

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

*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.*

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.

For further details, please see L. Verbik, and C. Merkley, *The International Branch Campus: Models and Trends, Observatory on Borderless Higher Education, 2006*, <http://www.obhe.ac.uk/products/reports/>. ■

## Mainland Chinese Students in Hong Kong and Macau

MEI LI

*Mei Li is senior lecturer in the Institute of Higher Education at East China Normal University. Address: Institute of Higher Education, School of Educational Science, East China Normal University, Shanghai, 200062, China. E-mail: limeiwang@yahoo.com.*

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 323 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 higher education quality levels in China (50.0%), the lack of internationalization (44.9%), and the inability to secure scholarships (33.5%) in Hong Kong. The problems in their homeland mentioned by mainland students in Macau were: lack of internationalization (44.5%), difficulty to improve foreign languages (35.6%), and lack of suitable programs (29.5%).

These findings indicate consistent views on the absence of internationalization of universities on the mainland, which

reflects that mainland institutions do not conform to international practice and have limited global links and a small percentage of international faculty and students. Institutions in Hong Kong and Macau mostly adopt a bilingual (English and Chinese) medium of instruction. The University of Hong Kong and Hong Kong University of Science and Technology use English as the official language of administration and teaching.

The respondents, 20.3 percent in Macau and 3.4 percent 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

*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%).*

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 (69.0%),

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. ■

## India: The New Private Sector

#### ASHA GUPTA

*Asha Gupta is a PROPHE affiliate, a former college principal, and the author of the forthcoming book, Looking Beyond Universities: Higher Education in the 21st Century. E-mail: ashagupta@vsnl.com.*

*IHE* devotes a column in each issue to a contribution from PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, headquartered at the University of Albany. See <http://www.albany.edu/dept/eaps/prophe/>.

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

*Notably, India's private primary and secondary schools have greater credibility than private higher education institutions.*

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 1980s 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.