

increasing regional competitiveness through economic innovation by means of higher education and research. The economic crisis slowed down and, for some countries, reversed the process. In many countries, there will still be a need in the near future to further reduce government debt, undercutting the space for government outlays for higher education and research.

The financial and economic crisis hit Europe harder than the United States in terms of bailout costs of banks and decline in GDP. This was felt by universities and students alike.

The EU program for student exchange, Erasmus, has been beneficial to maintain and even increase student mobility during the crisis. However, intra-EU student mobility (4 percent of the total university enrollment) is relatively low compared to student mobility within the United States. The mobility of well-off students from countries with serious funding deficits (mostly in the south) to Western Europe is likely to increase, even though language differences in Europe continue to present a major barrier to mobility.

The EU is now relatively homogeneous in terms of university degree structure, with the levels of bachelor, master, and PhD, thanks to the process initiated with the Bologna agreement in 1999. However, the organizational structures of universities differ substantially across the EU, due to substantial differences in legislation. In some countries, universities are still highly controlled by government and enjoy little autonomy, be it financial, organizational, pedagogical, and where curriculum and even staffing are concerned. During the crisis, university reforms virtually came to a standstill, perhaps because the climate for change was not beneficial in the face of all the other uncertainties.

The competencies of university graduates are related to university funding and organization. The impact of the crisis has reduced the innovative power of EU economies, in so far as they depend on the competencies of graduates. Research productivity continued to increase, but likely as a result of pre-crisis investments. The future will show the extent to which research has been hurt by the crisis, in particular in countries (mostly in the south) with a deep recession during the crisis period. The EU Framework Program has compensated to some extent for research cuts at the national level, and encouraged convergence, while “excellency programs”—like the one in Germany, with substantial extra investments—will give rise to divergence.

Universities in the northwest of Europe and in central and eastern European countries seem to have been more resilient to the crisis, compared to those in the south. A further widening of the competencies gap between the north and south of Europe is to be expected.

There is little or no evidence to support the notion that the crisis has encouraged innovation at European universities, whether in learning content or methods, or in research.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY SAFEGUARDED

Equality of access to higher education in Europe has not suffered, if measured by the availability of financial aid to students, compared to total public expenditures on higher education. During the crisis, European countries mostly abstained from raising the private (direct) costs of higher education, as a way to compensate for cuts in public expenditures. The European tradition of guaranteeing equality of access, with low or no tuition fees and ample student grants, is heavily criticized for benefiting the upper and upper-middle classes (the children of the richer part of the population, who are more likely to go to university.) From this perspective, the alternative of higher private costs and social loans (the system now in place in the United Kingdom) would be fairer. However, this alternative does not seem to fit in the political traditions of continental Europe.

Still, in comparison to the United States, Europe may not have fared too badly during the crisis in terms of preserving equality of access. The United States, with substantially higher tuition fees, may have lost its edge in promoting intergenerational mobility through higher education. It is likely that the crisis made it more difficult for youngsters from low and middle-income groups to participate in higher education, compared to Europe (with similar levels of student aid in relation to GDP). ■

The Global Challenge of Academic Integrity

ELENA DENISOVA-SCHMIDT

Elena Denisova-Schmidt is a lecturer at the University of St. Gallen, Switzerland, and research fellow at the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College, US. E-mail: elena.denisova-schmidt@unisg.ch.

The *Wall Street Journal* raises the alarm: international students enrolled at US universities typically cheat more frequently than their domestic counterparts. Accord-

ing to the newspaper, US public universities recorded about five cases of alleged cheating for every 100 foreign students, and only one for every 100 domestic students, in the 2014–2015 academic year. *The Times* of London revealed that almost 50,000 university students were caught cheating in the period between 2012 and 2015. Students from overseas—from outside the European Union—are more than four times as likely to cheat, according to the newspaper. In the same academic year, the Department of Immigration in Australia cancelled the visas of more than 9,000 international students over academic misconduct.

Why does this happen, and what does academic misconduct mean? Academic misconduct with the students' involvement includes various types cheating, such as attending classes or sitting for exams on another student's behalf, plagiarism, as well as services, gifts, informal agreements, or payments in exchange for admission, grades, advance copies of exams and tests, preferential treatment, graduation, and sham degrees.

Students from overseas—from outside the European Union—are more than four times as likely to cheat, according to the newspaper.

WHY ARE INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS MORE LIKELY TO CHEAT?

Many of these cheating students come from countries with endemic corruption. One study conducted at several public universities in Russia—a country and an educational system with a high level of corruption—shows that the students' acceptance of the use of various cheating techniques increases significantly over the course of their university studies: “using unauthorized materials during exams” increases by 12 percent; “copying off during exams or tests,” by 25 percent; “downloading term papers (or other papers) from the internet”, by 15 percent; “purchasing term papers (or other papers) from special agencies or from other students,” by 12.5 percent; and “giving a professor fraudulent or misleading excuses for poor academic performance,” by 11 percent. The results of the same study suggest that advanced students are significantly more aware of bribes at universities than freshmen—the difference is 52 percent. Russian students often justify their activities by pointing out the necessity to learn a great deal of material by rote and to write a lot of papers for what they consider “unnecessary” classes.

Sdaxue.com, an education website, has been moni-

toring diploma mills in China since 2013. Currently, the platform has over 400 phony colleges on its list. The fake universities often try to attract students with low *gaokao* (national entrance exam) scores or inexperienced young people from small villages and towns. Those schools often choose names that sound almost identical to well-known existing Chinese universities, like, for example, the Beijing Institute of Civil Engineering and Architecture, which presents itself by using pictures from the 80-year-old Beijing University of Civil Engineering and Architecture, or the Beijing Tongji University of Medical Science, a bogus college that offers degrees only for 300 yuan (about US\$45), which was most likely inspired by the Tongji Medical College, a top medical school in China. When these fake Chinese institutions are exposed, they often just change their domain names and continue to provide their “educational” services. The *New York Times* discovered a company named Aexact offering fake online degrees all around the world in 2015. The company, with headquarters located in the Pakistani city of Karachi, used to make tens of millions of dollars in estimated revenue each year.

Differences in academic culture might be an additional reason for why international students cheat. In many countries, students are expected to repeat information from their teachers without questioning and reflecting on it; all other opinions might be considered “wrong.” Hence, some international students might experience challenges in integrating into Western “academic freedom” and need some time to realize how to work. Research papers in other countries and in other languages might be structured differently from papers written in the United States or the United Kingdom. Moreover, academic writing might be not a substantial part of the curriculum of a secondary school education in many countries. Insufficient command of the language of instruction might be a further reason for cheating.

WHAT CAN UNIVERSITIES DO?

One longitudinal observation conducted between 2004 and 2014 among students at Australian universities shows that text-matching software and educational interventions focusing on raising awareness of academic integrity might be successful remedy tools. However, this might cover only some types of cheating, which can be taught and detected, such as simply copying and pasting without attribution. The German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), in cooperation with the German Embassy in Beijing, established the *Akademische Prüfstelle* (APS) in 2001. This agency is responsible for validating all certificates earned in China and conducting interviews with interested students in a discipline they used to study in their home country. This double check, together with language tests, is often a requirement

for Chinese students to enroll at German, Austrian, Belgian, and Swiss universities. In addition to various anti-plagiarism policies and procedures integrating the use of anti-plagiarism software programs like Turnitin or Unplag, faculty should present their assignments and expectations more clearly to the students, stipulating their cultural and educational backgrounds. This might be difficult to expect and demand from faculty, however: tenure-track faculty are under pressure to publish, and teaching seems to be less important for promotion; non-tenure-track faculty are under pressure to extend their contracts; and the administration is not likely to lose international students, who contribute an important part of the university's budget. Moreover, not everyone is ready to talk about such misconduct openly, because it might be perceived as racism. These improper dependencies might have dramatic consequences: It may be possible for less qualified people, or people with falsified diplomas, to get positions of responsibility, where their incompetence might lead to dangerous mistakes involving human lives. Universities should acknowledge this problem and allocate all necessary resources to mitigate academic misconduct involving students. ■

Analyzing the Culture of Corruption in Indian Higher Education

WILLIAM G. TIERNEY AND NIDHI S. SABHARWAL

William G. Tierney is university professor, Wilbur-Kieffer professor of higher education, and codirector of the Pullias Center for Higher Education at the University of Southern California, US. He recently completed a Fulbright Fellowship to India. E-mail: wgtiern@usc.edu. Nidhi S. Sabharwal is associate professor in the Center for Policy Research in Higher Education at the National University of Educational Planning and Administration in New Delhi, India. E-mail: nidhis@nuepa.org.

All universities have individuals who commit unacceptable acts. A student cheats on an exam. A professor fakes data in an experiment. A college president enriches himself by fraud. Although singular acts of corruption are unacceptable and must be condemned, they are individual errors of judgment that differ from systemic corruption. Systemic corruption occurs when the entire system is mired in schemes that are unethical and perpetrated at institutional and systemwide levels.

Many worry that India's postsecondary system is a post-

er child for systemic corruption. India garnered worldwide attention when a cheating scandal, involving thousands of individuals who took medical examinations on behalf of students, was exposed. Answers for entrance tests to professional courses continue to be regularly leaked. Images of family members scaling walls to help their children cheat are etched in the nation's memory.

The problems are structural. Over a generation ago, the Indian government faced a dilemma: it wanted to dramatically increase the number of students attending postsecondary institutions, but it lacked adequate funding. Con-

India garnered worldwide attention when a cheating scandal, involving thousands of individuals who took medical examinations on behalf of students, was exposed.

sequently, private, nonprofit colleges became prominent. According to the Ministry of Human Resource Development, India has 35,357 higher-education institutions and 32.3 million students. 22,100 of the institutions are private colleges. Over 60 percent of private and public colleges have less than 500 students, and 20 percent have less than 100 students. Although many say that the system is riddled with corruption, most are troubled by the 22,100 private colleges. The majority of news reports pertain to those with less than 500 students.

No one claims that all private institutions are corrupt; but large-scale surveys also will not yield data about dishonest practices. Who would admit on a survey that they engage in corruption? However, the sorts of activities that we discuss below are commonly acknowledged by those involved in higher education in India. Private institutions are, by law, nonprofit. Yet, the manner in which they are managed has enabled profit through "black money," or bribery. Private colleges enable multiple actors to generate incomes for themselves and others.

DRIVERS OF CORRUPTION

Agents: Students frequently do not approach a college directly, but go through "agents," or middlemen. Colleges also depend on agents so they can admit adequate numbers of students. The agents charge the students a commission for facilitating the admission process and negotiating a discount with the college principal. Agents also charge the col-