million students and being the world's third-largest tertiary education system—behind China and the United States—its national government funds just one program that sends 30 students from underrepresented groups abroad each year, to pursue master's and doctoral studies.

When examining why countries establish study abroad scholarships, similar motivations emerged. Most common was an interest in developing expertise in key fields, mostly

science and technology related, that were either unavailable or of poor quality at the countries' own universities. This motivation was not surprising—given that, to differing degrees, all of the countries in our study are striving to improve economic growth and global competitiveness.

Another shared goal is improvement of government and education infrastructure. Indonesia and Vietnam, for example, sponsor grants that send current and prospective university educators abroad for doctoral-degree training; in both countries, few academics hold doctorates. Indonesia's SPIRIT scholarships provide study grants to government workers in 11 national agencies, with the goal of improving civic regulations and human resources. China's new master's and doctoral scholarships were developed in an effort to increase collaboration with universities abroad, contribute to improvements in teaching and research, and encourage administrative reform. In every country, government scholarships are also touted as a way to support outstanding students, advance their career prospects, and improve their communication skills, especially in English.

Who is receiving these government scholarships? Our research did not collect demographic data that would allow for a refined examination of participation by sex, age, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status. In general, however, participation closely correlates with a program's goals. In China, for example, applicants for scholarships, intended to help build elite universities, must themselves be enrolled at China's top institutions. Only current government workers in Indonesia may apply for scholarships geared toward promoting civic reform. Otherwise, we found that admissions criteria are generally clear, nondiscriminatory, and merit based.

How scholarship programs are administered differs between and within countries. In some cases, they are managed by the ministry of education. In others, they are coorganized between a government office and university or an organization, such as the British Council, that is affiliated with a foreign government. A more recent and popular model, especially for large programs, is oversight by a government-affiliated nonprofit organization. For example, in the case of Kazakhstan, prior to 2005, its Ministry of Education and Science managed Bolashak, the country's flagship outward mobility scholarship but contracted with agencies from other countries—to help identifying host institutions and preparing scholarship recipients for their study experience. Following an audit revealing inefficiencies in this approach, the Center for International Programs, a joint-stock Kazakh company, was founded and today oversees day-to-day operations.

Our research revealed that governments predominately fund outward mobility scholarships themselves. Egypt and Pakistan are two exceptions. Both countries sponsor a number of small-scale awards, principally to support graduate study, but often in partnership with foreign governments or organizations that underwrite some or all of the scholarships' costs.

While government-sponsored outward mobility scholarships support only a small proportion of the world's international students, they constitute a significant source of funding. In an attempt to maximize their investment and limit brain drain, many countries now require that recipients return home to work following their studies. China, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Russia, and Vietnam, among others, have all instituted return-to-work/study requirements, with sizable penalties for breeching a contract.

When examining why countries establish study abroad scholarships, similar motivations emerged.

With 100s—sometimes 1,000s—of better-educated citizens returning home each year, outward mobility scholarships are clearly having an impact on the countries that sponsor them. Yet, assessing the impact is hard to gauge—in part because few countries have established formal procedures for measuring results, beyond counting program alumni.

Nevertheless, the fact that the number of these programs is increasing suggests that countries believe their impact exceeds their cost. If nothing else, they represent an expedient way for countries with poor or limited domestic educational opportunities to invest in areas of critical knowledge need; promote institutional reform; improve communications and connections with people and organizations abroad; and support their best and brightest. They may also be symbolically important, representing a country's overt (publicly funded) effort to engage with the global higher education and knowledge communities. This may be seen as a small-scale, yet, crucial aspect of national development strategies today.

Conclusion

Today, outward mobility scholarships are an increasingly common aspect of the complex and expanding globalization landscape. While the benefits of overseas study scholarships accrue directly to individuals, a private good, an increase in the number of nations deploying them implies they are also understood to be a worthy investment in the public good.