

creditation schemes, credit systems, tuition and scholarship programs, teaching approaches, entrance and examination requirements, language of instruction, thesis/dissertation supervision are a few of the issues that collaborating institutions need to address.

A challenge facing the higher education community around the world is to develop a common understanding of what double/multiple programs actually mean.

CRITICAL QUESTIONS

My analysis of double/multiple-degree programs, by several national higher education organizations, shows that there is no one model. Nor, should there be one standard model as local conditions vary enormously. However, important new questions are being raised as the number and types of double/multiple programs increase. For example, which is the best route for accreditation of double/multiple-degree programs—national, binational, regional, or international accreditation? Can one thesis/dissertation fulfill the requirements of two research-based graduate programs? Are international collaborative programs encouraging the overuse of English language and the standardization of curriculum? Will status building and credentialism motives eventually jeopardize the quality and academic objectives of these international collaborative degree programs? Are these programs sustainable without additional internal or external supplementary funding?

INTEGRITY AND LEGITIMACY OF QUALIFICATIONS ARE AT STAKE

A challenge facing the higher education community around the world is to develop a common understanding of what double/multiple programs actually mean, the academic requirements and qualifications offered, and how they differ from joint-degree programs. Joint-degree programs are very attractive alternatives but face legal and bureaucratic barriers, as it is impossible in many countries to offer a joint qualification with another institution. Most importantly, a rigorous debate on the vexing questions of accreditation, recognition, and “legitimacy” of the qualifications needs

to take place to ensure that international double/multiple-degree programs are respected and recognized by students, institutions, and employers around the world and that double/multiple-degree programs do not become known for offering “discount degrees.” ■

Is the United States the Best in the World? Not in Internationalization

MADELEINE F. GREEN

Madeleine F. Green is senior fellow at the International Association of Universities and at NAFSA: Association of International Educators. A longer version of this article appears in NAFSA's e-publication, Trends and Insights. E-mail: madeleinefgreen@gmail.com.

The American narrative about its higher education system is “the best in the world.” This assertion is largely based on the US research output, but other nations are closing the gap. Can the United States claim any worldwide pre-eminence in internationalization? Data from the *4th Global Survey of Internationalization of Higher Education*—conducted by the International Association of Universities (IAU), providing a unique opportunity to compare US perceptions and practices with those of other countries—suggests that the answer is *no*.

THE IAU SURVEY

Conducted in 2013, the survey elicited responses from a total of 1,336 institutions worldwide (approximately a 20% response rate), of which 209 were from the United States (approximately a 14% response rate). For comparability of data with the worldwide population of institutions that IAU surveyed, community colleges were not included in the US survey group. Within the US respondent group, 49 percent were doctorate-granting institutions; 26 percent master's-degree level, and 25 percent granted baccalaureates only. Nearly 55 percent were private, not for profit; 3 percent private for profit; and 42 percent public. The IAU respondent population included 66 percent doctoral institutions.

The full report analyzes global responses, as well as regional ones, and highlights changes from previous surveys. In the regional analyses, the United States and Canada comprise the North American region. Of the 253 respondents in North America, 209 were from the United States.



In addition to our Web site and Facebook page, we are now tweeting. We hope you will consider “following” us on Twitter!

This summary highlights a selected group of responses to questions about the overall institutional commitment to internationalization, including perceptions of leadership commitment, the presence of an internationalization strategy, and infrastructural supports. It also looks at the interest in the United States on the part of institutions in other regions, as a focus for their internationalization efforts, as well as the geographic targets of interest for US institutions.

INTERNATIONALIZATION STRATEGY

Although the overwhelming majority of American institutions mention internationalization in their institutional mission statement and/or strategic plan, US respondents were less likely to do so than all respondents (86% vs. 92%). (Note that “all respondents” or “global respondents” include US respondents.) US respondents were also less likely than all respondents to indicate that their institution had a strategic plan for internationalization (43% vs. 53%). About an equal proportion of US respondents and all respondents indicated that such a plan was being prepared (22% for the United States compared to 23% for all). It is interesting to note that of all regions, Europe was the most likely to have a strategy in place (61%).

The most striking difference is the proportion of US institutions that do not have an internationalization strategy (15%)—double that for all responding institutions (7.5%).

Some institutions choose to incorporate internationalization in the overall institutional plan rather than create a separate one for internationalization. A slightly lower proportion of US institutions, than of all institutions, reported having internationalization as a part of the overall institutional strategy (16% vs. 19%).

IMPORTANCE OF INTERNATIONALIZATION TO INSTITUTIONAL LEADERS

The findings about institutional strategy align with the relative level of importance of internationalization for institutional leaders. Respondents reported that US institutional leaders were less likely to assign a high level of importance to internationalization than were all respondents. 69% of all respondents indicated that internationalization was of high importance to their institutional leaders, compared to 53 percent of US respondents. More than twice as many US respondents as compared with all respondents indicated that internationalization was of low importance to institutional leaders (11% to 5%).

INTERNATIONALIZATION STRATEGIES AND INFRASTRUCTURAL SUPPORTS

Institutional capacity to support internationalization is another useful measure of institutional commitment to internationalization. US institutions were less likely than all in-

stitutions to have any of the typical infrastructural support mechanisms for internationalization, including dedicated office, dedicated budget, monitoring or evaluation framework, or explicit targets or benchmarks. Additionally, US institutions were less likely to include an international dimension in other institutional policies.

GEOGRAPHIC PRIORITIES FOR INTERNATIONALIZATION

Increasingly, institutions are focusing their internationalization efforts in specific geographic regions. Slightly more than half of US institutions (52%) indicated that they had specific geographic priorities for internationalization, compared to 60 percent of all respondents. European higher education institutions were the most likely to have such a priority (66%) and African higher education institutions were the least (44%).

The IAU survey reveals that cooperation with North America is not a priority for most regions. An important finding is that intraregional cooperation was the top-ranked geographic priority for Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Europe. Europe was a top priority for Latin America, the Caribbean, and the Middle East. Only Latin America and the Caribbean respondents indicated that North America was the top-regional priority for internationalization. North America was ranked second by the Middle East, and third for Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Europe.

Although the overwhelming majority of American institutions mention internationalization their institutional mission statement and/or strategic plan, US respondents were less likely to do so than all respondents (86% vs. 92%).

About half of the US respondents ranked Asia and the Pacific as one of their top three geographic priorities (first by 34% of respondents, second by 11%, and third by 4%). The second overall regional priority, Latin America and the Caribbean, was not as strong, with a total of 38 percent ranking it as one of their top three geographic priorities. Only 7 percent ranked it first, 17 percent second, and 14 percent third.

The Asia and Pacific region was North America's top-priority region for recruitment of international students. Latin America and the Caribbean were ranked second and the Middle East third. Looking in the other direction, no region selected North America as its top-target region for

recruiting international students.

CONCLUSION

The IAU global survey reveals that US institutions do not assign as high a priority to internationalization, as others around the world. They are less likely to have a strategic plan for internationalization in place or under development; and their leaders are perceived as assigning less importance to internationalization. In all measures of infrastructural supports, US institutions lag behind, including the likelihood of having a dedicated office, dedicated budget, monitoring and evaluation system, or explicit targets or benchmarks.

A sobering note for the United States is its relative status, as a potential priority for the internationalization efforts of institutions from other regions. When institutions do look outside their regions, North America is not generally a first choice. Europe is first or second for all regions, except North America.

The data from the IAU survey suggest that the United States cannot rely on the old narrative that it is leading the way in higher education. Institutions and governments around the world are intensifying their internationalization policies and strategies. Is the United States up to this challenge? ■

Private Higher Education's Distinctive Niche in New Zealand

MALCOLM ABBOT

Malcolm Abbot is an associate professor at Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne, Australia, and PROPHE Associate Senior Colleague, University at Albany, State University of New York. E-mail: mabbott@swin.edu.au. IHE regularly publishes articles from PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, headquartered at the University at Albany. See <http://www.albany.edu/dept/eaps/prophe/>.

Most developed countries have solid, traditionally established, public higher education institutions. These institutions are generally well-resourced, have subsidized enrollments, and possess solid reputations. They thus leave little space for the private sector to develop at that level. Typical of this state of affairs is New Zealand, whose higher education sector is dominated by a number of government-owned universities and polytechnics. Despite this dominance over the past 25 years it has been legally possible

for private providers to deliver higher education (diploma and degree) programs. In doing so, these private providers have developed a number of characteristics that distinguish them from the government providers. This means that the private sector is a small, but significant part of New Zealand higher education sector. In 2013 there were 265,362 equivalent, full-time students in higher education in New Zealand (degrees and diplomas); 38,964 of such students were enrolled by private providers or 14.7 percent of the total (New Zealand, Ministry of Education, Education Counts).

To enable the private higher education sector to come into existence, legal reform first had to occur. Before 1989, the only providers permitted to deliver higher education programs were government-owned ones (universities delivered degrees and polytechnics diplomas). The *Education Act 1989* then allowed for the private delivery of both degree and diploma higher education programs, as well as the delivery of degrees by polytechnics. From the old Department of Education, the New Zealand Qualifications Authority was created, which was given the role of accrediting new diploma and degree programs of the government polytechnics as well as that of the private providers.

RESTRICTED PRIVATE NICHES

During the 1990s the policy of the National Party Government was to promote growth of the private sector, by increasing its funding of enrollments in the sector. At this time it was accepted by the government that private providers would compete directly with the public providers, both for funding and for students. This attitude changed in 1999 when the Labour Party came to office. Gradually from 2001 a freeze on the number of funded places in the private sector was imposed. The view of the government then was that funding should be directed toward those providers that could show that they were meeting demands not adequately met by the government sector. The National Party's return to office in 2008 was accompanied by expectations of increases in funding for the private sector and a loosening of restrictions on the private sector applications. In general, this did not occur, partly because of the financial restraints placed on the government after the 2008 global financial crisis and partly because of the general acceptance by the National Party of the previous government's skeptical attitude to private education.

In 2013 there were over 300 formally registered private providers in New Zealand, compared to a government sector made up of 8 universities, 18 polytechnics, and 3 *wananga* (tertiary institutions with a Maori cultural emphasis). The private providers, obviously of smaller average size, tend to be more specialized and concentrate on providing programs in niche areas. They are—as they typically are in private higher education globally—mainly in business