NUMBER 110
SPRING 2022

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

BOSTON COLLEGE
Lynch School of Education and Human Development
CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

DUZ medienhaus

The complete table of contents can be found on page 2.

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education

brings an international consciousness to the analysis of higher education. We believe that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center publishes the *International Higher Education* quarterly publication, a book series, and other publications; sponsors conferences; and welcomes visiting scholars. Opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center for International Higher Education.

The Center is closely related to the graduate program in higher education at the Lynch School of Education and Human Development, Boston College. The Center offers an M.A. and a Certificate of International Higher Education.

For additional information see: https://www.bc.edu/cihe

Editors Philip G. Altbach and Hans de Wit

Associate Editors Rebecca Schendel, Gerardo Blanco, and Chris Glass

Publication Editors Hélène Bernot Ullerö and Tessa DeLaquil

Editorial Office
Center for International Higher Education
Campion Hall
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467–USA

Tel: +1 617 552-4236

E-mail: ihe@bc.edu

www.internationalhighereducation.net

We welcome correspondence, ideas for articles, and reports.

Subscription:
If you would like to subscribe, please do this via: www.internationalhigher education.net/en/newsletter. There is no charge for a digital subscription; a fee of €32/year applies to a subscription to the print version which can be purchased from the publisher: https://shop.duz-medienhaus.com/international-higher-education.html.

ISBN: 978-3-96037-361-2
ISSN: 1084-0613 (print), 2372-4501 (online)

GLOBAL LEADERSHIP

THE GLOBAL ROLE OF ENGLISH IN HIGHER EDUCATION

INTERNATIONAL ISSUES

INTERNATIONAL-IZATION

COUNTRIES AND REGIONS

The Woke Debate in Academia—What Could Take Us Further?

Carel Stolker

Abstract
The current woke debate has the potential to cause a rift in our university communities. What can we do to avoid that, and how can we make sure that the debate makes us stronger as a community, instead of weaker? This article presents a few suggestions from a former university president.

"I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." These words are often ascribed to Voltaire. Wrongly, but they nonetheless show us the foundation of both freedom of speech and academic freedom. The latter, of course, is more limited than the former. Academic freedom is always subject to such conditions as integrity, quality, openness, falsification, and scientific debate. These conditions are largely *self-imposed* in order to maintain the credibility of academia, and hence its entitlement to this freedom.

Without it, the university machinery comes to a standstill. In their 2008 paper for the League of European Research Universities (LERU), Geoffrey Boulton and Colin Lucas argue that "[t]he freedom to enquire, to debate, to criticize and to speak truth to power, whether it be the power of government, of those that fund the university, or those who manage it, is central to the vitality of the university and its utility to society."

And in their joint *Code for Good Governance* (2019), the Dutch universities declare, "Universities traditionally stand for freedom of thought and speech, and the independent development of education and research. They are spaces where any question may be asked and answered in freedom. Each university strives for a culture in which people feel safe and an inspiring environment that enables the entire academic community, also including our students, to develop to its full potential."

Throughout the history of science and scholarship, all this has never been a given. The newest kid on the block in the debate on academic freedom is the woke issue. Wokeness is an interesting but complex concept that is still far from fully formed, and it is one that has taken off partly as a result of the Black Lives Matter movement. Put briefly, wokeness is a strongly activist global protest in society and in universities as a reaction to injustices, past and present, toward minorities. Anyone who takes such injustices seriously is woke, or "has woken up." And those who do not, whose eyes are shut, are putting themselves outside the academic debate, or will be kicked out.

The newest kid on the block in the debate on academic freedom is the woke issue.

There does not seem to be much leeway here. Given its close links to identity and racism, all too soon the discussion becomes personal, resulting in "cancelling" people or denying speakers the right to express their views in a university context (*"no-platforming"*). The current debate is threatening to make us into one another's hangman: I am right, and you are wrong. We are turning ourselves into victims and perpetrators, and in doing so we are undermining our education and research.

"Stay Woke"

And this is going on at a time when the world needs its universities more than ever before.

"Woke issues" are often language issues, because words are hardly ever neutral. But, besides language, there is also a movement toward "decolonization of the curriculum" (See also Fakunle, Kalinga, and Lewis, "Internationalization and Decolonization in UK Higher Education: Are We There Yet?" in this issue). We ask ourselves questions like: Are our textbooks diverse enough? Are there other voices than those of dominant Western writers? Is it primarily white male authors that are prescribed, or is there also a place for women and for authors of color? And can particular topics still be prescribed? Take, for example, a scientific approach to the history of slavery, which could be seen as overtly relativistic.

These are discussions that we need to have within our communities. Academic freedom is probably the subject on which emotions run highest within academia. But one

thing is sure: Without challenging discussion with those who hold a different opinion, there can be no education and no advances in scientific research.

Should "staying woke" not become a continuous task for *everyone* within the university?

Open Discussion as a "Must"

So, how should academia go about that? This is an urgent question. The woke debate has spread from Anglo-Saxon countries to universities on the European mainland, without a clear instruction manual. It has already become an issue for the more traditional disciplines in many universities and programs. University administrators and boards have an important leadership role here. That is no easy role, but, as we all know, an easily governed university is no university at all (Boulton & Lucas, 2008). Lecturers and students, too, have an important part to play. The challenge is how we can treat one another respectfully without the debate losing its bite.

Here are five suggestions from the sidelines (the place where I, too, find myself as an emeritus university president):

- Academic communities should not wait for instances when emotions run high but need to take the initiative and have open conversations about wokeness, and give one another space. If *we* in academia cannot have that conversation, how can we expect it of the rest of society? Let the university set an example for the world.
- Involve first-year students, too, certainly in fields with a strong international and intercultural dimension, and have this conversation in the very first weeks of their program.
- Today's universities are broadly accessible and many have also become global universities, with global communities. Some students and staff may even originate from countries that are at war with one another. The globalization of higher education is a huge benefit, and at the same time, it puts pressure on the ambition to create a university community. Students and faculty, therefore, must have the right to expect one another to be aware of their different histories, cultures, and identities.
- Universities are places for the new, the provocative, the disturbing, and the unorthodox. Be very cautious, therefore, in banning student-invited speakers. And if there is a real risk of the name of the university being misused, move the talk from the lecture hall to a space where students have their own say: student societies or debating societies (as Timothy Garton Ash once suggested).
- And finally, in decolonizing the curriculum, take care that the discussion does not focus predominantly on weeding out "old" or possibly "outdated" perspectives, insights, and arguments. Also consider whether *adding* new perspectives might not be a more effective approach. The history of science shows that it is ultimately the specific gravity of these perspectives, insights, and arguments, old and new, that will determine what will advance science and scholarship and what will have the opposite effect.

Carel Stolker is a legal scholar. Until 8 February 2021, he was Rector Magnificus and president of Leiden University. The ideas expressed in this article are his personal views. Email: c.j.j.m.stolker@leidenuniv.nl.

Speaking Out for Science and Democracy

Marcelo Knobel and Goolam Mohamedbhai

Abstract
In the face of the great challenges that humanity is facing, including the current wave of denialism and autocracy, university leaders appear to be silent. Yet, universities are vital for addressing these challenges and university leaders must show the way forward within their institutions and in society in responding to scientific and environmental misinformation. More than ever, university leaders need to speak out and cannot afford to be complacent.

We are living in unprecedented times. For decades, the world has been grappling with the major challenges of conflict and violence, violation of human rights, population displacement, alarming environmental degradation, and inequality in different forms, to name a few.

Global Challenges and Denials

Added to these, we now have to tackle the more focused challenges resulting from climate change, the COVID-19 pandemic, and a gradual but noticeable shift from democracy to authoritarianism. Of course, these threats affect different countries to varying degrees of severity but, because of globalization, the impact on any one country or region may have unpredictable, global consequences.

Astonishingly, we are also witnessing a strong and articulated movement aiming at downplaying or even denying these challenges, often motivated by vested interests. This movement is gaining momentum in a world flooded with an excess of news pouring from unverified sources, rapidly spreading through social media. In fact, the so-called information disorders have thrived with the increased entropy of the internet, the lack of understanding of scientific reasoning, and the crisis facing traditional media, among other factors. Lies appear to be traveling faster than truth, and often it is hard to distinguish between facts and fake news.

Rising Autocracy

The rise in global autocracy is also a matter of grave concern.

The rise in global autocracy is also a matter of grave concern. The 2021 report of the Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Institute of the University of Gothenburg, Sweden, provides alarming signals of threats to democracy in several parts of the world. After witnessing a marked improvement in democratization during the 1970s and 1980s, Latin America and Africa are now experiencing a constant and noticeable decline of democracy over the past decade. The V-Dem report mentions a drift toward autocratization in Brazil, India, Turkey, and the United States. It specifically names those countries where democracy has declined the most over the past decade, such as Benin, Bolivia, Mauritius, and Poland.

Brazil, for example, is witnessing a clear attempt by the Bolsonaro administration to destroy the public federal higher education and science and technology system that has been built up over the past 60 years. The attacks on university autonomy, academic freedom, and science development—including fake news, threats, judicial coercions, and, ultimately, a drastic reduction in the institutions' budgets in order to limit their functional capacity—come from different and well-organized fronts. Absolute despair has pervaded the university sector, and the clear feeling is that this situation is not echoed by society at large. Although national associations of universities and science and technology have been continuously protesting and alerting the authorities concerned, the effect of these actions has been rather limited.

Similarly, in their 2021 report, Scholars at Risk (SAR), an international network of academic organizations, reported serious threats to university autonomy and freedom of speech of scholars and students in a number of countries, including Algeria, Egypt, Hong Kong, Hungary, Russia, and Turkey. The SAR report warns of the "shrinking of the space for free inquiry and discourse" in universities.

Response from Universities

Although universities are acknowledged for their vital role in addressing the great challenges facing humanity, now and in the future, this fact is usually taken for granted and the dangers of the current wave of denialism and autocracy that the world is experiencing are not fully recognized. We all watch, almost silently, the attacks to which universities are subject. The voice of universities with regard to tackling global challenges is barely audible. In particular, university leaders are failing to provide the leadership needed by their institutions and society. Their lack of response to scientific and environmental misinformation is weakening their universities, relegating the universities to being mere teaching institutions. (See also Robert A. Scott, "Should University Presidents Have a Voice in Public Affairs?" in *IHE* #104).

Universities attract some of the best brains in any country, whether in terms of faculty/researchers or students. The latter will make up the taskforce that will be responsible for undertaking the difficult tasks of executing identified solutions in the future. The former are active participants in the contemporary scientific endeavor to arrive at those solutions. Science is the only path to salvation to overcome major challenges, and universities, especially research-intensive ones, are best positioned to generate solid scientific evidence to create new solutions and help form public policies. We cannot overemphasize the fundamental role that universities and science play in addressing the most pressing issues of humanity. Also, the dynamic intellectual discussions that emerge from universities are critical to shaping important advances in society, for example on issues related to equity, diversity, democracy, and sustainable development.

Considering the trust and respect that universities and their leaders have in society, we find that the expected and necessary response from the higher education sector on global challenges and democratic recession has been rather weak. In our view, the response needs to be more robust and compelling, because the future of our planet depends on it.

The main message that university leaders must persistently convey is that universities play a crucial role in addressing the major challenges threatening our global sustainable future, and can help to distinguish between fact and fiction. They need to explore new ways of communication to reach out to wider society, and properly position universities to defend science when it is denied by specific interest groups. In order to attract public support, they need to communicate their views clearly and succinctly, not merely by publishing their research findings in scholarly journals. University leaders must also encourage faculty and students on their campuses to engage in frank and open discussion on major national and global issues, urging them always to be guided by facts and empirical evidence. They must also support and protect faculty and students who stand up and speak out truthfully on important issues.

Breaking Away from the Comfort Zone

There are several factors that make university leaders remain in their apparent comfort zones. First of all, they have to deal with a myriad of internal challenges related to financial resources, faculty, students, etc., which consume most of their time and effort. In the case of publicly funded institutions, leaders perhaps fear that any view expressed contrary to government positions could lead to budgetary cuts for their institutions. Additionally, there are often diverging views within their universities on some issues, and voicing their specific opinions could create rifts on campus.

Finally, with the rise of autocracy, university leaders are reluctant to challenge the government and bring to light its undemocratic processes for fear of retribution, including political harassment and even termination of appointment in countries where leaders are politically appointed. But universities must understand that autocracy would mean the end of university autonomy and academic freedom, which all universities cherish. To shield itself from political repercussions, a university could join hands with other universities within the country or region, but it needs to speak out and cannot afford to be complacent.

University leaders must consider the perils that exist if they continue to remain silent. More than ever, it is important for them to speak out and try to break the bubbles in which their institutions are comfortably seated. ◢

Marcelo Knobel is a full professor of physics and former rector of the University of Campinas (Unicamp), Campinas, SP, Brazil. Email: knobel@unicamp.br.

Goolam Mohamedbhai is former vice-chancellor of the University of Mauritius and former secretary general of the Association of African Universities. Email: g_t_mobhai@yahoo.co.uk.

The European Higher Education Area Faces Its Fundamental Values

Sjur Bergan

Abstract
Backsliding of democracy puts the values of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) under pressure. The EHEA finds it difficult to deal with violations. Higher education leaders must debate issues that do not make headlines as well as those that do. They must demonstrate international solidarity, so that higher education systems in vulnerable countries receive support as they deserve and need. The EHEA must focus on a fundamental values program for the decade until 2030.

From its launch in 1999, the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) has been underpinned by a set of fundamental values: academic freedom and integrity, institutional autonomy, the participation of staff and students in higher education governance, and public responsibility for and of higher education.

Values under Pressure

The EHEA has long been complacent about its values. Over the past few years, however, it has become clear that values can no longer be taken for granted. As parts of Europe experience a backsliding of democracy, some EHEA governments and societies put the academic community under pressure.

Populism—mostly on the right, but also on the left—raises questions with regard to the need to base societal decisions on facts and hence also the need for research-based knowledge, whether on COVID vaccines or problematic aspects of our past. European countries are increasingly reluctant to accept migrants and refugees, and to deal with the paradox that little more than a century ago, Europeans migrated to many parts of the world, whether as "huddled masses," political refugees, or colonizers. Hungary saw its citizens welcomed in many countries as they fled the crushing of the 1956 uprising, but now maintains refugees are somebody else's problem. Ultimately, this general hostility to migration could lead to questioning the justification for academic mobility.

Prominently, Hungary challenges the fundamental values of the EHEA by targeting the Central European University (CEU) as well as other institutions. The "Lex CEU," the Hungarian law specifically targeting the CEU operation, was accompanied by a campaign playing on the full register of crude nationalism and anti-Semitism presenting the CEU as an alien institution financed by a Jew, George Soros. Ultimately, the CEU felt obliged to move most of its activities across the border to Vienna, Austria, but for other institutions, relocation is not an option. The Hungarian Academy of Sciences, for example, cannot operate from abroad. The government also outlawed an entire academic field, gender studies.

Restrictions in the freedom of the academic community to conduct teaching and research have also been seen in other countries. Poland makes it exceedingly difficult to publish research critical of the way Poles acted during World War II. A Russian court has just outlawed International Memorial, an NGO devoted to critical historical research, in particular on the Stalinist period. The historian Yuri Dmitriyev, who is connected to Memorial and has conducted critical research on the Gulag, recently saw his jail sentence increased to 15 years on charges that his supporters maintain are fabricated, even if the facts of the case are difficult to establish. Turkey conducted an extensive crackdown on its academic community following the failed coup attempt in July 2016.

Belarus

Belarus acceded to the EHEA in 2015, on its third attempt. In 2005, Belarus was quietly discouraged from submitting a formal application and took the advice. In 2012, its application was rejected in view of the oppression directed at members of the academic community in the wake of the presidential election held in December 2010. Its admission in 2015 was accompanied by a Roadmap that, among other things, included provisions on fundamental values. I was among those who argued in favor of accepting Belarus, because members of the academic community critical of the Lukashenka

regime feared longer term isolation if the country were kept out of the EHEA. Belarus' implementation of the Roadmap was unimpressive, but there was nevertheless a thaw of some kind until the failed presidential election in August 2020. Large street protests over weeks and months were followed by significant repression, also against members of the academic community.

Reaction within the EHEA was mixed. In November 2020, only 26 countries and five consultative members signed on to a statement by the then-Bologna Follow-Up Group (BFUG) cochairs, Germany and the United Kingdom, while Russia issued a counterstatement. Faced with the prospect of Belarus as the public face of the EHEA in the fall of 2022, however, the BFUG decided to suspend its cochairmanship in December 2021. Nevertheless, several EHEA members—including some EU countries—did not want to take a position.

One of the main challenges will be how and where to draw the line between encouraging compliance and taking action against noncompliance.

Even this cursory overview shows that a loosely organized, consensus-oriented intergovernmental process finds it difficult to deal with challenges to its basic values, for lack of political will but also because of the limited leverage of ministers of education on issues that concern the fundamentals of foreign policy and political identity. One of the main challenges will be how and where to draw the line between encouraging compliance and taking action against noncompliance.

The Responsibility of Higher Education

Higher education will harm not only itself but also our democracy if fundamental values are taken for granted or considered to be unimportant because these values are not under immediate or spectacular threat in one's own country.

The academic community needs to raise debates about issues such as the impact of general legislation, financing and governance models, the role that fundamental values should play in quality assurance, and, more broadly, the relationship between public authorities (which are responsible for education systems) and the academic community.

A recent decision by the Norwegian government to direct Nord University to reestablish a delocalized teacher education program at Nesna, population 1,761, illustrates that there are issues of fundamental values also in well-functioning democracies. Nord University had decided to discontinue the program because the university had doubts about its pertinence and quality if it were to be delocalized. While ensuring the provision of higher education in a peripheral area may well be within the competence of public authorities, it is doubtful whether that authority extends to overruling an institution that has decided to close a study program for reasons of quality and budget, without making arrangements to meet the concerns that led to the closure of the program in the first place.

In 2017, a UK member of parliament (MP) asked university leaders for the names of professors involved in teaching European affairs "with particular reference to Brexit." The MP was firmly rebutted, but the fact that such a request could even be made raises concerns.

Academics, especially those in leadership, also need to demonstrate international solidarity. Some leaders and academics in Belarus, Hungary, Russia, and Turkey—the latter three countries singled out in the 2018 EHEA implementation report—have taken courageous stands. They deserve the support of less exposed EHEA colleagues, as well as of international institutions. The latter are hampered by a consensus principle that their leaders and member states would do well to reconsider. Courageous academic leaders under pressure deserve strong support from their peers. Ultimately, this support may convince EHEA ministers to face the threats to our fundamental values and back up their words with effective measures against those who transgress and show no sign of repenting.

The EHEA needs a fundamental values decade: We should make understanding and respecting our fundamental values a main priority of the third decade of the EHEA, which will run until 2030. ◢

Through January 2022, Sjur Bergan was the head of the Education Department of the Council of Europe. Email: sjur.bergan@gmail.com.

The Unstoppable Spread of English in the Global University

Rosemary Salomone

Abstract
As English has spread across higher education worldwide, it has generated ongoing debate and a wealth of scholarship raising academic and national concerns, but with little, if any, pause or retreat on policies and practices. This article examines that puzzling disconnect within the broader framework of the rise of English as the dominant *lingua franca*, its historical grounding, its social and economic implications, and its diverse course within Europe and postcolonial countries.

A global knowledge economy, combined with the pressure of international rankings, has set universities around the world on a mission to internationalize. That mission has influenced course offerings, student recruitment, faculty hiring, and scholarship, all tied directly to English as the dominant world *lingua franca*. Policymakers, educators, and the intellectual elite continue to debate the consequent benefits and burdens for faculty members and students, and challenges for institutions, particularly in Europe, with intermittent judicial input. Key points of contestation are the quality of the education programs; the levels of English proficiency among students and professors; and the impact on national languages, identity, and knowledge production and dissemination. Even the Nordic countries and the Netherlands, which were in the forefront of the movement, are now questioning whether they may have gone too far in internationalizing through English.

The debate has helped energize a related discussion among linguists, political scientists, political philosophers, and economists interrogating the question of a common world language, specifically English, and its comparative costs and benefits to individuals and nations. Though the competing arguments are highly informative in theory, they have had little influence in shaping national or institutional policies and practices, save perhaps for the Nordic countries. Understanding the extent of that disconnect in Europe and beyond, and its economic and social implications, demands a broader look at the rise of English, including its historical roots, its promises and limitations, and its present-day global impact.

Past to Present

Though English appears to have been loosened from its national moorings, it still bears the mark of its colonial past and its enduring power associated with the United Kingdom and the United States. Its global spread began with the British Empire, which, at its height, left a lasting linguistic and cultural imprint on a quarter of the globe. Just as that empire was unraveling in the mid-twentieth century, the United States emerged as a world military and economic leader, giving English an even more vigorous life and cultural appeal with the help of advancing technology.

Through the intervening years, English has become a marketable commodity, a form of cultural capital, and a vehicle for transcending language borders. It both drives the knowledge economy and gains from it. English represents modernity, cosmopolitanism, and technological progress across generational, geographic, and class divides. It has replaced French as the primary language of international diplomacy, and German as the language of scientific investigation. It is the most studied second language in schools worldwide. English speakers can travel internationally with greater comfort; world leaders can communicate with their foreign counterparts without interpreters; researchers can share their findings in international venues; and students can enroll in university programs in English, sometimes at a fraction of the cost of tuition in their home countries. Having English in one's skillset may significantly advance employment opportunities.

Limits and Inequities

Undoubtedly, the United States is the prime beneficiary. Yet other Anglophone countries and their speakers have also benefited from the "English effect." These advantages have reaffirmed a self-satisfied monolingual mindset and historical resistance among native English speakers to learn other world languages.

Relying solely on English, however, carries distinct disadvantages. Only about one-quarter of the world's population is minimally competent in English. That means that monolingual Anglophones cannot communicate with three-quarters of the world. Nor can they access knowledge generated in other languages or job opportunities dependent on other language skills. English, in fact, ranks behind Mandarin Chinese, Spanish, and Hindi, all languages of economic and political importance, in the number of first language speakers.

Most of the world, moreover, is multilingual or at least bilingual. In Europe, migration has brought multiple languages into the mix of national and regional languages, while intersecting colonial and indigenous languages are commonplace in postcolonial countries in Asia and Africa. English is increasingly part of these multilingual repertoires, though with varying levels of proficiency largely related to socioeconomic class and geography.

The spread of English has created social and economic inequalities on both sides of the English divide.

The spread of English has created social and economic inequalities on both sides of the English divide. In Europe and especially in the postcolonial world, the quality of English learned is directly related to the quality of schooling, with the less privileged denied language skills that bear important personal and economic benefits. A similar socioeconomic gap has arisen in the United States and the United Kingdom, where world languages are more commonly offered, formally or informally, in communities with the cultural capital to appreciate the value of multiple language skills and the resources to provide them to their children.

European Resolve

The march toward English seems to defy legislative or judicial efforts toward reconsideration for all the economic reasons discussed. In France, the adoption, in 2013, of the Fioraso Law, which loosened restrictions on teaching in a language other than French, unleashed a torrent of opposition from intellectuals who feared that English was robbing French of its historical status. Yet despite all the invocations to French republican values and the interventions of the country's literary giants, the number of English-taught programs has continued to increase, especially in the elite *grandes écoles* and business schools, where entire programs are offered only in English. In Italy, the proposed plan, in 2012, to shift all graduate programs to English at the prestigious Politecnico di Milano (Polytechnic University of Milan) moved a core of professors to challenge the proposal in court. Yet, notwithstanding the Italian Constitutional Court's ruling affirming the rights of Italian students to learn, and Italian professors to teach, in the national language, the overwhelming majority of the Politecnico's courses are still taught only in English. In the Netherlands, despite a law dating from 1992 intended to preserve the Dutch language, followed by years of intense debate over the growing number of English-taught programs and courses, the legislature has still not taken definitive action on proposed reforms to stem the tide.

Postcolonial Tensions

In the postcolonial world, where the economic value of English intersects with history and politics in distinct ways, decisions regarding English instruction in universities are fraught with even deeper tensions. In Algeria and Morocco, English competes with Arabic and French. Notwithstanding widespread ambivalence toward France and pushback from a postindependence Arabization movement, Morocco has settled on French instruction, though with an eye toward English in the future. Algeria, still reeling from its bitter war for independence from France more than a half century ago, has decidedly shifted to English. Rwanda, mindful of France's complicity in the 1990s genocide, has likewise replaced French with English, not just in education but also in government, commerce, and legislation. In South Africa, where the scars of white Afrikaner supremacy have not healed, universities have transitioned to English with approval from the Constitutional Court, in response to demands of Black students who view Afrikaans as the language of oppression and English as the language of resistance and liberation. In India, English competes with Hindi for political prominence in the face of rising nationalism, with recent reforms officially sidelining English in primary and secondary schooling. Yet parents, from the rich to the poor, still clamor for their children to learn English,

while English remains dominant in university teaching to preserve the country's place in a knowledge-based economy.

Looking Ahead

In the end, the rise of English in universities is more complex than conventional debates reveal. Not only is it a by-product of history and Anglo-American power, but it has evolved against longstanding global rivalries, national politics, and the enduring legacy of colonialism. It has also defied attempts to reel it back or even put it on pause. To what extent English-taught programs will continue to spread for the long term remains uncertain, dependent in part on the status of English vis-à-vis other world languages, and, for the short term, on the success of rising nationalist movements turning inward on globalization, of which English is a key component. It also depends on whether higher education institutions will use the strategic challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic to reconsider their goals in promoting internationalization through English and student and faculty mobility. ◢

Rosemary Salomone is the Kenneth Wang Professor of Law at St. John's University School of Law, New York (US). Email: salomonr@stjohns.edu.

Crucial Decisions Needed: English in Science and Teaching in Non-Anglophone Countries

Hans de Wit, Lisa Unangst, and Philip G. Altbach

Abstract

English is the dominant language of instruction and scientific reporting worldwide. There is an increasing need to access scientific research in other languages and from other regional and cultural backgrounds. Non-Anglophone countries need to find a balance between quality of education, service to their own students, efforts to widen access, and national identity, as well making their higher education attractive to international students.

Recently, two studies illustrated the complicated dimensions of the use of English in science. According to a September 2021 report from Clarivate's Institute for Scientific Information, English has taken over from Portuguese and Spanish as the dominant language of science in Latin America. Given that Latin America's overall research output grew more than in most of the rest of the world over the past four decades, this finding is of particular consequence, and shows the result of increased collaboration with scientists from outside the region, especially the English-speaking world and Europe, with in-region collaboration staying low (see also Natalia Ávila Reyes, "English as Academic Lingua Franca in Latin American Doctoral Education?" in this issue). These findings illustrate the dominance of Anglophone and Western research centers in non-Anglophone countries.

At the same time, according to an article in *Times Higher Education* (October 7, 2021), a paper in the journal *PLOS Biology* suggests that "non-English papers hold untapped information crucial to the conservation of global biodiversity, particularly in regions habituated by scientists who only publish in their own tongues." Lead author Tatsuya Amano stated in *Times Higher Education* that researchers tend to "blindly assume" that any important scientific knowledge is available in English, and that "[w]e need to rethink this assumption in many disciplines."

These two reports clearly illustrate the dilemma of the dominance of English in science. On the one hand, there is growth in the use of English as the dominant language in scientific reporting and of the related Western dominance in science. On the other hand, there is an increasing need to access scientific research in other languages and from other regional and cultural backgrounds. On the optimistic side, one could argue that the inclusion of coauthors from non-Western regions in scientific publications will stimulate more diverse input and, through them, access to reports from other languages

and cultures. Increased availability and quality of translation tools will also stimulate access to sources in other languages. But this will only be possible through a more proactive, decolonial approach by Western scientists, research funding entities, and scientific publishers to end their current power dominance and open themselves to a more inclusive practice of scientific collaboration and dissemination.

English as a Medium of Instruction

English is not only the dominant global language of science and scholarship; it is gaining increasing importance as a language of instruction around the world.

English is not only the dominant global language of science and scholarship; it is gaining increasing importance as a language of instruction around the world. In the past several decades, developments such as the rapid upswing in global student mobility, the march of globalization, the internationalization of higher education institutions, and to some extent the advent of various world university rankings, have all contributed to the rise of English Medium of Instruction (EMI).

The varied approaches to EMI outside of Anglophone countries are embedded in local contexts. These include formerly colonized settings with histories of student mobility to universities located in, for example, the United Kingdom, as well as countries that have only recently moved to adopt English across their higher education system. Exact figures are difficult to come by, but in Europe alone, more than 8,000 bachelor and master degree programs are taught in English. EMI is also present in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East. It is a global phenomenon that raises quality assurance and access and equity issues, as well as political concerns.

There are various reasons and rationales globally for pursuing EMI. The decision to pursue EMI may be a component of a policy iteration at the systemic level (as in the case of Rwanda, which shifted from predominantly French to English as a language of instruction in 2008) or at the institutional level, as demonstrated by the expansion of English-language programs at public and private institutions across continental Europe, China, Russia, South Korea, and many other settings.

There is no single EMI model in terms of funding, content, purpose, curricula, faculty, enrollment, or stability. EMI occurs at research universities as well as other types of institutions, public and private. It is imbued with colonial tensions and market appeal; EMI policy and practice is fragmented at the policy and program levels.

Given the engagement of public sector actors at the municipal, regional, and federal/national levels in various EMI schemes, as well as a plethora of private sector actors, it is interesting that the area of EMI has not drawn more attention from supranational actors involved with education policy, practice, and funding. This may be due in part to the complexity of the landscape: EMI occurs on various scales, in vastly different contexts, and with different rationales, goals, resources, and outcomes across national contexts. There are many professional associations that serve practitioners of EMI and those students who seek it. There is a whole industry around it for testing, services, and training, and there is also, at the institutional level, a range of policies and practices. Yet, in the existing global and national policy vacuum, language and EMI rationales, policies, programs, and outcomes are likely to remain fragmented. This creates a transnational access and equity issue that we find pressing.

As for internationalization and, more specifically, higher education as an export commodity in non-Anglophone countries, tensions are clear. The dominance of English as first or second language of communication has provided higher-income Anglophone countries with a competitive advantage in recruiting international students. Non-Anglophone countries and their institutions of higher education tend increasingly to teach not only in their own language but also in English. With higher education becoming an export commodity, non-Anglophone countries need to find a balance between, on the one hand, quality of education, service to their own students, efforts to widen access, and national identity, and on the other hand, an active recruitment policy and making their higher education attractive to international students who are not fluent in the local language of instruction—in other words, offering them programs taught in English. This requires a national and institutional (higher) education language policy, which in most countries is still lacking or is stalled in intensive debates. ◢

Hans de Wit is professor emeritus and distinguished fellow, and Philip G. Altbach is research professor and distinguished fellow at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. Emails: dewitj@bc.edu *and* altbach@bc.edu. *Lisa Unangst is a visiting assistant professor at Ohio University, Athens, US. Email:* lisau@ohio.edu.

This article is based on a chapter by the authors in the upcoming book International Student Recruitment and Mobility in Non-Anglophone Countries. Theories, Themes, and Patterns, *edited by Hans de Wit, Ekaterina Minaeva, and Lizhou Wang (Routledge Internationalization in Higher Education Book Series, February 2022).*

English as Academic *Lingua Franca* in Latin American Doctoral Education?

Natalia Ávila Reyes

Abstract

While English requirements in higher education have increased worldwide, the language of instruction in Latin America tends to be Spanish or Portuguese. This article addresses the challenges that doctoral programs face when promoting both English as a means of academic participation and Spanish as a valid language for fostering regional scientific development.

Spanish is the fourth most spoken language globally, with nearly 500,000,000 native speakers, most of whom are located in Latin America. Over the past years, the region has experienced a growth in higher education enrollments and development, including a proliferation of doctoral programs.

Traditionally, the language of instruction for undergraduate education in Latin America—except in the Caribbean region—has been the first language of each country, either Spanish or Portuguese. This tradition of Spanish and Portuguese-speaking universities in Latin America contrasts with other non-English-speaking countries, which offer English-medium programs or have introduced policies of English requirements for graduation.

In global doctoral education, the trend toward "Englishization" is even stronger. Knowledge is overwhelmingly produced and communicated in English, which implies that new researchers must be able to both understand relevant, up-to-date knowledge of their disciplines and publish in the venues most valued by the global academic community. In terms of doctoral training, proficiency in English today has become a fundamental measure of quality and provides a distinctive competitive advantage to graduates entering the academic job market.

Although proficiency in English is a fairly objective index of the quality of doctoral training, there are several tensions around the predominance of this language as an academic *lingua franca*. I will address two of these tensions. The first is the struggle for the validity of Spanish as a scientific language. The second concerns the geopolitical and educational inequality that comes with the use of English in academia.

Academic Spanish and Directionality of Knowledge

It has become commonplace to point out that English is the universal scientific language, consequently imposing a canon of multilingualism on academics and doctoral students from non-English-speaking countries as a condition to join relevant disciplinary conversations. However, multilingualism is not a two-way requirement: The current hegemony of English responds to the geopolitics of knowledge production, which offers a directionality from the (English-speaking) center to the (non-English-speaking) periphery.

At the same time, universities in Latin America have implemented policies for the growth and promotion of research, including various accountability and funding mechanisms linked to scientific productivity. University accreditation criteria frequently include publication in mainstream indexed journals, which are published primarily in English. However, Latin American universities and agencies have fostered a model of local publishing in high-quality journals frequently run by universities or associations in a nonprofit model. As of October 2021, the Scopus database has listed 888 Latin American journals, around half of them in social sciences and humanities. A high proportion of Latin American journals listed in Scopus publish in Spanish or Portuguese or have either multilingual or bilingual models that include English. Of the total number of Latin American journals indexed in Scopus, 784 are open access and 574 are also indexed in SciELO, a database from the Global South that constitutes a paradigmatic example of the promotion of science in developing countries in a multilingual format. SciELO is a cooperative effort that indexes academic journals from Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Uruguay, the West Indies, and Venezuela, with high standards of scientific quality. SciELO makes a large amount of research in Spanish and Portuguese available,

although, according to a recent study by the Institute for Scientific Information, nowadays most of it is written in English. Over time, though, publication in Spanish has remained stable in the region.

I cite these initiatives as examples that enhance Spanish-language research and resist the North–South directionality of knowledge. These journals have allowed access to knowledge and scientific participation to large audiences in the region that would otherwise be entirely excluded from this possibility. In short, it has boosted scientific development in a region where there are still significant pockets of poverty and great educational inequalities that have dominated the political agenda in several countries in recent years. Therefore, rather than constituting a disincentive to the adoption of English, these cooperative responses offer an alternative model of scientific advance for developing countries.

Educational Disparities

Issues of educational equity should also be considered when implementing higher education language policies in Latin America.

Issues of educational equity should also be considered when implementing higher education language policies in Latin America. The disparity in educational quality continues to affect large populations in most countries of the region. The teaching of English is unevenly distributed in K-12 schooling of most countries and constitutes a significant challenge for students and universities during undergraduate and graduate studies.

I will take Chile as an example. The country has experienced tremendous growth in its doctoral program offerings. Chile's 56 universities currently offer 280 doctoral programs in different fields, 230 of which are accredited by the National Agency, meaning that they meet the minimum quality criteria for their students to be eligible for public funding. The most prestigious universities in the country require a foreign language, at least up to a competent reader level, but progressively a requirement of a B2 level of English according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (a "confident" command of the language) has become the standard. However, even in the most elite universities in the country, students struggle to meet this requirement.

Currently, regulations for doctoral studies at several universities require an English language certification, or, in some cases, another second language that each program determines as relevant to its discipline. This flexibility allows, for example, waivers for students cosupervised by French, Portuguese, or German-speaking universities, which in any case tend to be a minimal number. Hence, English language course sequences are added to the doctoral curriculum, which is already demanding, generating an additional challenge for those students who, although very talented in their specialties, did not receive this instruction in their previous schooling.

All in all, doctoral programs in Latin America face the dual challenge of promoting early entry into research and, at the same time, providing language proficiency that will enable future researchers to perform sustainably in a predominantly English-speaking environment. Doctoral theses by *compendium* of articles and publication requirements for graduation have created curricular spaces for this critical aspect of quality. Still, educational imbalances within countries, in the same way as global scientific participation imbalances, remain barriers to the adoption of the English language.

In summary, we need to rethink language policies at the doctoral level with a view that balances, on equal terms, publication in quality local, Spanish-speaking academic venues and the acquisition of English as a vital tool for global scientific participation. The former aims to strengthen knowledge production and networks in developing countries and challenges the directionality of knowledge. The latter provides emerging academics with critical resources and should become a central goal as early as in undergraduate curricula. Ultimately, early access to English may promote equal participation for Latin American students in their graduate programs and for Latin American scientists in their academic communities at the global level. ◢

Natalia Ávila Reyes is assistant professor and director of postgraduate studies at the Faculty of Education of Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. Email: naavila@uc.cl.

Sustaining Internationalization: English-Medium Programs in Japan

Annette Bradford, Yukiko Ishikura, and Howard Brown

Abstract
The number of degree programs and courses taught in English at Japanese universities has increased considerably over the past ten years. However, there are concerns about the sustainability of such programming. With government-supported initiatives ending, universities must now reflect on lessons learned and adapt accordingly. For English-medium instruction (EMI) to be fully embedded in the Japanese higher education landscape, universities need to reexamine the scope of their programs and focus on internal resources and structures.

English-medium instruction (EMI) was initially established in Japan to attract talented international students by lessening the burden of learning Japanese, and is now becoming a considered element of internationalization at home.

English-Medium Education as a Government-Led Strategy

EMI programs are key to Japan's higher education internationalization efforts. Undergraduates can now study for at least part of their degree in English in more than 40 percent of the nation's nearly 800 universities and there are 87 degree programs fully taught in English. However, in recent years, the growth in the number of institutions offering EMI has slowed. It appears that universities are no longer establishing new courses to follow the trend and EMI is reaching a point of maturity.

EMI has not become mainstream and is not supplanting Japanese-medium instruction, nor should it be. After all, the majority of graduates will work domestically in primarily Japanese-language environments and thus have little real need for full degree programs in English. In our view, this stabilization of EMI will prevent it from being pushed into inappropriate spheres and will ensure high-quality, sustainable programs over the long term. We need only look at South Korea for an example of how external pressure to implement EMI too widely puts institutions, faculty, and students under untenable pressure. But for EMI to become embedded and remain a permanent fixture in Japan's higher education landscape, universities should now be looking at ways to sustain programming.

In Japan, as in much of East Asia, university internationalization strategies are largely government driven. This can accelerate the implementation of policies and programs, but raises concern over sustainability once funding is halted. Two large-scale government funding schemes, the Global 30 (G30) Project and the Top Global University Project (beginning in 2009 and 2014 respectively), have explicitly called for EMI and driven much of the recent implementation. However, funding cycles invariably end and universities are left to fend for themselves. Newly established programs have not only to determine if they are able to obtain financial support from within the university, but they also have to figure out how to further develop their curricula in the absence of a strategic vision beyond the funding cycle.

EMI programs are key to Japan's higher education internationalization efforts.

When the G30 Project ended in 2014, institutions experienced particular challenges with regard to human resources. With administrative and teaching staff salaries often directly supported by the project, universities lost program capacity and know-how. The Top Global Project will end in 2024 and with no guarantee of future funding, the 37 recipient universities should now look at lessons learned and plan for their future. A good option for sustaining programs is to use existing internal resources. In the case of EMI, this demands rethinking the scope and goals of programs and expanding institutional support for faculty members.

Widening the Scope of Internationalization Efforts

One of the aims of many EMI programs is to create a learning environment in which international and local students can learn from one another. Yet, the G30 programs often found that, in practice, English distanced international students from the Japanese community. During the funding cycle, much effort was made to improve infrastructure to welcome non-Japanese speaking students, and in a few cases local students were also able to take G30 English-taught courses. However, in many instances, EMI programs

were established outside the main Japanese curriculum and in some cases even away from the main campus. The programs became isolated communities. The intended internationalization did not usually reach the local students. More than seven years on, many universities still face the same challenge. Widening the scope of EMI to encompass more of the local campus community is a significant factor in sustaining and embedding EMI programs.

As universities reflect on the lessons learned from the G30 project, EMI programs are evolving. Some universities are using existing resources and are combining English-medium programs with Japanese-based curricula, and a dual language program model has been gaining ground. Here, students initially study in English while learning the Japanese language. They then shift the medium of education to Japanese and study with local students. The pattern is reversed for Japanese students wishing to pursue classes in English. This model allows international and local students to go back and forth between languages and encourages interculturality. It also trains international students to become a part of Japan's future workforce and prepares Japanese students for international roles. This type of plurilingual program has been quite common in Europe, but for Japan it represents a shift in thinking away from "international equals English." It expands the scope of internationalization and, through benefiting a larger number of students, unlocks extra university financial support.

Professional Development for Sustainability

Faculty buy-in is important for sustaining any new educational innovation. It is especially important for EMI in Japan, given the funding cycles and subsequent loss of term-teaching staff. However, research highlights a concern that faculty members in EMI are overburdened and undersupported. To embed EMI into existing programs, faculty need to feel supported to make the transition to teaching in English. Unfortunately, current professional development (PD) efforts do not have a good reputation among faculty members. Many confide that they do not attend sessions offered by their institutions, or they do so out of a sense of duty rather than interest.

We therefore recently investigated the current state of teacher support for EMI in Japanese universities. Encouragingly, we found that more than 45 percent of respondents had taken part in in-service EMI training. However, fewer—only 20 percent—had completed preservice EMI training, usually as part of graduate studies overseas. Moreover, several respondents conflated English-language training with EMI-related PD, and some reported that they felt that PD at their university was intended only for native Japanese speakers.

The EMI research community recognizes the importance of targeted training for pedagogy and cultural awareness to facilitate learning in EMI classrooms. Consequently, the number of commercially available PD programs that support professors in these activities is growing. In Japan, an increasing number of institutions are enrolling faculty members on such programs, and as these courses have shifted online during the pandemic, therefore requiring less of a time commitment, participation rates have grown. However, budgets for outsourced training remain tight. The number of in-house symposia and workshops targeting EMI is similarly increasing, but unfortunately these activities are often small-scale, primarily attracting those with a prior interest in EMI research and practice. Organizers have difficulty persuading faculty members of the value of PD delivered by in-house experts and, as with any other type of PD, faculty members feel there are too many demands on their time.

The Next Steps

As EMI programs become more mature and fully embedded in universities' curricula, our thoughts must turn from start-up and implementation to maintenance and sustainability. Japanese universities have largely been successful in developing curricula and programs that meet the students' needs, and they are finding a stable place for those programs in the university community. For many institutions, the project funding cycle is just the beginning of EMI. The next steps in sustaining this feature of Japan's higher education internationalization must be to ensure that EMI reaches the wider campus and that the faculty members organizing, planning, and delivering EMI programs are prepared and supported. ◢

Annette Bradford is adjunct fellow at the Institute of Contemporary Asian Studies, Temple University Japan Campus, and Oxford EMI associate. Email: annette.bradford@oxfordemi.co.uk.

Yukiko Ishikura is associate professor at the Center for International Education and Exchange, Osaka University, Japan. Email: ishikura@ciee.osaka-u.ac.jp.

Howard Brown is professor in the Faculty of International Studies and Regional Development, University of Niigata Prefecture, Japan. Email: brown@unii.ac.jp.

This research was supported by JSPS KAKENHI (Grant Numbers 19K14259 and 20H01698).

The Future of China and the Chinese Language in Global Higher Education

Philip G. Altbach

Abstract

There has been much debate about the emergence of Chinese universities on the world stage and the potential role of the Chinese language as a global scientific medium. I argue that while China's top universities have done well in rankings, there are structural and other impediments to their taking global leadership. Further, English is sufficiently dominant as the global medium of science that Chinese has no possibility of serving as a key global academic language.

The Chinese language will play a modest but noticeable role in the future of global higher education. An interesting discussion has recently emerged among several Western scholars on this topic, see Hans de Wit, "Will English or Mandarin Dominate International HE?" in *University World News* (January 5, 2022), and Rosemary Salomone, "China and the Geopolitics of Language in Africa," *University World News*, December 11, 2021. Both have made the Chinese language an issue and express skepticism about the Chinese language replacing English. This is interesting because the Chinese government has no plan to declare an initiative to push Chinese as the international academic language of science. In fact, China has launched its own international academic and scientific journals in English with the intention, over the long run, to make them internationally competitive. According to *Nature*, the government is spending over CNY 200 million (USD 29 million) each year to help improve the caliber of about 280 journals, most of which publish in English. On top of that, the accessibility of increasingly accurate translations of scientific literature from Chinese to English has made research cooperation easier, with the promise of an acceleration of quantum driven artificial intelligence in future decades.

Although Chinese will not replace English anytime soon as the global scientific language, some of the top Chinese universities are world-class and increasingly influential. China's unprecedented investment of approximately USD 182 billion in several world-class university initiatives during recent decades has yielded impressive results, increased China's position in the global rankings, and attracted world-class scientists. China has the world's largest academic system in terms of student numbers. It has also attracted (pre-COVID-19) 500,000 international students to its universities, most to study the Chinese language, but with an increasing number registering for degree programs. No country has matched China's rate of increase in producing patents and scientific publications. Seven of China's 200 or so top research universities are now in the top 100 of the *Times Higher Education* rankings. Indeed, its upward trajectory in such a short time is unprecedented. If China's economy continues to steam ahead, with a significant investment of resources in science and technology as well as in the higher education systems of selected countries as part of its "Belt and Road" initiative, its global influence will continue to expand.

This would not constitute firm evidence that Chinese universities will displace the top 10 global universities any time soon. There are still significant obstacles to be addressed. As was pointed out by Altbach in "Chinese Higher Education: 'Glass Ceiling' and 'Feet of Clay'" (*International Higher Education* # 86), these issues are worth considering. Among them are high levels of bureaucracy, low levels of institutional autonomy, direct control exerted by political authorities in the internal management and intellectual life of universities, and access to information, especially in the humanities and social sciences. These are obstacles that the world's top ten universities would refuse to accept. The unprecedented expansion of the higher education system and the sudden onset of the "publish or perish" pressure has led to hyperplagiarism and weak protection of intellectual property. But these are easily fixed in comparison to the other obstacles.

China's academic progress has some similarities to the rapid rise of German universities in the nineteenth century and of American universities in the first half of the twentieth century. In both cases, German and then English became influential in scientific publication, but national languages continued to predominate. This occurred when

academic systems were still small and the number of scientific journals was modest. By the twenty-first century, over 71 of 79 million articles (90 percent) indexed in the Web of Science are in English, with a similar proportion in the other major citation indices. For the same reason, degree programs in English are in high demand. All of this helps to explain the more pragmatic approach taken by China in the current academic English-rules-based order. The English language can be an inconvenience, but it is not a major obstacle to China's scientific progress. At the same time, like all academic powers, language remains a linchpin of national pride and academic leaders recognize that international engagement should not be to the detriment of the national language.

Language Realities

Numbers tell part of the story. Chinese has the largest number of native speakers—918 million, much larger than the native speakers of English at 379 million (Spanish is in second place for native speakers with 460 million). English is the most widely spoken language with 1,132 billion as compared with Chinese at 1,117 billion. Further, English has official status in 55 sovereign states, most as former colonies of the British Empire. English is the *lingua franca* in six influential industrialized powers. It has an official status in six Asian countries, with Singapore making it the main language. Further, there has been a dramatic expansion of English language degree programs in non-Anglophone countries. A recent Studyportals study noted 27,874 English-taught programs outside the main four English-speaking countries, with numbers increasing significantly in recent years.

The International Visibility of Chinese

Chinese will increasingly be taught in universities around the world, in the same way that French or Spanish are widely taught languages—but with greater emphasis because of the growing global impact of China.

Currently, Chinese has little visibility internationally as a language of teaching outside of China or as an internationally used medium for scientific publication or communication. While the number of internationally cited publications by Chinese authors has significantly increased—as has the number of Chinese patents, their international visibility is limited. Of the top 100 universities ranked by *Times Higher Education*, 64 are English medium, seven are Chinese medium, and 29 use other languages (among the 29 are several where English is a key language—such as ETH Zurich and several Dutch universities). There are also five universities in the top 100 in "greater China" (Hong Kong and Singapore) that use English. Of the four branch campuses sponsored by Chinese universities, all use English as the predominant medium of instruction.

China has made a major investment, estimated at USD 10 billion annually, in government-sponsored Confucius Institutes (CIs). In 2019, there were more than 530 CIs on six continents, offering Chinese language and culture programs. The Chinese ministry of education estimated that 100 million people were studying Chinese worldwide, many in CI programs. However, there has been considerable controversy concerning the CIs, and many have been closed.

Future Prospects

Chinese will increasingly be taught in universities around the world, in the same way that French or Spanish are widely taught languages—but with greater emphasis because of the growing global impact of China. Thus, as a language spoken by a major economy and by a globally competitive higher education system, Chinese will continue to gain in importance. However, scientific publication, collaboration, and global academic discourse will remain mainly in English. ◢

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and distinguished fellow, Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. Email: altbach@bc.edu.

Reform of the English Component in the *Gaokao*

Qi Wang

Abstract
As a result of an initiative of the Chinese ministry of education in 2014, an English test will be held twice a year and only the higher score will be counted in the students' overall *gaokao* results. This article reviews the policy rationales of this decision and its impact on students and teachers, and discusses its implications on promoting proficiency-oriented teaching and learning and on redefining the status of English in China.

In late 2014, the Chinese ministry of education (MOE) issued a policy initiative regarding the English component of the *gaokao* (the national university entrance exam), as part of the plan to deepen reforms of the national examination and enrollment system. This initiative stated that the English tests would be held twice a year and only the highest score would be counted in the students' overall results. It aimed to alleviate students' study pressure and to promote proficiency-oriented language learning and teaching in China. This initiative has been gradually piloted in a small number of selected provinces and municipalities since 2017, and more provinces intend to join this "test-twice-a-year" initiative. This has caused heated debate among the general public on its impact on English language teaching and learning and its implications on the status of the English language in China.

Rationales behind this Policy

Ever since the university entrance exam was reinstated in the late 1970s, the English component has always been one of the focuses in the *gaokao* reform. Over the years, the overall score of the English component has increased, from not being included in the entrance exams in 1978 to being granted the same weight as Chinese language and maths in terms of score points in the 1990s. The status of English has been significantly enhanced along with China's rigorous engagement with the world: English language education is considered to play a vital role in national socioeconomic development and English proficiency is viewed as a generic skill for individuals.

Compared with previous reform initiatives, this "test-twice-a-year" initiative appears to place emphasis on students' choices, equity, and quality education, and to have at least three policy intentions. First, it aims to change the "once-in-a-lifetime" exam system and alleviate students' study stress. The initiative places students at the centre and allows them to choose when and whether to take the test once or twice.

Second, the initiative intends to transform English teaching and learning approaches, focusing on practical use and communication rather than on the examination itself. English education in China tends to teach just what is covered by the *gaokao*. Students only manage to learn "broken English," memorizing vocabulary and grammar points, and as such may lack cross-cultural communication skills. Thus, under the guidance of this initiative, in a few provinces the listening and speaking components in the English test have been increased, with a stress on testing students' basic knowledge and skills.

The initiative intends to transform English teaching and learning approaches, focusing on practical use and communication rather than on the examination itself.

Third, researchers and experts argue that this initiative can lead to redefining the status of English in the *gaokao*, thereby reinforcing the societal importance of the Chinese language and culture. Because of the perceived roles of English in both national socioeconomic development and individual career development, some research points out that students and teachers have given high priority to English (the so-called "English fever"), while to some extent marginalizing their own native language, culture, and traditions. The changes proposed in the "test-twice-a-year" initiative may help students to understand the need to learn their native language well, and to redistribute their study time and effort between Chinese, English, and other subjects.

Less Stress but More Workload

When first announced in 2014, the initiative received support but also raised doubt among various stakeholders. While the general public tended to support the initiative, education experts doubted whether it would actually relieve the burden of students (see Wang and Li, "'English Fever' in China Has Reached a Watershed," in *IHE* #75). Since

its implementation, have these views changed? Some recent research projects on the "test-twice-a-year" initiative (such as research conducted by the National Education Examinations Authority at MOE and Tsinghua University) have reached similar conclusions, in spite of their different focuses, such as changes in the English test structure and content and its impact on students, teachers, and parents. These studies find that while students and teachers have adapted to the new initiative and agree on some positive developments, issues and concerns are emerging.

From the students' perspective, the initiative may have eased the stress and anxiety related to the *gaokao*, as it allows them a second chance to improve their performance, if needed. However, due to the *gaokao's* high pressure level, few students give up the opportunity to try to achieve a higher score, which results in most students taking both tests anyhow. As a result, students spend twice as much time and effort to prepare for English tests, which increases their academic workload and hardly reduces any study burden.

From the teachers' perspective, the new initiative has impacted their teaching and work load. High-school English teachers have to start teaching senior-year content in sophomore year, so as to prepare students for their first test, which is generally held in the first term of their senior year. While rushing to complete their teaching task, teachers then have less time to help students with their speaking and listening skills, thus returning to the exam-oriented teaching and learning style. A survey by the National Education Examination Authority reveals that more than 90 percent of respondent teachers agree that their workload has increased substantially since the initiative was implemented, while only half of the respondents think that the initiative has had a positive impact on teaching and learning outcomes. In addition, stakeholders are concerned about how to ensure the exams' reliability (whether both tests are equally challenging) and validity (whether the tests can assess students' proficiency and intercultural competence), as well as other logistic issues and costs.

Deemphasizing English?

When first introduced, the "test-twice-a-year" initiative was considered as a means to possibly play down the excessive "English fever" in China and raise the importance of Chinese. However, since its implementation, students have had to spend more time overall preparing for the English test. Yet there is no doubt that it is imperative for Chinese students to learn their native language, traditions, and culture well. Chinese and English should be considered complementary to each other. The strategic role of English (and other foreign languages) in international communication and to promote China's exchanges with the world remains crucial. Rather than deemphasizing English, focus should be directed toward how to further enhance proficiency-oriented teaching and learning. This will take more than a single government initiative.

One fundamental challenge when promoting the "test-twice-a-year" initiative, as well as proficiency-oriented teaching and learning, is the exam culture that is deeply embedded in Chinese society: The *gaokao* is seen as a social ladder determining individuals' social status. In the past four decades particularly, it has evolved into a score-focused enrollment system. Students are under tremendous pressure to achieve higher scores in order to enter higher-ranked schools. Teachers are expected to prepare students for exams and their teaching performance is largely assessed according to students' test results and admission rate to universities. While the "test-twice-a-year" initiative might be a good start for providing students with choices, more changes are needed to develop an effective teaching and learning system and transform the Chinese "score-oriented" ideology. ◢

Qi Wang is an adjunct researcher at the School of Education, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, P.R. China, and a research fellow at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. Email: qwmichelle@gmail.com.

US–China Geopolitical Tensions: Implications for Universities and Science

Xiaojie Li and Jenny J. Lee

Abstract
Based on recent findings from a national survey involving about 2,000 faculty members, postdocs, and graduate students at top US universities, this article discusses the negative impact of US–China geopolitical tensions on the scientific community, including perceptions of equity, research collaboration, and scientist mobility.

While the advancement of knowledge often necessitates mobility and collaborations among scientists across borders, geopolitical tensions can sometimes interrupt or even halt the process for many. The United States and China are two leading research producers and cocollaborators. Yet, conflicts between these two countries are heightening. There is also a wave of anti-Asian hate incidents and sentiments entering US academia. As our recent study demonstrates, Chinese scientists' full participation in scientific research in the United States is under threat, and the future of US–China scholarly exchanges and collaborations is uncertain as well.

The US–China Geopolitical Tensions

US–China geopolitical tensions are at least partly attributable to federal regulations and policies in the United States that specifically target China as a threat to US national security. In 2018, the visa stay of Chinese students in certain high-tech majors was shortened from five years to one. Two years later, Proclamation 10043 banned entry to the United States for Chinese students and scholars with military ties. While these two immigration regulations limited the mobility of certain scientists from China, the US Department of Justice's China Initiative, launched in 2018, had a broader impact on the scientific community. The China Initiative sought to protect national security and specifically targeted China, portraying China as an intellectual threat that, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI), needs a "whole-of-society response." In short, the China Initiative disproportionately accuses scientists of Chinese descent of being potential spies.

The Consequences of the China Initiative

In collaboration with the Committee of 100, a nonprofit organization of Chinese Americans, we conducted a national survey among 1,949 STEM faculty members, postdocs, and graduate students at top US universities in order to examine the impact of the China Initiative on the scientific community. We asked about their perceptions and experiences related to collaboration with China and the China Initiative itself, and about future plans. Nearly half of the survey sample (46 percent) self-identified as Chinese.

Racial profiling among Chinese scientists was particularly salient. Forty-two percent of the Chinese scientists reported feeling racially profiled by the US government, compared to only 9 percent of non-Chinese scientists. Fifty-one percent of the Chinese scientists felt fear/anxiety of being surveilled by the US government, compared to 12 percent of the non-Chinese scientists. In addition, more Chinese scientists experienced difficulty in obtaining research funding in the United States as a result of their race/nationality/country of origin, compared to non-Chinese scientists (38 percent vs. 14 percent). Also, Chinese scientists were more likely to experience professional challenges (i.e., promotion, professional recognition) as a result of their race/nationality/country of origin than their non-Chinese counterparts (38 percent vs. 16 percent).

Negative stereotypes about China and Chinese scientists were also evident. Although a significant number of China Initiative cases were dropped or dismissed, as well as exonerated, 75 percent of the non-Chinese scientists believed that the United States should be tougher on China to prevent theft of intellectual property, and 44 percent believed that academic espionage and intellectual theft by Chinese scientists in academia was a serious issue. In spite of little evidential basis for such views, such stereotypes are concerning, as they not only affect individual scientists but also the US scientific enterprise.

We also found that US–China research collaborations were inhibited due to scientists' perceptions of potential research risk and added hassle. Among 43 percent of the scientists who conducted international collaborative research involving China over the past three years, 16 percent prematurely or unexpectedly ended/suspended research collaborations with scientists in China. The main reason cited was that they wanted to distance themselves from collaborators in China due to the China Initiative. In addition, 28 percent of these scientists (who conducted international collaborative research involving China over the past three years) limited communication with collaborators in China, 17 percent decided not to involve China in future projects, and 16 percent decided not to work with collaborators in China in future projects.

Lastly, the United States may suffer from potential talent loss. Forty-two percent of the Chinese scientists who are non-US citizens indicated that the FBI investigations and/or the China Initiative affected their plans to stay in the United States. The scientists who reconsidered their future in the United States included Chinese international graduate students seeking to start their careers as well as established professors who had lived in the United States for decades. If US–China geopolitical tensions continue, the US may suffer as a result of Chinese scientists leaving the country.

Even though the US–China geopolitical tensions have triggered stereotypes about China, scientists' belief in collaboration—a fundamental component of scientific research—remains strong.

Scientists Continue to Value Collaboration with China

Although US–China geopolitical tensions have led to numerous negative consequences, our findings also suggest that scientists, nevertheless, recognize the value of international collaboration, including scholarly engagement with China. Scientists in our survey overwhelmingly emphasized that Chinese scientists made important contributions to research and teaching programs in their field (95 percent), that the United States should build stronger research collaboration with China (87 percent), and that having collaborations with Chinese scientists was important to their own scholarly research (80 percent). In addition, the vast majority of the scientists believed that limiting collaboration with China would have a negative impact on academia (93 percent), their academic discipline (93 percent), and their respective research projects (94 percent). There were no significant differences between Chinese and non-Chinese scientists on these views. Even though the US–China geopolitical tensions have triggered stereotypes about China, scientists' belief in collaboration—a fundamental component of scientific research—remains strong, and this value does not appear to have been affected by current geopolitics.

Overall, our survey revealed that although scientists in the United States highly value scholarly collaborations between the United States and China, geopolitical tensions between these two countries have interfered with their scientific knowledge production. In other words, the current China Initiative and anti-China climate have made international collaboration less worthwhile (and in some cases highly risky) for many scientists, despite a shared belief about its importance. As our research has shown, racial profiling among Chinese scientists, withdrawal from research collaborations with China, as well as scientific talent loss are just some of the possible consequences when geopolitics interfere with academic science. ◢

Xiaojie Li is a PhD student, and Jenny J. Lee is a professor at the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Arizona, US. Emails: xiaojieli@email.arizona.edu *and* jennylee@arizona.edu.

Jenny J. Lee has disclosed an outside interest in the Committee of 100 to the University of Arizona. Resulting conflicts of interest are being managed by the University of Arizona in accordance with its policies.

The Implications of Campus Closures

Daniel C. Kent

Abstract
Many international branch campuses, particularly those originating from the United States, have closed their doors in recent years. Understanding how institutions have accommodated students during a closure may help other campuses best serve their students even in their final days of operation.

The announcement in August of 2021 that Yale-NUS College would be closing its doors permanently in 2025 sent shockwaves throughout Singaporean and international higher education circles (see also Hoe Yeong Loke, "Closure of Yale-NUS College: Unclear Reasons, But Clear Implications," in *IHE* #109). The class that had enrolled just weeks before would be its last, and by 2025, Yale-NUS would be fully replaced by New College—a reimagined form of Singaporean liberal arts education. Although not meeting the technical definition of an international branch campus (NUS controlled and operated all aspects of the institution rather than their international partners in New Haven), the incident nevertheless represents both the highest-profile and most recent instance of an international branch campus (IBC) closure. The move to allow current students to finish out their degrees under the auspices of Yale-NUS College rather than elsewhere, however, raises the question of how other IBCs and similar international tie-ups have treated their students upon announcing their closure. Given the high rate of IBC closures, with an average of around two per year for the last twenty years, this issue will likely have continuing relevance for international higher education administrators and observers alike.

Options after Closing

From a review of the available data, it seems that many closing branch campuses have allowed current students to finish out their degrees while simultaneously barring new enrollment. In Singapore, NYU's Tisch branch campus announced their closure after years of finance-related scandals, calling a community town hall to announce in person to students the fate of the institution. As with Yale-NUS, the institution allowed students to finish out their degrees (though master of fine arts [MFA] programs are notably shorter than a four-year undergraduate degree) before closing for good. Given the rigid structure and distinct curricula of most MFA programs, transfer pathways do not seem to have been developed for students, and it is unclear if they were offered the chance to finish their degrees in New York rather than Singapore.

From a review of the available data, it seems that many closing branch campuses have allowed current students to finish out their degrees while simultaneously barring new enrollment.

There remains a question, of course, as to whether allowing students to finish locally is the best option for students in all cases. How is the value of a degree impacted when a campus closes, especially from the perspective of local employers? Would it be better to facilitate transferring the students to other colleges that will outlive their original institution? How will the student experience change, as faculty and staff depart from a shuttering campus? And what is the psychological effect of being part of a higher education community that has announced its expiration date?

Administrators grappling with these questions simply cannot answer them, as the impact of closed campuses on degree returns and other effects on students is an understudied area. Alumni of shuttered branch campuses also lose out on the benefits of potentially valuable alumni support services and closer ties to home campuses in the form of institutional events, networks, and continuing professional contacts that often provide graduates continuing value from their degrees even after graduating. While institutions would likely claim their home campuses continue to serve these alumni just as well, it is hard to imagine that they could do so at the same level as a full branch campus without on-the-ground dedicated staff. For students, finishing locally, though surely the easiest option, is not as straightforward a decision as it may seem, and they may prefer to transfer elsewhere.

Other colleges with closing campuses have done just this, facilitating transfer to other nearby institutions, or offering students the opportunity to study at another branch

of the home university rather than allowing them to finish their degrees locally. Indeed, for IBCs announcing sudden or unexpected closures, transferring may be the only option for students. When the New York Institute of Technology in Manama, Bahrain closed, the few students remaining were offered the option to complete their degrees at other NYIT international campuses, though it is unclear if any of the students took up the offer. And when Suffolk University in Dakar, Senegal, shuttered, the remaining students were offered the opportunity to transfer to the home campus in Boston, of which approximately 100 did. George Mason University's Ras Al Khaimah campus in the United Arab Emirates closed in 2009 after the host government decided to change its financial support of the institution. Although efforts appear to have been made by the university to ensure that students could transfer elsewhere, there were no clearly established, guaranteed transfer pathways developed for students to other institutions other than studying in George Mason's home campus of Virginia. Students were notified that other local branch campuses had expressed "interest" in their enrollment—without confirming that their credits would necessarily transfer through preexisting agreements.

Facilitated transfers to other campuses, when available for students, would seem the optimal solution for at least some, given the uncertainty around the value of their degrees and lack of stability of a campus in the midst of closure. Of course, such transfers also involve upheaval for students' lives, moving to an unfamiliar campus and perhaps even country context that they did not sign up for. Similar academic programs, especially after transferring to another institution entirely, may not be available. And new administrative structures and institutional cultures can be difficult to manage, further imperiling students' likelihood of degree completion.

There are no readily documented instances of IBCs leaving students completely in the lurch, not allowing them to easily complete their degrees locally or elsewhere. However, such drastically sudden institutional closures have become almost commonplace in the past several years in the United States, particularly in the volatile for-profit higher education sector. It is not difficult to imagine that this scenario could take place in the rapidly changing administrative and financial context of IBCs in the future.

Closures on the Rise

Given the large proliferation of IBCs, a changing international context, and challenges in administrative and financial management, a small number of IBCs may continue to shutter year by year, as has been the case for some time (see also Jana Maria Kleibert, "Optimistic Postpandemic Outlooks for International Branch Campuses" in *IHE* #109). For students at these closing campuses, the options are not ideal. They are losing a community, an academic program, and a campus that they have been a part of for anywhere from months to years. Understanding how other institutions have responded to closures, though, may help future administrators provide better ways to serve their students, even as they close their doors for good. ◢

Daniel C. Kent is a former senior admissions counselor at Yale-NUS College in Singapore and currently a program associate for research at a philanthropic foundation in New York, US.
Email: dk@mellon.org.

Internationalization and Decolonization in UK Higher Education: Are We There Yet?

Omolabake Fakunle, Chisomo Kalinga, and Vicky Lewis

Abstract
Different interpretations and contestations related to internationalization and decolonization in universities result in a contradictory picture. Even where Western institutions ostensibly embrace the drive for decolonization, their Anglocentric, colonial interpretations of internationalization are often at odds with this effort—in the areas of strategy and policy, as well as teaching practice and research. Changes in approach are needed in order for these two processes to work hand-in-hand within a complex conceptual and operating context.

Discourses around internationalization are largely centered on student mobility and mainly economically oriented. Scholarly engagement is thus mostly framed around marketized narratives and ensuing criticism of the neoliberalist turn of international higher education. At the national level, international education organizations from Western countries are missing opportunities to move away from the "westernized, largely Anglo-Saxon, and predominantly English-speaking paradigm" (see de Wit and Jones, "A Missed Opportunity and Limited Vision for Internationalization," in *IHE* # 109). At the university level, recent research in the US context suggests that internationalization policies may be disconnected from the racialized lived experiences of students, faculty, and administrators. Resonating with recent scholarship in internationalization studies, our article examines racialization and decoloniality in relation to internationalization.

Problematizing the Current World Order

The unresolved and persisting problematic legacy of colonization on the current world order, including in academia, have been brought to the forefront on a global scale by the #Black Lives Matter movement and the Rhodes Must Fall protests. This has reenergized calls for decolonization in universities that acknowledge the hegemonic positioning of Western epistemologies, and consequent loss and marginalization of bodies of knowledge. In this sense, it is argued that decolonization is "an on-going process of becoming, unlearning, and relearning regarding who we are." We consider that this process of unlearning and relearning forms a basis for dialectic scholarly engagement that recognizes historical and current power dynamics in attempts to "decolonize the university."

In this piece, we examine interpretations and contestations around internationalization and decolonization in UK universities, in strategy and policy, teaching practice, and research collaborations. We put forward suggestions about what needs to happen for these two processes to work hand-in-hand, and about the complexities involved.

Reframing Our Institutional Strategies

Using the United Kingdom as a case study, we can trace how universities' international strategies have evolved over time and more recently are often described as "global engagement strategies." On the surface, these are outward facing. They are about building long-term relationships and making a positive global contribution. But how different are they really? With whom are these "engagement" strategies actually engaging? And do the relationships that are envisaged still place the UK institution in the driving seat?

Headline findings from a research study exploring the current and future role of global engagement in UK university strategies indicate that, while rhetoric has become more values-led, measures selected to evaluate success have changed little. Most relate to institutional profile, reach, or income. Western, Anglocentric conceptualizations of internationalization are rarely challenged. Decolonization is barely mentioned.

Western, Anglocentric conceptualizations of internationalization are rarely challenged.

Embracing the International Classroom

The recent and renewed interest in decolonization within UK higher education seeks to understand what decolonizing research and the curriculum actually looks like. Academics and students alike have challenged the reluctance to "decolonize the academy" through tactical interventions such as "Why is my curriculum white?" and to criticize why courses (and the staff who teach them) are lacking representation from nonwhite scholars.

Furthermore, OECD data shows that over 40 percent of the 6.1 million internationally mobile students are studying in only four host English-speaking countries: the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia. This has implications for teaching practice and for students learning in a second language.

The convergence of diverse cultures and languages in an internationalized classroom can provide a space for critical and uncomfortable dialogues from different perspectives. This suggests that internationalization can potentially afford a space for decolonization in higher education. But this will involve a recognition that diversity creates an opportunity for learning and teaching, for everyone. However, there persists an academic deficit perception of international students in internationalization discourses. This deficit narrative has been described as neoimperialist. In other words, Western frames of knowing remain the dominant conceptualization of internationalization. This, therefore, begs the question: Can internationalization be decolonized in our teaching practice?

Reconceptualizing Research Collaboration

A 2020 Higher Education Policy Institute (HEPI) debate paper made several recommendations to ensure that decolonization in UK higher education focuses on increasing funding for BAME (Black, Asian, and minority ethnic) scholars. The recommendations included increasing research support and scholarships, addressing deficiencies in curricula, creating departmental roles to address decoloniality, and working toward rectifying misunderstandings of the terms and processes. Key research funders such as UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) and the Wellcome Trust have also sought to address issues related to decoloniality in research. For instance, the Wellcome Trust published a resource to inform anti-racist practice in its organization and research.

Counterarguments point out that the scope of these reflections remains Eurocentric, focusing more on "self-improvement" on the part of UK funders and universities. In contrast, efforts led by African universities establish measures to address decolonization through holistic measures to improve curricula, research objectives, and international collaborations. Furthermore, a recent consensus statement set forth guidelines for researchers to promote equitable authorship in research partnerships between low- and low-middle-income countries (LMIC) and high-income countries (HIC). As some Global South universities are dependent on Western funding to support their research programs, particularly in the areas of health and development, more work needs to be done to center the needs of southern institutions to divest from ongoing legacies of coloniality in higher education and promote meaningful collaboration.

Embedding Decoloniality in Internationalization

There is little evidence that the university internationalization agenda is explicitly invested in decolonization. This answers the rhetorical question posed in our heading. It also prompts another question: Where do we go from here?

Although a few universities place valuing other cultures and perspectives at the heart of internationalization, there is still a long way to go when it comes to opening up the debate on the decolonization of internationalization. Universities are at different stages of this complex and complicated process. Many have not even started.

Moving forward with a decolonial internationalization agenda will require institutions to truly welcome diversity of knowledge and confront the persisting hegemonic structures that constrain knowing through an expanded lens. Thus, all stakeholders in different global contexts need to challenge the rhetoric of "global engagement" that seemingly presents a nonpoliticized and nonracialized outlook. The voices of erstwhile marginalized stakeholders reaffirm the need to redress the enduring legacies of colonization embedded in the structures of higher education institutions, globally. Strategies for decolonialization of internationalization must be supported by tangible policy changes that reflect the lived experiences of students and staff. The current main manifestation of internationalization as affording intercultural connections offers a potential way to re-envision internationalization, first by embracing the international classroom as a site of diverse perspectives that can drive decolonization of curricula and pedagogy.

Omolabake Fakunle is a Chancellor's Fellow at the Institute for Education, Community and Society, and Chisomo Kalinga is a Chancellor's Fellow at the School of Social and Political Science, University of Edinburgh, UK. Emails: Omolabake.Fakunle@ed.ac.uk *and* Chisomo.Kalinga@ed.ac.uk.

Vicky Lewis is founder and director of Vicky Lewis Consulting, UK. Email: vickylewisconsulting@gmail.com.

Next, we need to reconceptualize research collaboration so that marginalized partners are prioritized through the centering of subaltern voices in this process. In sum, internationalization policy must explicitly dismantle the legacy of coloniality, using the current manifestations of internationalization as a starting point in this complicated but necessary process.

Building Connections During a Time of Global Change: An International Snapshot of Virtual Exchange

Rajika Bhandari and Kyle Kastler

Abstract
Virtual exchange has witnessed unprecedented growth in recent years, yet much remains to be known about types of programs globally; characteristics of participants and content of programs; and countries engaged in these activities. Based on a 2021 survey of virtual exchange, this article presents key findings about the landscape of global virtual exchange, while sharing lessons learned and implications for implementing virtual exchange. Further, the variable impact of COVID-19 on virtual exchange is also examined.

Virtual exchange has expanded in recent years, with more regional, national, and multinational initiatives being established. Yet the dynamics of the field have not been adequately studied, and little is known about the diversity and spread of programs that leverage technology to foster knowledge and cultural exchange. Individual educators are often left wondering how much virtual exchange is happening beyond their campus context and if it varies from what they provide. Based on a 2021 survey of global virtual exchange conducted by the Stevens Initiative, which aims to fill this gap in knowledge, this article shares key findings about the landscape of global virtual exchange, while also discussing lessons learned and implications for implementing virtual exchange.

This survey included responses from 233 virtual exchange providers who implemented global programs between September 2020 and August 2021. Of these, the 177 providers who shared detailed data on their virtual exchange programs reported implementing a total of 3,073 distinct programs that in turn served a total of 224,168 participants. A highlight of the 2021 survey, the second in a series, is its attempt to go beyond programs that involve the United States, capturing programs in other world regions and including South–South exchanges.

Virtual Exchange Providers and Participants

Most virtual exchange providers were higher education institutions (56 percent), followed by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that operate in more than one country (21 percent). The higher education sector is most represented in the survey, whether as the largest group of providers of virtual exchange programs or with postsecondary students being the largest participant group (66 percent of providers reported serving undergraduates; 29 percent reported serving graduate/postgraduate students). About 35 percent of programs served high school students.

Providers increasingly reported joining virtual exchange networks around the world, with a majority (60 percent) indicating they were part of one or more such consortiums, including the Stevens Initiative's own network (24 percent), the SUNY COIL Global Network (13 percent), UNICollaboration in Europe (9 percent), and Red Latinoamericana COIL (6 percent).

Types of Virtual Exchange Programs

Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) courses, a specific virtual exchange model that is developed by pairs or small groups of educators and connects two or more academic courses in different places, were the most common type of program (36 percent) reported. The second most frequent type of program (24 percent) was a single virtual exchange program run mostly the same way across several sites, locations, or classrooms. Most programs (63 percent) were offered in English only, with about 20 percent being offered in English and another language, and only 4 percent offered solely in a language other than English.

A notable change in this second survey was to account not just for virtual exchange programs, but also for training and advocacy provided by many large institutions and initiatives. While 53 percent of providers reported offering such training, this year's survey allowed for a mere glimpse into this important aspect of the field.

Where Virtual Exchange Is Occurring

While virtual exchange has clearly expanded its global footprint, capturing this data remains a challenge. The United States is overrepresented in the survey, whether as the country where the program originates (75 percent of all providers) or as the home country of a key partner in a virtual exchange. The reasons for this could include: (a) the possibility that virtual exchange is more established in the United States; (b) the fact that respondents have a connection to the US-based Stevens Initiative; (c) or that virtual exchange providers in other countries are still building their capacity to report data. The second largest group of virtual exchange providers was based in Europe (11 percent). Virtual exchange activity in Latin America is likely more extensive than our survey suggests, especially given the growth of virtual exchange networks in the region.

The survey also attempted to capture the countries in which virtual exchange participants reside, as well as the number of participants per country (a level of detail that most respondents were unable to report). While participants resided all over the world, the top 10 countries (in descending order) are: United States, Germany, Japan, France, India, Mexico, China, Spain, Egypt, and Colombia.

The How and What of Virtual Exchange

Most virtual exchange programs (38 percent) use a blend of asynchronous (sharing information and engaging at different times) and synchronous (engagement in real time) approaches. Both categories encompass a wide range of activities and applications that are constantly evolving in response to pedagogical and technological advances. The top three content areas on which programs focus are: intercultural dialogue and peacebuilding (67 percent); STEM (25 percent); and global or international affairs (24 percent). Respondents also indicated covering timely and emergent topics such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); media literacy; communications; racial and social justice; and environmental issues, ecology, and sustainability.

Impacts of the Pandemic

With teaching and learning mostly shifting from in-person to online since early 2020, most virtual exchange providers (69 percent) reported an expansion of their programming and anticipated future growth.

With teaching and learning mostly shifting from in-person to online since early 2020, most virtual exchange providers (69 percent) reported an expansion of their programming and anticipated future growth. Forty-six percent plan to offer more programs next year (2022), while 39 percent plan to retain their current level of programming. However, the impacts of the pandemic are complex, and the challenges faced by some practitioners should not be discounted: Even where virtual exchange programs were not canceled outright, some saw a drop in participation. It is possible that virtual exchange programs focused on the K-12 student population and run by NGOs were significantly affected by the interruptions to students' in-person learning, since participation in virtual exchange often occurs in formal classroom settings.

Lessons Learned

The current survey offers some important lessons for the field, while also surfacing some inherent limitations.

- Defining and understanding virtual exchange: Despite attempts to define and classify virtual exchange (such as with the Stevens Initiative Typology), programs around the world are complex and varied, resisting easy categorization. More research is needed on these variations, in particular the presence, rationales, and models of virtual exchange in the Global South.
- Maintaining and reporting data: Depending on the structure and size of an organization/institution, it can be difficult to report data at the organizational level.
- Measuring change: Measuring program-level change in virtual exchange remains challenging. It is hoped that the continuing annual survey effort will yield higher response rates and wider global representation, thus enabling an understanding of change over time.
- Understanding the quality and context of virtual exchange: This survey focused on quantifying and mapping virtual exchange globally, yet not much is known about the quality of virtual exchange programs, including how institutions ensure quality in their delivery of virtual exchange.

Looking ahead

Data limitations notwithstanding, this second survey points to a growing and evolving field and offers a useful snapshot and metrics for the virtual exchange sector. These findings also come at a critical time, given the global pandemic, the disruptions to in-person education and exchange, and a rising tide of nationalism. This confluence of factors has sharpened the need for virtual exchanges that foster mutual understanding and educational diplomacy. Looking ahead, it is possible that virtual exchange programs will have an even stronger role to play in addressing some of these shifts, in diversifying teaching and learning, and in enabling students and educators from a range of backgrounds to develop global competencies. Data that quantifies and explores virtual exchange qualitatively will help equip international education professionals with the tools to make important decisions regarding their students and communities.

Rajika Bhandari is an international higher education expert and the founder of Rajika Bhandari Advisors. She partnered with the Stevens Initiative on the survey. Email: rbhandari@rajikabhandari.com.

Kyle Kastler is a senior program associate at the Stevens Initiative. Email: Kyle.Kastler@aspeninstitute.org.

The Role of Institutes for Advanced Study in Promoting Internationalization

Dorothea Rüland and Sonja Gräber-Magocsi

Abstract

Since 1930, more than 150 Institutes for Advanced Study have been founded all over the world. They have a common role in the global science system in that they all aim to promote innovation and free spaces for researchers. The future of internationalization in research and higher education might lie in a strong focus on the development of global networks.

In 2021, the German Science and Humanities Council published a study on the Development Perspectives of Institutes for Advanced Study (IASs) in Germany, concluding that IASs have come to form an integral part of the German science system. Since the establishment of the first IAS in Princeton in 1930, there have been subsequent founding waves that responded to the specific needs of the respective time periods.

Worldwide, there are now more than 150 IASs altogether, spread over five continents. A common characteristic of all the institutes is that they try to foster innovation and reforms in the field of science and scholarship. They want to attract excellent researchers from all over the world by offering them free space to develop new ideas. In Germany,

the most prominent for a long time was the Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin, which was joined by a wave of new institutes established through funding by a top level research competition, the Excellence Initiative.

Internationalization of Research—The Missing Link?

In the past decades, support of individual career paths as well as participation in the global competition for the most promising researchers have been high on the agenda of IASs, promoting internationalization. Is this the final destination of IASs as well? Or is there still more in the pipeline? Today, as far as research on internationalization is concerned, there is a strong focus on mobility and research output, but not so much on the processes of internationalization in research. Considering that all the grand challenges that we are facing today can only be tackled through international cooperation, this omission is quite surprising. One explanation might be that the majority of national funding organizations still think and operate mostly within bilateral (and less within multilateral) structures. Another reason could be that individual mobility and publications are simply far easier to measure and quantify than the multidimensional effects of scientific networks.

IASs—Promoters of Global Networks

What does that mean for the future and the potential of IASs? The overarching issue and the mission of IASs today might be to act as platforms and to offer spaces to build networks for all the urgent topics that need solving. By definition, IASs are small entities bringing together researchers at different career stages, and of different nationalities and academic disciplines, who live and work together without any other obligation than to pursue their own ideas. They build small communities, socializing with one another, asking each other questions, exchanging ideas, and forging new transdisciplinary relations. Together, they act as a kind of incubator for new networks, which hopefully will last much longer than the fellows' individual stays at their respective IASs. This is an investment in the future, something that universities today may not always be able to offer because of all the obligations that today's scientists and scholars have to fulfill in research, teaching, and administration.

By definition, IASs are small entities bringing together researchers at different career stages, and of different nationalities and academic disciplines.

The Hamburg Institute for Advanced Study

Another conclusion of the Council's survey is that this type of fertile atmosphere will not develop spontaneously out of thin air, but needs a certain framework. Each IAS has to develop its own profile and highlight the added value that it has to offer. In our case at the Hamburg Institute for Advanced Study (HIAS), the foremost distinction is its unusual structure: HIAS is an independent membership organization of nine local institutions of higher education (publicly and privately funded universities and research institutions), with strong financial commitment from the city of Hamburg. This offers the chance to cover nearly any kind of field, including the arts. The focus lies on inviting excellent researchers to Hamburg at different stages of their careers, as well as artists and cultural professionals from all over the world, and to provide them with the opportunity to build new networks, or develop existing ones, by matching them with a cooperation partner from one of HIAS' member organizations. This helps fellows to integrate into the local academic landscape right from the beginning of their stay, and is intended to facilitate new cooperative relationships.

As an additional effect, this networking offers outreach opportunities beyond academia because local counterparts often provide access to their own networks, thus opening doors to the local community and contributing to more science communication and an increased understanding of science.

The whole endeavor is flanked by an evaluation process that follows up on the output of each fellowship. From the beginning, an alumni concept is needed to make sure that all of these cooperative developments will prove to be sustainable. Additional elements might make sense, for example, offering fellows the chance to invite doctoral students or postdocs for shorter periods of time in order to work on a proposal for a joint research project and to broaden the network.

Networks of the Future

Internationalization is much more than just mobility; it is needed on all levels of higher education and research. Students have to learn how to work in an intercultural environment; they have to start right from the beginning to build their own networks. This process will never come to an end, on the contrary. In the long run, there will be a stronger focus on the internationalization of research. The networking taking place at IASs can promote cooperation in two directions: between the fellows, who are staying together and who are encouraged to develop new transdisciplinary ideas (that is, beyond their respective fields of research), as well as between the different fellows and their counterparts at the local academic institutions. Therefore, IASs are indeed an integral part of the (German) science system and contribute to the internationalization of research. ◢

Dorothea Rüland is secretary-general of the Hamburg Institute for Advanced Study (HIAS) in Hamburg, Germany. Email: dorothea.rueland@hias-hamburg.de.

Sonja Gräber-Magocsi is responsible for fellow management and academic coordination at HIAS. Email: sonja.graeber-magocsi@hias-hamburg.de.

Do International Students Benefit from Their US Study-Abroad Experience?

Anna Esaki-Smith

Abstract

Increasingly, international students pursue study abroad to gain skills that will enhance their employment prospects upon graduation. Host destinations such as the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada not only offer pathways connecting education to a professional future, but data that quantifies how international graduates have benefited from their overseas study experiences. The United States comes up short in both those areas. Can it catch up?

The reasons why international students study abroad vary widely. Traditionally, the main drivers were access to high-quality academic programs overseas or limited higher education opportunities at home. Anglophone host destinations also provided an opportunity to master English, a skill widely perceived as critical to future prosperity.

However, what propels international students to look beyond national borders has shifted amid a globalized economy increasingly disrupted by technology. Certainly, the original influencing factors remain. But what students want from their study-abroad experiences has become more tangible and practical in nature, with expanded employment opportunities now number one.

There is much discussion about skills that students gain by studying overseas: critical thinking ability and creativity, among other so-called "soft skills," in addition to harder tech skills from STEM-related academic programs. But, to a large degree, how the study abroad experience enhances employability remains mostly anecdotal. So, with students demanding concrete evidence of the benefits of an overseas education, what can the United States offer when recruiting new prospects?

Perceived as More Welcoming, But That Alone Is Not Enough

The recent Open Doors data from the Institute of International Education indicated a 15 percent drop in international student enrollments in the United States in the academic year 2020–2021, with the total number falling below one million for the first time since 2016. Undoubtedly, the pandemic's impact is largely behind the fall. However, perceptions that the Trump administration was unwelcoming to international students, together with personal safety concerns stemming from social turmoil, also contributed to dampening interest.

The election of a new president, widely viewed as friendlier to the international community, has infused the market with much-needed optimism. Indeed, in July of 2021, a landmark "renewed US commitment" made by the Departments of State and Education to promote the United States as a study destination for international students was

both unexpected and wholly welcomed. The Biden administration's clarion bell of support alleviated fears that the Optional Practical Training (OPT) scheme, allowing international graduates to work for at least one year in the United States after graduation, would be rescinded.

However, a reprieve in sentiment alone is not enough. The United States still lacks an international education policy, like those of competitor countries such as Australia, Canada, and the United Kingdom. Not only do those destinations offer clearer pathways to work opportunities and a professional future, they publicize graduate outcomes to underscore their universities' recruitment strategies. With technology disrupting industries across the spectrum and the workforce growing increasingly competitive as a result, there is an intensified need to map the career pathways of international students who graduate from US institutions. Adding to the pressure to do so is a proliferation of study abroad options in countries like Germany, Japan, and the Netherlands, which are cheaper and perceived to be safer.

The Demand for Data-Based Outcomes to Support Recruitment Strategies

In *Career Pathways for International Students*, a research paper that I authored for the American Council on Education, I examined how little is understood about how international graduates of US universities actually fare in the job market. We simply do not know if their career trajectories are altered as a result of their study-abroad experiences. Universities largely fail to track their international graduates, either in the United States, their home countries, or elsewhere, in the same manner that they follow domestic alumni.

The reasons for the data shortfall are numerous. According to a survey of 100 universities conducted by Academic Assembly and the marketing firm Intead, 65 percent of respondents said that they did not dedicate staff time to track international alumni. Insufficient time and budgets and a dearth of data management systems were among the reasons given.

This contrasts with the United Kingdom, where efforts are being made to quantify the impact of the UK study-abroad experience. For example, on behalf of Universities UK International, the consulting firm iGraduate published a survey-based research report, *International Graduate Outcomes 2019*, which tracked the career outcomes of a large number of international students who had studied in the United Kingdom. The report revealed, among other findings, that 69 percent of respondents said that they progressed more quickly in their careers than peers who had studied elsewhere; 82 percent said that the UK degree was worth the investment; and 83 percent said that their degree helped them get their first job.

Where the United States Comes up Short, And What Is at Stake

The inability to optimally align international graduate outcomes with poststudy work and immigration policies keeps the United States well behind competitor countries that draw students with neatly packaged offers that address aspirations beyond education. For example, Canada's national strategy to attract international students is underpinned with pathways, not only to jobs, but to citizenship. The result? Between 2010 and 2017, there was a 119 percent increase in the number of international students studying in Canada.

Universities are being increasingly viewed as gateways to global talent.

Further, universities are being increasingly viewed as gateways to global talent. A significant number of international students pursue STEM and related subjects at universities in the United States and elsewhere, and many have gone on to establish and lead tech companies. As technology continues to disrupt industries, demand for tech talent has increased accordingly. So, host countries originally eager to attract international students simply to capture tuition revenue increasingly value what these graduates can offer as members of their workforce.

There is a lot at stake. Incorporating international talent into a country's workforce, especially in the fields of high tech and artificial intelligence, is key to maintaining global competitiveness. Tech and science jobs in the United States outnumbered qualified workers by three million as of 2016, and by 2030, a global shortage of over 85 million tech workers is expected, representing USD 8.5 trillion in lost annual revenue.

What the United States Needs to Do to Stay Competitive

Despite the challenges, there are signs of promise. Surveys conducted by the American Physical Society in 2019 indicate that federal policies can reverse the downward trend, showing that making the F-1 visa "dual intent" and providing a clear path to a green card for international students who earn advanced STEM degrees from US institutions will help restore the United States as a competitive host destination.

It would be useful for a US-specific study to be undertaken to gather robust data from US universities. This could be done through a survey of current international students and recent alumni, to identify connections between overseas study and employability. Insights gained by such research would enable universities to integrate graduate employability into institutional internationalization and recruitment strategies. It may be trickier to measure the economic and innovative contributions of international graduates, but case studies of careers of international graduates, mapping their career trajectories and the levels of influence that they command, could provide much-needed data.

Overall, even with the lack of US data, it is fair to conclude that simply living and studying overseas requires students to extend themselves in a manner that they would not in their home countries. To build upon that foundation with quantifiable feedback from international students about how exactly the US study-abroad experience benefited them would be powerful. And while we assume that increased employability is the desired outcome, can we be sure there are no others? To better understand whether expectations are being met would ensure that we are equipped to address the evolving needs of students in an increasingly volatile world. ◢

Anna Esaki-Smith is cofounder of the research consultancy Education Rethink. Email: anna@education-rethink.com.

Germany's International Career Services: Marketing Mismatches and Sustainable Structures

Jessica Schueller

Abstract

Retaining international students is central to many countries' economic development policies. One manifestation of these efforts is the development of international student career services, which are established to support international students in pursuing careers in the host country. Examples of international student career integration in the Anglosphere are abundant. This article examines the German context, offering perspectives to non-Anglophone countries interested in sustainably attracting, recruiting, supporting, and retaining international talent.

Retaining international students is a policy goal for many countries in light of labor shortages, demographic changes, and economic innovation. Examples of integrating international students into labor markets in the Anglosphere are abundant. Policies and practices for integrating graduates into non-English-speaking countries such as China, Russia, and Turkey, which all host considerable numbers of international students, are lesser-known. This article examines the case of Germany, arguably a traditional destination, but one of the non-Anglo-Saxon countries hosting a high number of students and researchers. A glimpse into the German case offers a perspective to other countries outside of the Anglosphere that are interested in sustainably attracting, recruiting, supporting, and retaining international talent.

International Student Mobility and Poststudy Employment

Similar to other non-Anglophone countries, the appeal of studying in Germany has expanded due to public and private marketing campaigns, ever-increasing numbers of English-taught programs, and a generous poststudy work visa scheme. Initiatives that aim to improve the academic success, sociocultural integration, and German language skills of over 300,000 international students in Germany have long been part of a system that was designed to improve the mobility experience.

International students who attend German universities account for 11.1 percent of the total student population, nearly double that of the proportion of international students in the United States. Germany's numerous population of international students is geographically diverse, and outgoing mobility is also high. Both aspects starkly contrast other economically advanced countries. Becoming a leading nation in hosting students has not come without its costs, however. Since the international student population has increased by over 75 percent over the last decade, calls for greater transparency around the effectiveness of internationalization agendas have also multiplied. In particular, Germany's integration of its growing international student population into the labor market has gained the attention of a wide variety of stakeholders. Political and socioeconomic developments have influenced the establishment of special career services for international students, programs created to sensitize students to what awaits them upon graduation—and to convince them to stay.

Career Services for International Students

The institutionalized set-up for informing international students about, and preparing them for, working in Germany is a recent development. Unlike students heading for English-speaking countries, many international students in non-Anglophone countries are not fluent in the host country's language when they arrive. This impacts academic performance, sociocultural integration, and labor market prospects. In Germany, a generous poststudy work visa scheme allows graduates to look for work for 18 months upon degree completion, and research indicates that about half of all international graduates find gainful employment.

To address labor market integration, contextualized career advising programs seek to help students in the process. These are special services that have been curated to inform international students about the expectations of German employers and offer strategic preparation support. While there is no unifying name for the career services provided to international students, one of the more established terms is "international career services" (ICSs). The acronym "ICS" combines "international office" and "career services" to represent the collaborative effort among these two departments.

ICSs often focus on integrating students from English-language master programs, German-language bachelor programs, and, more recently, early career researchers. The range of services may include a mixture of coaching, workshops, seminars, job shadowing, or company visits. ICSs are primarily temporary, project-funded programs. Some states have partnered with employer associations to provide funding for ICSs; in other cases, universities have reacted to student demand or initiated ICS programming to attract international students. Some universities have stand-alone ICSs, whereas others provide ICSs in partnership with multiple offices. Roughly 20 percent of German higher education institutions offer some form of tailored labor market preparation and individual coaching, but the extent of ICS provision varies drastically between institutions. However, providing these services is not about benchmarking—each institution has a different international student population that requires individualized solutions.

Labor Market Tensions

Some government initiatives and institutional ICSs emphasize supporting international students interested in science and research careers in Germany. Simultaneously, German academia is experiencing tensions while trying to expand capacity for early career researchers plagued with short-term, precarious contracts, leaving them without long-term perspectives. While marketing initiatives seek to attract foreign talent to Germany, many researchers already in the country face fierce competition in advancing their careers or obtaining stable employment. The movement #ichbinhanna criticizes the system of temporary contracts and provides information in English to foreign academics employed in the country. This tension also exists in the nonacademic labor market, where pandemic-induced unemployment has been particularly high for young graduates and is even more troublesome for those with foreign passports or migrant backgrounds.

The Consequences of Misaligned Marketing

Attracting and supporting international talent in a country facing labor market shortages is a fundamentally sound and common approach. Germany has advanced a clear logistical, financial, and staffing commitment to providing career services to international students interested in staying in the country. However, the rise of ICSs in Germany also illustrates a need for aligning marketing to prospective international students with German labor market demands. On the one hand, public and private marketing efforts often recruit students to English-language programs. On the other hand, employers are often interested in graduates who speak German. A discrepancy results when marketing is aimed at one student demographic, but the demand is for another. This has given way to a need to internationalize career services that then sensitize students to what they need to do to increase their employment prospects—the backbone of which is learning German.

Once the language expectations needed to pursue employment in Germany become more transparent, a key advantage will be that these students are familiarized with Germany and committed to starting careers in the country. And yet, this phenomenon sheds light on the wider inconsistencies between internationalization stakeholders—including employers—and raises questions about Germany's internationalization strategy. More holistic decisions around internationalization, considering the whole pipeline, are necessary. Previous marketing initiatives have led to enrollment increases in English-language programs. But if the graduates of these programs are not in areas facing skilled labor shortages, or if they do not learn German, higher education institutions and students will bear the negative consequences in the form of unemployed, unsatisfied students, and unhappy employers. More transparent marketing of available career opportunities, the crucial importance of German language skills, and sustainable funding of ICSs could, however, serve the country's larger economic development and innovation goals.

Ultimately, many countries welcoming international students seek to integrate them into their societies and labor markets. Germany's ICSs provide a noteworthy model, with many good-practice initiatives from which to derive ideas and inspiration. ICSs play a central role in connecting international students with employers. But for Germany's ICSs to adequately support the integration of students into the labor market in the long-term, transparent country marketing and permanent funding for ICSs is necessary. While developing English-language programs may expand international enrollment, a domestic degree alone may not translate into employment. If the intention is to retain international students, then it is important to set clear expectations while marketing programs, and later on, provide students with tailored employability preparation.

Cases such as Germany's offer insight into the challenges and opportunities that non-Anglophone countries face in attracting and retaining foreign talent. While internationalization has been central to economic strategies for decades, a comprehensive approach needs to include sustainable structures for international student labor market integration. ◢

Cases such as Germany's offer insight into the challenges and opportunities that non-Anglophone countries face in attracting and retaining foreign talent.

Jessica Schueller is a PhD student at Miami University, US, and a C-BERT research associate. Email: schueljd@miamioh.edu.

Developmental Trends of Graduate Education in China

Yanru Xu and Ji'an Liu

Abstract
This article offers a snapshot of developmental trends in Chinese graduate education for the past twenty years by examining the differentiated expansion of levels, types, disciplines, and gender composition. Also, the drivers for expansion are analyzed in terms of domestic demands for graduate education and for upgrading research and development workforces. Finally, the potential outcomes for future development are explored.

On December 25, 2021, about 4.57 million applicants took the National Graduate Education Entrance Examination in China, marking the sixth consecutive year of a rate of increase over 10 percent. This indicates the strength of domestic demand for graduate education, at a time when the country is speeding up the construction of its knowledge-intensive economy. As knowledge and innovation have replaced capital assets and labor productivity as the engines for national growth and prosperity, and with worldwide higher education approaching mass and universal stages, many countries have been expanding student participation in graduate education to prepare for the future. Mainly using data from the ministry of education and the National Bureau of Statistics in China, supplemented by data from the World Bank, UNESCO, and the National Science Foundation in the United States (US), this article tries to depict the developmental trends of graduate education in China, which may offer implications for other countries striving to upgrade their workforce.

Differentiated Expansion: Levels, Types, and Disciplines

Since the Reform and Opening-up in 1978, China has witnessed an unprecedented development of graduate education, with an increase of the total number of entrants from about 10,000 in 1978 to 128,484 in 2000, and further to 1,106,551 in 2020. Over the past two decades, the number of master degree entrants grew by a factor of 9.62, from 102,923 to 990,504, while the number of doctoral entrants increased by a factor of 4.62, from 25,142 to 116,047.

In terms of types of education, the past two decades witnessed the rapid development of professional graduate education in China. Professional graduate programs first appeared in 1991, with a large proportion of enrollments from part-time students graduating without degrees. This lasted until 2009, when the ministry of education began expanding professional graduate education to full-time programs. The percentage of entrants into the professional track jumped from 22.17 percent in 2010 to 55.69 percent in 2020 (from 24.83 percent to 60.83 percent in master programs, and from 2.36 percent to 11.82 percent in doctoral programs).

The development of each discipline varied during the expansion. The general trends show that the share of social sciences gained the most, that of medicine and agriculture also increased, while that of engineering, natural sciences, and humanities and arts dropped. At the master level, engineering constantly attracted the largest share of entrants, with a decline, however, from 42.95 percent in 2000 to 27.34 percent in 2010, followed by an increase to 34.92 percent in 2020. The same trends occurred with other applied disciplines, including social sciences, medicine, and agriculture. The share of the natural sciences has been in constant decline, from 12.51 percent in 2000 to 6.83 percent in 2020.

At the doctoral level, engineering has also attracted the most entrants, although also experiencing the trend of a decline and a subsequent increase, and achieving 41.27 percent in 2020. The second largest discipline in terms of numbers of entrants has been the natural sciences, with a relatively stable percentage, from 19.21 percent in 2000 to 18.54 percent in 2020, followed by medicine (15.47 percent) and social sciences (14.67 percent), while humanities & arts saw a continuous decline from 7.88 percent in 2000 to 5.74 percent in 2020.

Women Are Catching Up

From 2000 to 2020, the share of female entrants into graduate education rose from 34.3 to 52.5 percent. Their percentage at the master level has gone up from 36.3 to 53.5 percent; and for doctoral education, it has expanded from 26.6 to 42.7 percent. Notably, women have been catching up and their number now surpasses that of men in graduate education in general, although in doctoral programs, male entrants are still more numerous. Little is known with regard to gender composition within the various disciplines, because of a lack of open data.

From 2000 to 2020, the share of female entrants into graduate education rose from 34.3 to 52.5 percent.

Drivers for Further Expansion

With more than one million entrants in total, the current scale of Chinese graduate education is significant. However, it is still unable to meet domestic demand. The demand–supply disparity of graduate education can be illustrated by the ratio of entrants to applicants, which was 1:3.4 in 2021 and is likely to widen further in 2022, given that 800,000 more applicants took the recent entrance exam. It can be predicted that strong demand will continue to drive further expansion, for a number of reasons:

First, the development of Chinese graduate education has not kept pace with the expansion of undergraduate education. During the period of 2000–2020, the ratio of the number of graduate entrants to the number of bachelor degree awardees was 1: 4.4 on average.

Second, in spite of a nearly tenfold increase of graduate education since 2000, the number of graduate enrollments was only 2.2 per thousand individuals in 2020. China lags significantly behind the United States and most European countries, with figures ranging from 9 to 14 per thousand individuals, respectively.

Third, the Chinese labor market is starved for a more highly skilled workforce. Statistics from the US National Science Board and the US National Science Foundation show that China's share of global value-added output of high and medium-high R&D intensive industries has risen from 13 percent in 2003 to 47 percent in 2018, while the output of knowledge- and technology-intensive industries reached around 2,100 billion US dollars in 2019. Nonetheless, less than 0.7 percent of the total number of employed individuals in 2020 were full-time equivalent members of the R&D workforce. In 2019, about 43.9 percent of the full-time equivalent R&D workforce were researchers, and less than 35 percent of the full-time equivalent R&D workforce members were graduate degree holders. This puts great pressure on the need to increase the Chinese R&D workforce, for which further developing graduate education provides one solution.

Potential for Future Development

China has the financial potential to strengthen its graduate education. Its GDP has increased 10.1 times in the past two decades, and its growth rate exceeded 8.1 percent in 2021, in spite of the pandemic. Meanwhile, its total R&D expenditure experienced a 26-fold increase in the period 2000—2020, from 89.6 billion to 2,439 billion; that of basic research saw a 30-fold growth. Both growth rates outpaced the rate of increase of graduate enrollment.

China acknowledges the strategic role of talent to lead national development. This has recently been stressed by the leader of the Chinese Communist Party, who announced the implementation of a strategy to develop a quality workforce to help reach China's goal of becoming a major world center of talents and innovation. Therefore, as a crucial way to upgrade the nation's workforce, graduate education can be expected to develop further. ◢

Yanru Xu is a postdoctoral researcher and Ji'an Liu is a professor in the School of Public Policy and Management, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, P.R. China. Emails: xuyanru@ucas.edu.cn *and* jian.liu@ucas.edu.cn.

Internationalisation of Higher Education

Policy and Practice

Peer reviewed!

- **4 issues per year**
  in English
  with 5–7 articles per issue
- **Unlimited access**
  to the publication's website
- **Print & online: €268**
  annual billing + shipping
- **Online-only: €241,20**
  annual billing
- **Campus & team licences**
  also available

Internationalisation of Higher Education – Policy and Practice is a publication for practitioners and policymakers in higher education. It examines internationalisation policies, processes and activities, addressing key issues in the internationalisation of higher education, and placing them in the context of global developments.

DUZ medienhaus

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE VISIT
www.handbook-internationalisation.com

Our Global Reach

Published since 1995 by the Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE), International Higher Education (IHE) is the world's oldest continuously published source of news and analysis of global higher education. Our mission is to provide insightful, informed, and high-quality commentary and analysis on trends and issues of importance to higher education systems, institutions, and stakeholders around the world.

As such, since our establishment, IHE has aimed to be globally representative, both in terms of the topics covered and the authors represented. Our contributors are drawn from a broad network of distinguished international scholars, policymakers, and leaders, who are well positioned to offer critical perspectives on key issues and trends that shape higher education worldwide.

The IHE editorial team is also committed to the principle of linguistic diversity. As a result, IHE is translated into Chinese, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, and Vietnamese by partners in China, Brazil, Russia, Chile, and Vietnam.

IHE is distributed all over the world to individual subscribers based in over 100 countries and via partnerships with the International Association of Universities (IAU), the Association of Indian Universities (AIU), the Association of African Universities (AAU), and the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD).

CIHE and IHE also partner with international publications, including the DUZ magazine; Higher Education in Southeast Asia and Beyond (HESB), published by the HEAD Foundation in Singapore; and Educación Superior en América Latina (ESAL), published by a consortium of partners in Brazil, Chile, and Colombia.

Project management: Niklas Heuser
Cover illustration: axeptdesign.de

DUZ Verlags- und Medienhaus GmbH
DUZ Academic Publishers
Kaiser-Friedrich-Straße 90
10585 Berlin
Germany

Phone: +49 (0)30 21 29 87-0

Fax: +49 (0)30 21 29 87-20

Internet: www.internationalhighereducation.net

***International Higher Education* is the quarterly publication of the Boston College Center for International Higher Education.**

The journal is a reflection of the Center's mission to encourage an international perpective that will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. Through *International Higher Education*, a network of distinguished international scholars offers commentary and current information on key issues that shape higher education worldwide.

www.internationalhighereducation.net