

International Higher Education is the quarterly publication of the Center for International Higher Education.

The journal is a reflection of the Center's mission to encourage an international perspective 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. *IHE* is published in English, Chinese, Russian, Portuguese, and Spanish. Links to all editions can be found at www.bc.edu/cihe.

International Issues

- 2 Student Activism: A Worldwide Force
Philip G. Altbach and Manja Klemencic

American Themes in Global Perspective

- 4 Research Universities: American Exceptionalism?
Henry Rosovsky
- 6 Demographics and Higher Education Attainment
Arthur M. Hauptman

Internationalization

- 7 Converging or Diverging Global Trends?
Eva Egron-Polak
- 9 International Students: UK Drops the Ball
Simon Marginson

Private Higher Education

- 11 Private Higher Education in the UK: Myths and Realities
Steve Woodfield
- 13 US For-Profit Higher Education
Elizabeth Meza and William Zumeta

Africa Focus

- 14 Inside African Private Higher Education
Louise Morley
- 16 African Academic Diaspora
Kim Foulds and Paul Tiyambe Zeleza

China: New Directions

- 17 Reforming the *Gaokao*
Gerard A. Postiglione
- 19 Systematic Changes
Qiang Zha and Chuanyi Wang

Countries and Regions

- 20 Graduate Education in Malaysia and Thailand
Chiao-Ling Chien and David W. Chapman
- 22 Russian Examinations: Problems and Perspectives
Elena Denisova-Schmidt and Elvira Leontyeva
- 23 The *International Higher Education* Reader Survey
Ariane de Gayardon and David A. Stanfield

Departments

- 24 New Publications
- 27 News of the Center

Student Activism Remains a Potent Force Worldwide

PHILIP G. ALTBACH AND MANJA KLEMENCIC

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. Manja Klemencic is postdoctoral fellow, Department of Sociology, Harvard University. E-mail: manja.klemencic@gmail.com. (This article has appeared in Inside Higher Education.)

Students were a key force in toppling Ukrainian autocrat Victor Yanukovich. They were on the Maidan battleground in Kiev from beginning to end. They were also instrumental in the 2004 Orange Revolution in the aftermath of that year's presidential election, which was marred by corruption and outright electoral fraud. Students were active on Tahrir Square in Cairo when Hosni Mubarak was forced from office, and they were active participants in all of the Arab Spring movements.

The beginnings of student-dominated youth movements in "color revolutions" come probably with the Serbian Otpor ("Resistance") movement, which was started in 1998 as a response to the repressive university and media laws introduced by the regime at the time led by Slobodan Milošević. In 2000, Otpor organized a campaign "Gotov je" ("He is finished"), ultimately leading to Milošević's defeat in elections. Organizations such as Kmara in Georgia, active in the Rose Revolution in 2003, KelKel in Kyrgyzstan in the 2005 Tulip Revolution, and Pora in Ukraine were all inspired and trained by Otpor. Students occupied the Taiwan legislature protesting a trade agreement with China for several weeks in March 2014—and spearheaded a protest rally of 100,000.

Although the era of student revolutions may have ended a half century ago, students continue to be active in politics, and they are often a key force in political movements directed toward social change around the world. Students may no longer be at the center of political movements, but they are often indispensable participants, frequently helping to shape the messages, ideologies, and tactics of protest movements.

Students have also been engaged in university politics and policy. German students successfully pushed to have free higher education restored, convincing politicians and the public. Similarly, high school and university students in Chile demonstrated for extended periods to improve educational quality, end for-profit education, and eliminate tuition and fees. They finally succeeded when Michelle Bachelet won the presidency in 2013. In Canada, the "Maple Spring" protests in 2012 emerged from students' opposition to the

government's announcement of increased tuition fees and led to the fall of Québec's government.

In some parts of the world, student agitation, often relating to campus issues, cause governments to shut universities for extended periods. This has occurred in Nigeria, and universities in Myanmar were closed for several years after student protests against the military dictatorship. In many of these cases, student demands have combined local campus issues with broader political concerns. They seldom had success in social change, although sometimes university policies or conditions have altered.

Despite continuing activism and impressive but often ignored success, student activism has not received the scholarly attention that it once did. This may be because movements that may originate on the campus often move quickly off the campus and to the streets and involve many other segments of society. Unlike the 1960s, when students were often both the originators and main participants in protest movements, more recent movements have involved a wider section of the population. Students often lost control over the protests, and in fact in some cases student leaders left the campus to run for public office or participate in a broader leadership coalition. Nonetheless, students have remained a key spearhead for oppositional movements and protests.

Students were a key force in toppling Ukrainian autocrat Victor Yanukovich. They were on the Maidan battleground in Kiev from beginning to end.

THE "IRON LAW" OF STUDENT ACTIVISM

There is an iron law of student political activism. Students can often bring public attention to political issues and, when there is an undercurrent of discontent, may help to create political movements that may destabilize or even defeat regimes. As a social group, students tend to have the leisure of time to exchange and develop ideas and organize within the tightly knit university environment; and the public tends to be sympathetic to students' concerns.

But students cannot control national politics once a regime is removed. They may infiltrate political parties; but, in the wider political arena, the typically adversary and non-compromising voices of student activists do not get far. Societal politics is generally about political power vested in economic and military resources, in ability to build alliances and forge compromises. While energetic and driven,

if students enter the political arena, they may become only a marginal voice—since they seldom possess the substantial and procedural knowledge, experience, and networks required for the larger political stage.

Indeed, in most cases, politics after the end of the social movement moves in directions quite different than advocated by the students. Thus, students may be a precipitating force for social and political change, but never control the outcomes.

Events in both Egypt and Ukraine support the “iron law.” Students in general did not favor the ascendance of the Muslim Brotherhood to power following the Arab Spring, nor were students in general happy with some of the ultranationalist forces that became influential in the recent Ukrainian events.

SUCCESS ON THE EDUCATIONAL FRONT

Students have sometimes had better success with educational issues. Although massive student demonstrations—and the opposition of British academics—failed to keep high tuition fees from being imposed in England and Wales, students were successful in Germany in rolling back tuition charges so that all of the German states are now committed to free higher education. Protracted demonstrations by high school and university students in Chile resulted in major education reforms and the roll-back of previously high student tuition fees.

The contemporary student protests on the educational front tend to be against cuts in public funding of higher education and increases in tuition fees, both of which are associated with neoliberal reforms in higher education. Austerity measures, following the global financial crisis, have accelerated the implementation of such reforms in countries where they previously did not exist. Although the differences between countries continue to be pronounced, a sense exists nevertheless that the national higher education systems are becoming more alike in the sense of being more market-oriented, even in countries with a strong social-welfare tradition.

The fight against tuition fees remains the single most powerful mobilizing force for student activism worldwide. Other social-welfare concerns—such as availability of student housing, subsidized food and transportation—occasionally lead to more localized types of protests initiated by the local student unions and typically also fairly quickly resolved. Quality assurance is almost never an issue salient enough to mobilize students to political action. These questions are handled by the elected student representatives, who consult the universities voicing student expectations and their satisfaction.

21ST CENTURY STUDENT ACTIVISM

Many argued that student activism would disappear in the era of higher education massification. Diverse student populations, part-time study for many, the non-elite social backgrounds of most students, the increasingly high cost of higher education in many countries, and other factors all argued against active political and social engagement. This clearly has not been the case. Students remain a potent political and social engagement. This clearly has not been the case. Students remain a potent political and social force, and only the modes of their involvement have been changing. Students are less likely to vote and less likely to join political parties..

But they more likely take part in online petitions, join boycotts, express views in online forums, involve themselves in advocacy social networks, and participate in demonstrations and protest movements. The nature of student activism still very much depends on which part of the globe is being considered. As the World Values Surveys depict, in Western societies where entire value systems have shifted to postmodernism, students are becoming more individualistic and perhaps more interested in subjective well-being, self-expression, and quality of life.

There is an iron law of student political activism. Students can often bring public attention to political issues and, when there is an undercurrent of discontent, may help to create political movements that may destabilize or even defeat regimes

There are other societies where democratization, including minority rights, freeing political processes and institutions from corruption, and so forth, remain salient and compelling issues. Even in postmodern postindustrial societies, some students remain politically engaged—as evidenced by student involvement in the “occupy” movements and student participation demonstrations against tuition increases in England. The potential grievances that may mobilize students into student movements for social change are obviously very different, depending on which part of the world being considered.



Research Universities: American Exceptionalism?

HENRY ROSOVSKY

Henry Rosovsky is dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Emeritus, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA. Editor's note: This is an abridged version of remarks made at the Carnegie Corporation/Time Summit on Higher Education (September 2013) and published in the Carnegie Reporter (Winter 2014): <http://higheredreporter.carnegie.org/>.

A PARADOX

Domestically, American higher education is the subject of almost unprecedented criticism. “Too expensive and inefficient and not a good investment” is a common conclusion. Students are said to be unprepared for the job market. Higher education is accused of being too permissive in tolerating low faculty productivity and in resisting the technological revolution. In general, the current “business model” is judged unsustainable: some think that we are riding on the road to self-destruction.

But in international discussions and evaluations of higher education, American universities are frequently called “the envy of the world.” In the United States, it makes no sense to speak about “higher education” or “universities” in general. The label “American universities” has little meaning when our country is home to more than 4,000 tertiary institutions, ranging from those that might actually be the envy of the world to those barely distinguishable from high schools—with a tremendous variety in between.

At the top of our higher education pyramid—my sole focus here—we find the public and private research universities with their special role of creating and maintaining knowledge, training graduate students in arts and sciences and professional schools, and offering a liberal education to undergraduates. According to Jonathan Cole in *The Great American University*, there are about 125 diverse universities that fit this description and they “are able to produce a very high proportion of the most important fundamental knowledge and practical research discoveries in the world. It is the quality of the research produced, and the system that invests in and trains young people to be leading scientists and scholars, that distinguishes them and makes them the envy of the world.”

All the institutions at the top of the American educational pyramid—and some others as well—share six characteristics closely associated with high quality. Their absence would preclude—or make it much more difficult—for research universities to achieve the highest quality, not just in this country but anywhere else. Indeed, their partial or total absence abroad helps to explain why there are relatively few

foreign—especially non-Western—institutions represented at the top of the accepted surveys. None of the six characteristics is wholly unambiguous; all are blurry. But it is not difficult to detect their presence or absence.

SIX CHARACTERISTICS OF QUALITY

Shared governance. First, these institutions all practice shared governance: the trustees and president conditionally delegate educational policy to the faculty. That would primarily include curriculum and the initial selection of those who teach, are admitted to study, and do research. The administrative style is collegial rather than top-down, faculty sharing authority in specified areas with appointed administrators and trustees, the latter holding final authority. This is a distinctly American form of shared governance, which relies on a strong executive. Presidents, provosts, and deans possess and exercise considerable authority over budgets, institutional priorities, and many other matters of consequence.

What makes shared governance so important? There are many possible answers, but these are among the most frequently mentioned: universities are extremely complex organizations in which centralized decision making does not achieve the best results; in universities the proportion of self-motivated people is large, and to capture the full measure of their “creative juices” requires a sense of ownership. Susan Hockfield, former president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, puts it very well: “Faculty travel the frontiers of their disciplines and, from that vantage point, can best determine future directions of their fields and design curricula that bring students to the frontier. No academic leader can chart the course of the university’s discipline independent of the faculty.”

Shared governance may frustrate administrators intent on implementing rapid change, but a slower pace may also lead to wiser choices and certainly has not—in light of university histories—prevented fundamental changes.

Academic freedom. Second, despite periodic challenges, American research universities enjoy academic freedom—“the right of scholars to pursue their research, to teach, and to publish without control or restraint from the institutions that employ them”—and, in addition, all rights granted to inhabitants of this country, especially those associated with the First Amendment of the United States constitution.

Merit selection. Third, admission of students and selection and advancement of faculty is based on merit measured by recognized and accepted institutional standards. Some form of prior achievement would define merit: assuredly not an issue devoid of numerous ambiguities. One cannot ignore legacies, affirmative action, athletic scholarships, and similar deviations from the simplest notions of merit for students, such as scores on a standardized national test. Similarly, gender, race, and old-boy networks can create oth-

er deviations from a straightforward standard for selecting and promoting faculty. Nevertheless, objective measures of merit remain at the very least the central core.

Significant human contact. A major component of education exists now and is intended to remain significant human contact: real as opposed to virtual encounters between students and teachers to encourage participation and critical thinking. In his 2012 Tanner Lectures, William Bowen calls this “minds rubbing against minds.” The proportions may change over time but the basic principle has to be retained: it has to be part of liberal education for undergraduates who need guidance and contact in making choices, and it is a self-evident part of the mentor-mentee relation for those aspiring to reach a PhD. Few would deny the great value of digitization, virtual course materials, or occasionally flipped classrooms, but they remain complementary rather than primary.

But in international discussions and evaluations of higher education, American universities are frequently called “the envy of the world.”

Preservation of culture. All these universities consider preservation and transmission of culture to be one of their missions. This would include representation of the humanities in curriculum (mandatory for undergraduate liberal arts), as well as, for some, more specialized activities including research and language studies, and the maintenance of libraries and museums.

Nonprofit status. All research universities operate on a nonprofit basis. If maximizing profit or increasing shareholder value were the goal, all the previous conditions become unwelcome obstacles and inefficiencies that could not be tolerated by a competent management. But this condition is not as cut and dried as it may seem. Decisions in nonprofit universities can be influenced and possibly distorted by considerations of revenue. For example, activities that generate research or operating funds in return for certain privileges obtained by a funder may require exclusive access to specific scientific results for a limited period of time. In this sense, no research university today is purely not-for-profit. None, however, is mainly directed by the business aims of outside supporters.

The six characteristics are neither canonical nor subject to rigorous mathematical proof. They are based on my (I believe uncontroversial) reading of our historical experience.

UNDERSTANDING AND MISUNDERSTANDING THE QUALITY REQUIREMENTS

Many academics will consider a listing of these characteristics individually familiar, obvious, and of little interest. Non-academics, on the other hand, may have a quite different reaction. The list could easily be interpreted as a plea for the status quo, typical of an academic establishment that stubbornly resists all change.

Both perspectives are wrong. The characteristics of quality are almost never considered as a system, even though the absence of any one of them will affect the integrity and quality of a research university.

Turning to the nonacademic perspective, none of these characteristics, singly or as a group, make—to use the term beloved by our critics—disruptive change impossible. This is an important point because, I think, it runs counter to widely held beliefs.

For example, tenure is perceived to be an obstacle to change. It may indeed be desirable instead to adopt a system of long-term contracts—particularly because US federal law prohibits adoption of mandatory retirements, thereby penalizing young scholars. But it is not the enumerated characteristics that stand in the way of change. Faculty do not determine their own pay or conditions of employment: these are in the hands of the administration and are not a part of shared governance. However, change is made much more difficult by interuniversity competition and the American legal system designed to prevent collusion (cooperation?) among for-profit businesses.

The notion that research universities are “unchanging” has always struck me as bizarre. Our products are education and research, and the vital element is not the format or setting (the bottle) but the content (the wine). And that is forever changing.

ADDRESSING THE PRESENT MOMENT

To fulfill their role in society—creating knowledge and educating graduate and undergraduate students—the university community makes assumptions that may not always be, and almost certainly are not now, obvious either to the trustees who are their governors or to the wider public. For example, the characteristics associated with quality can be seen as pleas for special privileges.

Another reality to consider is that American universities only rarely have written constitutions or long-lasting traditions of common law. The guarantors of their privileges and practices are trustees, most of whose life experiences have been in private business. Furthermore, in the case of state universities, appointment to positions of governance can be political, frequently in the hands of governors and sometimes subject to state elections.

At a time of contentiousness and criticism current practices raise questions: do those who constitute the court of last resort understand the unusual entity with which they have been entrusted? When trustee initiative is necessary and appropriate and when it is not? Have we done enough to prepare trustees for their responsibilities? Are those who make the appointments more concerned about the candidate's ability to read balance sheets than their appreciation of university values? Or do we look primarily at the capacity of potential trustees to make large donations? Or are those who have the power of appointment primarily interested in a candidate's political affiliation?

The same point can be made about faculty. We take great care to examine research credentials and—these days, and this is a major and welcome change—we look more closely at teaching capacities. But do we do anything to prepare faculty to participate productively in shared governance? Both of these tasks will grow in urgency as the American research university—"the envy of the world"—navigates very stormy seas predicted by nearly all observers.

■

The Importance of Demographics in Explaining Attainment Patterns

ARTHUR M. HAUPTMAN

Arthur M. Hauptman is an independent policy consultant specializing in higher education finance issues. E-mail: Art.hauptman@yahoo.com.

In the past decade, the issue of how the United States compares to other countries in its attainment rate—the share of adults with a college degree—has become a very prominent issue in American higher education debates. Thus, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has issued a series of reports that indicate the United States has fallen behind many other OECD member countries in its attainment rate, especially among young adults. Concerns about this slippage led President Obama to make increasing degree attainment and completion rates an essential part of his domestic policy agenda. A number of recent reports also have made the related argument that many more millions of college graduates must be produced over the next decade, to allow the American economy to remain globally competitive.

Lost in these expressions of concern, however, is the seemingly contradictory fact that the number of bachelor's and associate degrees awarded in the United States has consistently grown for many decades—including the most recent one—at rates that far exceed the growth in the overall and college-age populations. Since degree holders of a certain age, divided by the relevant age population, determines the attainment rate, that means the US attainment rate has grown consistently over time as well.

How does one make sense of the seeming contradiction that the number of degrees awarded annually and the attainment rate of the adult population in the United States have both grown, even as the country has fallen further behind many global competitors in the share of its population with a postsecondary degree. The simple answer is that the attainment rate in other countries has grown faster than in the United States and thus the relative US ranking has declined, particularly for the youngest group of adults.

But, based on this puzzle, an important answer lies in differences in demographics and the impact that demographic trends can have on the number of college graduates that a country produces and on its higher education attainment rate. What has too often been forgotten or ignored in recent American debates is that the number of college graduates in a country is actually a function of two components: the size of the relevant age group and the share of that group that holds a degree. What is not well understood is that of the two factors; demographic trends can often be a much larger determinant of the total *size* of the college-educated work force than changes over time in the attainment rate.

THE AMERICAN EXPRESS

The number of bachelor's degrees awarded in the United States has grown much faster than the population, since the end of World War II. As a result, attainment rates for at least a bachelor's degree in the United States have grown consistently over the past half-century for all adult age groups. Even in the most recent decade, the rate for each age group grew by at least 10 percent. In each age group, the attainment rate for those with a bachelor's degree or more has at least tripled since 1960 and at least doubled since 1970. This pattern of sustained growth in attainment is also true over the past two decades for working-age adults holding at least an associate's degree. The time span examined is shorter because the US government has only recorded the numbers of adults holding an associate's degree, since 1990.

The description above, regarding attainment rate trends, contradicts the frequently heard statement that US attainment rates have been flat or stagnant for an ex-

tended period. This mistaken assertion flows from an accurate observation: Attainment rates of the youngest and oldest groups of working adults in the United States are now roughly the same that leads many to conclude that US attainment has not grown over time. But the fact is that the rough equality in attainment rates for the youngest and oldest adult workers has largely been achieved through rapid increases in the attainment rate of the oldest group, rather than any decline or even slowing in the rate for the youngest group of adult workers.

Demographic trends that dictate the size of the population are the other less discussed part of the equation for determining the number of college degree holders. But unlike the attainment rate that has consistently increased, the size of the traditional college age group has varied over time. The number of high school graduates in the United States peaked in the mid-1970s as a result of the baby boom, fell

The attainment rate in other countries has grown faster than in the United States and thus the relative US ranking has declined, particularly for the youngest group of adults.

until the early 1990s, and then grew again, peaking around 2008–2009. That number is now projected to fall again through 2014–2015 before starting to grow again toward the end of the current decade.

Yet, despite fairly steep declines in the number of high school graduates for several decades, the number of college students and degrees awarded in the United States has consistently grown over the past 50 years. How to explain this? The basic answer is that American higher education has been very successful in increasing the number of students older than the traditional college age. As a result, participation and attainment rates for each adult age group has increased consistently over the past 50 years, as have the numbers of degrees awarded.

THE EXPERIENCE IN HIGH-ATTAINMENT COUNTRIES

Patterns of population growth and attainment rates in the United States, as described above, jointly determine the size of the current and future American labor force, with respect to college graduates. But they do not provide much insight into why the US ranking in attainment-rate charts has slipped so badly when compared to many other OECD

countries. For this, the demographics and attainment rates must be looked for those countries.

Many of the OECD countries have overtaken us on attainment rates, with large declines in their numbers of young adults—due to low-birth rates and patterns of net out-migration. For several countries with the highest attainment rates, such as South Korea and Japan, the number of 15–24 year olds and 25–34 year olds dropped by double-digit percentages between 2000 and 2010. The decline in younger age groups for many other high-attainment countries was similar. Moreover, for many of these countries, especially in Asia, the decline in the numbers of college age youth has been chronic and persists.

This means that many of the countries that now rank higher than the United States on the overall degree attainment of younger adults have accomplished this feat by educating an increasing share of a declining number of younger adults—a fact that could have serious adverse labor market implications for these countries now and down the road. For many of these high attainment countries, the number of young adults with degrees far exceeds the number of those getting ready to retire, which could also greatly add to the unemployment rate of recent college graduates in those countries.

Thus, the recent debates concerning where the United States ranks among OECD countries in attainment have not focused nearly enough on the extent that different demographics have played a role in these attainment trends or on their implications for meeting labor force requirements in the future. ■

Internationalization of Higher Education: Converging or Diverging Trends?

EVA EGRON-POLAK

Eva Egron-Polak is secretary general of the International Association of Universities, Paris. E-mail: e.egronpolak@iau-aiu.net. The full report can be ordered from the Web site: www.iau-aiu.net.

What is the key finding in the International Association of Universities (IAU) 4th Global Survey?" This is the question that is most frequently asked about the International Association of Universities' latest survey, Internationalization of Higher Education: Growing Expectations,

Fundamental Values, which reports on 1,336 institutions from 131 countries—garnering a respectable nearly 20 percent response rate. Writing the “headlines” for a survey that covers so much ground is not only challenging but also potentially misleading. Thus, important regional variations as well as a variety of results, analyzed carefully, demonstrate a number of more nuanced realities. Nonetheless, some general findings do stand out.

THE IMPORTANCE OF INTERNATIONALIZATION

The study confirms the importance of internationalization for higher education institutions. With percent 69 percent of the respondents stating that it is of high importance, 27 percent indicating that it has remained high over the past three years, and an additional 30 percent reporting that it increased substantially in importance during that same period, the centrality of this process in higher education is clear. The results also show that 75 percent of the higher

Important regional variations as well as a variety of results, analyzed carefully, demonstrate a number of more nuanced realities. Nonetheless, some general findings do stand out.

education institutions that took part in the survey already have or are preparing an internationalization strategy or policy, while an additional 16 percent report embedding internationalization goals in the overall institutional strategy. European institutions have most frequently developed an internationalization policy or strategy, with 61 percent of the higher education institutions in this region indicating that they already have one.

LEADERSHIP AND BENEFITS

The 4th Global Survey continues to demonstrate that internationalization is still largely driven by the top institutional leaders, with the presidents, vice chancellors or rectors ranked as the most important internal driver of this process by 46 percent of the respondents. The findings with respect to expected benefits also show continuity over time—identifying student awareness of or engagement with international issues as the most significant benefit of the process.

UNDERLYING VALUES AND PRINCIPLES

Linked to the International Association of Universities' recent policy statement—*Affirming Academic Values in Inter-*

nationalization of Higher Education: A Call for Action—new questions were included in this latest survey to ascertain what values or principles are deemed important by higher education institutions in the conduct of internationalization. Although these questions about values have probably solicited somewhat “politically correct” responses, it is interesting to note that, in all but one region of the world, the largest number of respondents report that their institution's internationalization policy refers to “placing academic goals at the center of internationalization efforts.” This is not, however, the case in the Middle East, where higher education institutions report instead that their policies most frequently refer to scientific integrity and research ethics. African institutions report this as well, although it is the second most frequently referenced value in their policies. Notably, institutions in no other region have identified this value among the top three values or principles mentioned in their strategy.

A focus on values were also highlighted by other survey questions, and even more importantly, by the responses received. Equity in internationalization provides one example. At the global level and in all but one region (Europe), higher education institutions voiced their concern that access to international opportunities could be or become available only to the privileged few: the highest-ranked risk was “access to international opportunities [being] available only to students with financial resources.”

RISKS OF INTERNATIONALIZATION

The findings concerned with risks show an interesting mix of both divergence and convergence of views among institutions, in different regions. As mentioned above, there is almost global consensus that the most important *institutional* risk of internationalization for higher education institutions is that not all students will benefit from the opportunities. This consensus breaks down, however, when looking at the second- and third-highest ranked risks. A wide divergence among the regional responses becomes quickly evident with African and Middle East African institutions pointing to the brain drain, North American institutions citing too much emphasis on recruitment of fee paying students, Latin American and Caribbean institutions identifying issues related to regulating quality of foreign programs, and institutions in Asia and Pacific finding excessive competition among higher education institutions as the second most important risk.

When asked about *societal* risks, respondents diverge even with regard to the top-ranked risk. At the aggregate level and in at least three regions—including in Europe, which had the largest number of respondents—the most important risk of internationalization is commercialization of education. However, the unequal sharing of benefits of

internationalization is identified as the top-societal risk by respondents in Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean. In the Middle East, respondents identified the brain drain and the loss of cultural identity as the first- and second-ranked societal risks, respectively.

FUNDING LEVELS AND ALLOCATION CHOICES

The 4th Global Survey continues to demonstrate that internationalization is still largely driven by the top institutional leaders, with the presidents, vice chancellors or rectors.

The responses that result in near-complete consensus are rare, but respondents from higher education institutions across all regions almost unanimously point to a lack of funding, as the most important barrier to advancing internationalization. This result is also consistent over time, since a similar response was found in the 3rd Global Survey. However, questions that probe this issue more deeply present a much more diverse view of the availability of funding for internationalization. When asked how the level of overall funding to support specific international activities has changed over the past three years at their institution, the largest number of respondents in all regions indicated that their institution has *increased funding* for student mobility. Similarly, the largest number of respondents in every region, except in North America, indicated that their institutions have increased funding for research collaboration.

Additionally, the institutions in Middle East and Africa have increased their funding for almost half of the areas of internationalization proposed in the questionnaire, which included a dozen specific activities as options. This is in sharp contrast to institutions in Europe or North America, where funding increases were reported by the majority of respondents in the case of only two internationalization activities, among the 12 possibilities.

The distinct strategic choices being made by institutions in different regions can also be seen by looking at the allocation of funds for specific internationalization activities and most particularly by examining which type of activity has seen increased funding. In the Middle East, Africa, and Asia and Pacific, for example, institutions are investing more in marketing and promotion of their institutions internationally, while in Latin America and the Caribbean there is a stronger focus on out-going mobility of faculty and staff. These results are very much in line with the pri-

ority activities and challenges identified by the institutions elsewhere in the survey.

A COMPLEX PICTURE

It is important to keep in mind that the results of such a comprehensive survey reveal a lot more than a few key findings. This survey, like the earlier International Association of Universities survey reports, presents data on the many different dimensions of internationalization and compares results across world regions as well as changes over time. The report covers a wide variety of aspects of internationalization: such as, infrastructural supports that institutions have put in place; the expected benefits and perceived risks of internationalization; drivers and obstacles; institutional mobility patterns and targets; as well as issues related to curricular change and learning outcomes. ■

International Students: The United Kingdom Drops the Ball

SIMON MARGINSON

*Simon Marginson is professor of International Higher Education at the Institute of Education, University of London, UK. E-mail: S.Marginson@ioe.ac.uk. (This article has appeared in *The Australian*.)*

The United Kingdom has long been a powerful attractor of international students; and its higher education sector, from local colleges to venerable global universities, has become almost as dependent on international students, as Australian institutions.

In 2011–2012 the University of Manchester enrolled 8,875 non-European Union students, which are the high fees international students, mostly from Asia, that generate surplus (EU students pay home country tuition fees). University College London enrolled 7,565 non-EU students, Edinburgh 6,045 and even Oxford 4,685. In the United Kingdom, 81 institutions draw more than 10 percent of revenue from this source. The export sector generates nearly £20 billion a year in fees and other spending.

DOWNWARD TREND

Yet, after a long period of growth total full-time students from EU and non-EU countries dropped by 1.4 percent in 2012–2013. In taught postgraduate programs—such as the one-year UK business master's degrees that are short in

content but a lucrative money-spinner—EU entrants fell 8 percent and non-EU entrants fell 1 percent.

EU student numbers were down because of the £9,000 fee regime, as expected. It is the trend in high-fee non-EU students that is generating most of the ripples. The number of students from India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh plummeted, though this was partly balanced by increases from China and Hong Kong.

The downturn has occurred in the number of students entering the United Kingdom from the subcontinent contrasts, with the partial recovery of Indian student numbers in Australia and major increases in the number of Indian students entering the United States.

The UK authorities have cracked down on rogue colleges and immigration scams in the subcontinent, but that is not the only cause of the downturn in numbers.

In sum, international education in the United Kingdom is being undermined by the consistent set of policy moves that are designed to slow inward student mobility and retard the progression from a student to migrant.

VISA AND COSTS

The cost of UK visas (US\$520) is high, compared to \$360 in the United States and only \$124 in Canada. Non-EU students are subject to individual interviews designed establish “student integrity.” Lecturers must report on non-EU students on a monthly basis.

Many universities describe the present visa regime seen as unwelcoming, discriminatory, burdensome, and intrusive. Universities UK estimates the total cost of institutional compliance at £70 million per annum.

Worse, in 2012 poststudy work visas, which allowed graduates two years of looking for work to defray the cost of their education, were scrapped. Graduates must now find jobs worth £20,600 a year within four months if they want to stay and work in the United Kingdom. This compares to two–four year poststudy work visas in Australia and three years in Canada, which is emerging as a serious competitor for the United Kingdom.

In sum, international education in the United Kingdom is being undermined by the consistent set of policy moves that are designed to slow inward student mobility and retard the progression from a student to migrant. The sole goal is to reduce immigration. The government is run-

ning scared in the face of migration resistance in the electorate.

POLITICS AND IMMIGRATION

The raw and chaotic UK debate on immigration shows no sign of ending. It is like the 2010 antimigration reaction in Australia, which also triggered a choke in international student visas, but the antimigrant feeling in the United Kingdom is more protracted.

The change agent is Nigel Farage’s UK Independence Party, now polling at 10–20 percent. Farage is a folksy communicator who complains about foreign languages on the streets and pitches to “the white working class male,” said to be crowded out of the labor market by East European migrants and neglected by Westminster.

The UK Independence Party’s position is building in the lead-up to European elections (2014) and national elections (2015). The major parties are on the defensive in relation to both EU membership and migration.

The David Cameron government has promised to hold a referendum on EU membership and cut migrants from 213,000 in 2013 to less than 100,000. International students are almost 40 percent of the migration count.

Polls show that there is much more public concern about asylum seekers and illegals than about international students, but bearing down on non-EU students is the quickest way to reduce migration.

There is much concern about the effects on export earnings, the financial viability of universities and the inward flow of global talent—for example, in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields. In a gloomy report earlier this month on the trend in international student numbers, the Higher Education Funding Council of England (HEFCE) concluded: “The recent slowdown points to increasing challenges in recruitment following a long period of growth. With education continuing to become more globalised, competition from a wider range of countries is only likely to increase....”

HEFCE says that whether there is “an enabling environment for collaboration with a wide range of countries in research, teaching and knowledge exchange” will decide if “higher education in England continues to be a key global player.”

In other words, open the door in full again or lasting damage will be done. But the UK Independence Party has the political momentum. In the present environment, the best option is to remove international students from the net migration target, and no less than seven select committees of the Houses of Commons and Lords have now called for this decision. ■

Private Higher Education in the United Kingdom: Myths and Realities

STEVE WOODFIELD

Steve Woodfield is a senior researcher, Vice-Chancellor's Office, Kingston University London, UK. E-mail: s.woodfield@kingston.ac.uk.

The UK independent sector remains relatively small. Around 160,000 students were studying for UK awards in 2011–2012 in independent institutions, compared with 2.3 million students in the publicly funded sector. Recent research identified 674 independent higher education institutions and most students are concentrated in a small number of larger providers in England (mostly in and around London). Many private higher education institutions are either new or have been recently reconfigured in response to policy changes that have encouraged expansion, and enrollments are growing rapidly.

MYTH NO. 1: FEW PRIVATE PROVIDERS

All UK higher education institutions are technically private (as defined by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) although the system is dominated by universities and colleges that receive government funding. The government describes that higher education providers run privately and not in receipt of recurrent public funding for teaching and research as “alternative providers” and private institutions term themselves as “the independent sector.” Higher education is a devolved policy area in the United Kingdom, and public funds are distributed by independent funding councils in the four UK countries who attach certain conditions and regulatory controls to this funding.

MYTH NO. 2: PRIVATE PROVIDERS ARE A HOMOGENOUS GROUP

The UK independent sector is highly diverse in terms of mission, ownership, size, subject specialisms, student profile, fee levels, and level of awards. There are four-main groupings of independent higher education institutions: those that can award their own degrees (recognized bodies); those whose UK- and European Union-domiciled students can access government financial support (through specific course designation); those that can offer degrees in partnership with recognized bodies (listed bodies); and overseas institutions offering non-UK degrees, about whom very little is known. Independent institutions also offer vocational sub-degree programs examined by private companies (e.g., Pearson, EdExcel). The largest group is the listed bodies,

most of which are small institutions (for-profit and non-profit) that offer professionally orientated programs (e.g., business, creative arts/design, law, accountancy, or information technology).

There are no “elite” private universities in the United Kingdom, although recognized bodies are less regulated and tend to have larger enrollments (up to 5,000 students), recruit more UK students, offer a wider range of programs, and engage in basic and applied research. There are currently six independent recognized bodies, four charities (Regent's University London, the University of Buckingham, *ifs* University College, and Ashridge Business School), and two for-profit companies (BPP University and the University of Law). For-profit status is currently only important for taxation purposes, although mission (and associated differences in governance structures) may become an important differentiator under any new legislation.

Around 160,000 students were studying for UK awards in 2011–2012 in independent institutions, compared with 2.3 million students in the publicly funded sector.

MYTH NO. 3: THE UK'S PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION SECTOR IS IRRELEVANT

Despite its small size, the independent sector also provides niche, flexible, and demand-led provision (including post-graduate studies) to UK-domiciled students, complementing provision in the publicly funded sector and often provided at a lower cost. Around two-thirds of students in the sector are over 25 years, the same proportion study around employment, and many have family responsibilities. The independent sector also acts a vital recruitment channel for international students, many of whom remain in the United Kingdom after graduating, either working in highly skilled jobs or pursuing further studies in the publicly funded sector.

Recent policy changes in England have created optimum conditions for the independent sector to grow rapidly and thrive. Independent higher education institutions are becoming more attractive as they can gain university status, sponsor non-EU students, and as UK and EU-domiciled students studying in England on designated courses can access government tuition-fee maintenance loans—albeit a lower maximum level (£6,000 per annum) than students studying in the publicly funded sector (£9,000). Many independent providers are rapidly increasing their recruit-

ment (which will be uncapped from 2015–2016), intensifying the pressure on public higher education funding due to the associated increase, in take up of tuition-fee and living-cost loans and grants. This expansion will have a significant impact on publicly funded providers competing to recruit the same students as independent providers, while charging higher fees and receiving reduced government funding.

MYTH NO. 4: PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS PROVIDE POOR-QUALITY EDUCATION

A key feature is that all higher education institutions providing education leading to UK awards (in the country or overseas) are expected to follow the UK Quality Code for Higher Education. Educational oversight and quality assurance is provided via the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), and professional programs are regulated by Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies. A 2013 research study reported that 82 percent of students studying in the independent sector were satisfied with their provider, a figure comparable with a national survey of students in the publicly funded sector.

This higher education regulatory system protects quality through tight control over the award of “university title” and degree-awarding powers, the ability to offer degrees in collaboration with recognized bodies with degree-awarding powers, and any unplanned expansion in student recruitment. Independent institutions also undergo a rigorous course designation process covering quality assurance, financial sustainability and management, and governance arrangements.

Unlike publicly funded providers, independent ones are not currently required to offer complete data for accountability purposes, measure student satisfaction (via the National Student Survey), or provide information about their institution to support student decision making (the Key Information Set). However, as the regulatory system evolves, independent providers’ accountability burden is likely to increase.

A small part of private provision operates “below the radar” offering non-UK qualifications or unaccredited provision. Some private colleges are also “diploma mills” offering fraudulent qualifications or recruiting bogus students, although the tightening of visa regulations is gradually closing down such a provision.

MYTH NO. 5: THE PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTORS ARE SEPARATE

The independent sector does have a set of unique characteristics—mainly due to its uneven engagement with the United Kingdom’s current regulatory, funding, and quality-assurance landscape. However, in policy terms, status differences between these institutions and more traditional providers are being eroded—as the regulatory and quality-assurance landscape slowly adapts to include them. The

English government is seeking to create a “level playing field” for all providers and to foster fairer competition.

The publication of the 2011 white paper *Students at the Heart of the System* signaled the English government’s intention to open up the sector to “alternative providers.” This policy move forms part of the wider privatization and marketization of English higher education that centers around increasing access to that system—while reducing public funding, focusing on the “employability” benefits, increasing education exports, improving efficiency, and commercializing educational activities. However, the other devolved governments in the United Kingdom do not share this policy direction and the independent sectors in these countries remain both separate and small.

Unlike publicly funded providers, independent ones are not currently required to offer complete data for accountability purposes, measure student satisfaction (via the National Student Survey), or provide information about their institution to support student decision making.

The publicly funded higher education also engages in various types of partnership with independent-listed bodies, via franchising and other types of collaborative provision. About 30 publicly funded institutions also partner with private-sector educational organizations—based on the delivery of pathway UK programs designed to prepare international students for entry into degree-level studies in the publicly funded sector.

Private businesses are also heavily engaged in higher education provision beyond direct program delivery, as the system becomes more and more “unbundled”—for example, by providing curriculum materials, learner support, and the technological infrastructure to support online learning (e.g., the arrangement between the University of Liverpool and Laureate Education). Publicly funded providers also increasingly outsource key-support services (e.g., information technology) and engage in shared services arrangements with private organizations. As this privatization and commercialization intensifies and the policy changes in England take effect, the boundaries between different types of higher education institutions are likely to blur, with only institutional mission (for-profit or nonprofit) being a key differentiator between the different parts of the sector. ■

Policies and Patterns in US For-Profit Higher Education

ELIZABETH MEZA AND WILLIAM ZUMETA

Elizabeth Meza is a research fellow and PhD candidate in higher education in the College of Education at the University of Washington. William Zumeta is professor of Public Affairs and Higher Education at the University of Washington. E-mail: zumeta@uw.edu and bapple@uw.edu.

IHE regularly publishes articles on private higher education from PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, headquartered at the University at Albany. See <http://www.albany.edu/>.

For-profit institutions of higher education have become a sizable component of the US higher education marketplace, yet they remain poorly documented in many respects and understudied. The growth of this sector in recent decades has been prodigious. As late as 1995, the for-profit share of all students enrolled in postsecondary education was less than 2 percent. According to federal data, the private for-profit sector enrolled 10 percent of all students or around 2.1 million, in 2010. This is a conservative figure, counting only students enrolled at degree-granting institutions reporting to the government. The growth rates in this sector have skyrocketed since the mid-1990s—from 304,000 students in 1996 to 2,110,000 in 2010—and their market share jumped from 2.1 percent to 10 percent. Federal policy has generally been accommodating: for-profit students are eligible for federal student aid grants and loans, and the schools have taken advantage of this aggressively.

Some for-profit institutions still reflect the origins of the sector in small, locally oriented, vocationally focused and often family-owned enterprises. Others have grown into corporate behemoths, encompassing virtually every postsecondary credential in vast portfolios of educational offerings (including graduate degrees) that in some cases transcend US borders. Some very recent contraction has been in the sector due to scandals over student recruiting practices and an increased public perception of low-quality, high-dropout rates. Also, a low-labor market returns for many degree holders (not to mention large debts incurred by both graduates and dropouts) during a period of extended labor-market sluggishness. Also, these concerns have led to increased regulatory pressure from the federal government.

Yet, it can be argued that this sector remains potentially important to the public interest, perhaps as never before. Around the world burgeoning growth is seen in private provision, as governments are increasingly unable to meet the

demand for higher education utilizing public institutions alone, and the United States is not altogether different. Also of policy significance, the for-profit sector enrolls disproportionately large shares from groups of students—e.g., minorities, students of modest financial means, and those who are older than traditional college age—that are under-represented elsewhere.

THE ROLE OF STATE POLICIES

We have recently researched *state* policies directed at for-profit higher education, since sector enrollment growth rates vary widely by state. In the United States, states have traditionally had the primary role in higher education policy. A majority of states now provide at least some student aid and/or other resources to the for-profit sector. States also have basic consumer protection and/or quality assurance responsibilities as part of their oversight of higher education within the US federal system. Moreover, in the modern, keenly competitive world, states have good reason to pay attention to all sources of capacity to educate their citizens and to the quality of what they provide.

For-profit institutions of higher education have become a sizable component of the US higher education marketplace, yet they remain poorly documented in many respects and understudied.

Variation in how states treat the for-profit industry has not been documented comprehensively; therefore, it is unknown whether the variation bears any relation to outcomes, in particular here for-profit enrollment growth rates. It has been interested in understanding the dramatic growth period from 2000–2010. Using a variety of sources, we documented state policies toward for-profit institutions across several dimensions, to the extent possible given data limitations. These dimensions are: state student aid policy; direct state financial subventions to institutions for other purposes; rates of tuition change at public competitor institutions (assumed to be primarily public two-year colleges); involvement of the for-profit sector in state higher education governance and planning; nature and extent of information collection and dissemination about the sector; and intensity of state regulatory oversight and quality-assurance effort. Starting with Zumeta's (1996) conceptual model of state policy approaches or *postures* toward the private nonprofit sector, we found evidence that there are some distinct dif-

ferences in how states view their for-profit sectors in terms of information policy, regulation, financial aid policy, and level of involvement in state higher education planning.

While not able to gather sufficient data to validate nuanced policy posture constructs, we could determine that states fall into two broad categories—displaying either *laissez faire* or *active* policies in regard to the degree to which they pay attention to for-profit higher education. There are serious measurement problems here, and most of our research had to rely on incomplete and sometimes impressionistic information gleaned from Web sites, selected phone interviews, and national data gathered for other purposes. We used definitions and distinctions that were found plausible given the information available rather than strictly defined and fully measured variables. After estimating the number of resident-in-state enrollments in for-profits in 2000 and 2010 (i.e., excluding primarily online enrollments in cases where the state of the student's residence cannot be determined), our fairly confident statement is that

Using a variety of sources, we documented state policies toward for-profit institutions across several dimensions, to the extent possible given data limitations.

states that display *active policy* tend to be more populous, to have larger for-profit sector enrollment shares, and greater policy capacity. These states also showed significantly larger percentage growth in their for-profit enrollments relative to *laissez-faire* states. Rates of for-profit enrollment growth across the states, at least in the boom period of 2000–2010, did not seem to be influenced by the contextual variables that influence nonprofit and public sector growth—i.e., state population growth or unemployment rates.

THESE RELATIONSHIPS

One possible conclusion is that, as initially hypothesized, state policy accounts for some of the variation in for-profit enrollment growth across states. Yet, there is also another possibility. Perhaps the causal arrow points the other way—the growth comes first and then elicits what Daniel C. Levy calls “reactive regulation,” (i.e., active policy). Certainly, as the sector grows, policymakers may feel responsibility (and political pressure) to monitor it, perhaps seek to regulate it (i.e., for quality assurance or at least consumer protection), or utilize it to expand limited state educational capac-

ity cheaply, and seek to further state workforce development goals. Private institutions, whether for-profit or nonprofit, surely have a role to play in meeting state and national needs for more educated people, if they provide a quality product. So, one needs to better understand the workings of policy systems in their sphere and the relationship of these workings to results. Enrollments, of course, are only a readily documented outcome of interest and perhaps not the most important one. ■

Inside African Private Higher Education: Contradictions and Challenges

LOUISE MORLEY

Louise Morley is professor in the Centre for Higher Education and Equity Research, University of Sussex, UK. E-mail: l.morley@sussex.ac.uk/education.

It would be erroneous to suggest that all quality challenges reside in the private higher education sector in low-income countries. Unfunded expansion and overall lack of human and material resources are also enemies of quality and standards throughout the public sector. However, it is pertinent to focus on the rapidly expanding private sector as now, worldwide. The rising social hunger for higher education and fiscal constraints have meant that the state, in many national locations, can no longer meet demands; and the private sector is seen as a response to capacity challenges in both developed and developing countries.

The market ideology of the private sector is often perceived as a contradiction to the core values of education for all, and critics fear that it will contribute to elite formation and social exclusions. Fears have tended to focus on the commodification of knowledge, the changing ethos, curriculum and values of higher education, a possible abdication of state responsibility, and the belief that new providers are compromising quality and standards by producing poorly regulated diploma mills. The private sector is also conceptualized as a threat to social diversity and equality of opportunity, with the potential to exclude students from low-socioeconomic backgrounds.

WIDENING PARTICIPATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN GHANA AND TANZANIA

In a recent empirical study of Widening Participation in Higher Education in Ghana and Tanzania (<http://www.sus->

sex.ac.uk/wphegt/), it was found that private higher education played a contradictory role in widening access and opportunities. The project was a mixed-methods study of two public and two private universities. Two-hundred life history interviews with students explored their experiences of primary, secondary, and higher education, and their future plans and aspirations. Two-hundred university staff and policymakers were interviewed about barriers and enablers for nontraditional students. The project produced statistical data on participation patterns presented in Equity Scorecards and collected evidence to build theory about sociocultural aspects of higher education in Ghana and Tanzania. The three main structures of inequality included in the Equity Scorecards were gender, socioeconomic status, and age.

One striking finding was the different way in which quality and standards in the private universities were represented by staff and students. Staff often stressed quality and expansive facilities and resources, whereas many students reported lack and deficit—especially in relation to information and communications technologies and library facilities. The sense of massification was also widely discussed by students, with reports of between 800 and 1,000 students in some classes. Spatial injustices led to cognitive injustices, according to the students who argued that these lecturer/student ratios unequalized their opportunities, to learn and participate in any meaningful manner in the classroom.

The area that appeared to attract the most concern was assessment. This was frequently reported by students in the vocabulary of instability and unfairness. It was also seen as a major relay of power, with the potential for corruption, exploitation, and sexual harassment. For example, the lack of quality-assessment procedures, including double-marking, meant that some unscrupulous lecturers offered to enhance grades in return for sexual or monetary favors. In spite of paying private-sector fees, students tended to lack basic consumer rights—including the existence of grade criteria and service-level agreements and the right to appeal. Students complained that they never know why they received particular grades; and when they sought explanations, they were told to make a formal complaint. However, when they tried to complain, there were no procedures or even forms to complete. There were narratives of chaotic timetabling of examinations, with some students scheduled to write two examinations at the same time. The result, of course, was failure. Assessment exemplified some of the tensions when educational matters collide with financial considerations—with several students reporting how they were evicted from exams or refused access to their examination results for non- or late-payment fees.

LOSSES AND GAINS

While many students complained about their private universities in terms of the second-class status and services, others saw these institutions as providing an opportunity structure for those who had been failed by the state. In their view, any access to higher education was better than none at all as it facilitated them “becoming a somebody,” with positional advantage and the potential for long-term material rewards. This was especially noticeable in students from poor, rural communities, who were motivated to enter higher education as it represented an escape from poverty. More women and mature students were also entering the two private universities, than the two public universities studied—again raising questions about whether the private sector is opening up new opportunities for formerly excluded social groups. Or, indeed another question is whether less socially privileged students are getting diverted into less prestigious institutions.

While many students complained about their private universities in terms of the second-class status and services, others saw these institutions as providing an opportunity structure for those who had been failed by the state.

The development of private higher education raises questions about values—for money and how students are valued. Does the private sector represent enhanced, demand-led opportunities, market opportunism, or a complex combination of opportunity and exploitation? It seems as if the symbolic power of being a university student in countries that sometimes have only 1 percent of participation rate compensates for all the shortcomings experienced in private universities. Many of the students in these universities were from low socioeconomic backgrounds and had a history of being failed by the education sector. However, it seems that many private universities are operating way below minimal quality standards, with no sense of student entitlements or service-level agreements. This urgently needs to change in order to halt the vicious circle of poverty, low expectations of educational institutions, and low standards of delivery. ■

The African Academic Diaspora and African Higher Education

KIM FOULDS AND PAUL TIYAMBE ZELEZA

Kim Foulds is program coordinator, Carnegie African Diaspora Fellowship Program. E-mail: kimberly.foulds@quinnipiac.edu. Paul Tiyambe Zeleza is vice president for academic affairs, both at Quinnipiac University, Hamden, CT. E-mail: paul.zeleza@quinnipiac.edu.

The dominant discourse around the African academic diaspora follows a distinct pattern of deficit: the wide-ranging costs of losing some of the continent's best and brightest intellectuals. The focus on this deficit, however, clouds the expansive and often innovative relationships that African academic diasporans have forged with scholars and institutions across the continent—relationships that build and reinforce both scholarly and personal engagements. These relationships—primarily informal though many formal individual and institutional engagements do exist—are often neglected in discussions of internationalization because African universities have not been seen as legitimate partners for institutional engagement with North American and European universities. In terms of valuing academic enterprise and commitment to producing innovative and dynamic scholarship, universities have overlooked African institutions, renewing and reinforcing existing gaps in knowledge production.

THE AFRICAN ACADEMIC DIASPORA

A recent study by Paul Tiyambe Zeleza—*Engagements between African Diaspora Academics in the U.S. and Canada and African Institutions of Higher Education: Perspectives from North American and Africa* (Carnegie Corporation of New York, February 2013)—sheds much needed light on which African academic diasporans are in the United States and Canada, as well as the existence of engagements between the diaspora and African higher education. According to the study, the African-born academic diaspora in North America has grown rapidly over the last three decades, in part due to the severe economic challenges and political repression that faced African countries and universities in the 1980s and 1990s. Many African diaspora academics have established vibrant, albeit largely informal, engagements with individuals and/or institutions across Africa. Ranging from research collaborations to curriculum development and graduate student supervision, these engagements are often frustrated by institutional and attitudinal barriers, on both sides of the Atlantic. Some of the major obstacles in-

clude differences in resources and facilities, expectations, academic status, teaching loads, institutional priorities, and scheduling around incompatible academic terms between the sending and receiving institutions. The study reveals traditional structures, and systems of faculty exchange are inadequate to alleviate these barriers.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Recently, there have been significant efforts made to address these gaps and to support African universities for purposes of international engagement. Many of these efforts have been spearheaded or supported by philanthropic foundations. The most well known example is the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa that brought together seven foundations (Carnegie Corporation of New York, Ford, Rockefeller, MacArthur, Hewlett, Mellon, and Kresge) and invested US\$440 million in the revitalization of African universities between 2000–2010. Often missing in these efforts and in the internationalization of American higher education, the critical and transformative role the academic diasporas can already play. Compared to the voluminous literature on the role of diasporas in the economic development of their homelands, through remittances and investment, not much is known about their role in the development of systems of knowledge production including universities. The academic diaspora is a rich source of intellectual remittances.”

Many African diaspora academics have established vibrant, albeit largely informal, engagements with individuals and/or institutions across Africa.

CARNEGIE AFRICAN DIASPORA FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Current models of faculty exchange remain relatively static, operating within a two- or three-tiered system: funding organization, sending institution(s), and receiving institution(s). Out of Zeleza's study, a new model has been established through the Carnegie African Diaspora Fellowship Program. The program establishes a novel partnership between four parties: Carnegie Corporation of New York with funding, the International Institute for Education with logistical support, Quinnipiac University with administrative support, and an Advisory Council comprised of leading African academics and university administrators in North America and Africa with strategic direction. The program will serve as the springboard for increased institutional af-

filiations between American and Canadian universities and institutions across Africa by demonstrating that, though Africa has long been neglected as a site of ground-breaking research; and knowledge production across the disciplines, the continent—its institutions, scholars, and students—can no longer be ignored if American and Canadian universities are in fact committed to producing globally rigorous scholarship and world-class students.

The program will focus on three-key areas: increased research collaboration; curriculum codevelopment between diaspora academics, their home institutions, and African institutions and faculty; and graduate student teaching and mentoring. Unlike existing exchange programs, in this program African institutions will drive the structure of exchanges and engage the desire of diaspora academics to contribute to higher education across Africa. Through the program, African institutions in Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania, and Uganda submit a proposal—requesting the expertise of a diaspora scholar in the three areas or to be matched with an interested diaspora scholar for the appropriate disciplinary expertise.

The goal of this program and model to ensure that African institutions are the driving forces in identifying needs and opportunities for engagement, as well as providing to diaspora scholars and African institutions the space to build and expand their scholarly alliances. While the brain drain is a very real phenomenon, engaging the African academic diaspora and establishing programs to promote academic exchanges and collaborations holds potential for internationalizing and strengthening the capacities of African universities. ■

China: Reforming the Gaokao

GERARD A. POSTIGLIONE

Gerard A. Postiglione is Chair in Sociology and Education Policy, associate dean for research, and director of the Centre of Research on Education in China, Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong, China. E-mail: postiglione@hku.hk.

Another reform is soon to be under way for China's *Gaokao*—the national college and university entrance exam that remains the greatest determinant of a Chinese student's life chances. Beside the reform of the English component (see Yang Rui in *IHE* No. 75: 12–13), there is a new move to align the test with China's moderating economic growth. In this sense, the *gaokao* is also a barom-

eter of the challenges facing China's economic rise and its breakneck expansion of higher education.

CHINA'S DICTUM: SEEK TRUTH FROM FACTS

Fact one: Before graduation last May 2013, only about half of the nearly 7 million graduates had signed job contracts. Many university graduates would come to find themselves underemployed and facing a skills-mismatch problem. In a nation that is still more rural than urban and that families must make great sacrifices to pay for their children's higher education, it is disconcerting to the average parent when a student who passes the grueling national examination and attends university cannot find a good job.

Fact two: 17 million high school and college graduates enter the labor market every year, but state planners are concerned that the nation suffers from a shortage of talent, particularly in technical fields. Although China will have almost 200 million college graduates by 2020, it will require far more expertise to elevate the value chain for equipment manufacturing, information technology, biotechnology, new materials, aeronautics and astronautics, oceanography, finance and accounting, international business, environmental protection, energy resources, agricultural technology, and modern traffic and transportation. To sustain its economic rise, the nation has to wean itself off of low-wage assembly export manufacturing. While it has top-notch scientists, it cannot upgrade its manufacturing sector without a greater number of well-trained technicians. While there is still concern that the education system does not encourage innovation and creativity, there is also a demand for technicians with a higher education that can support the ratcheting up of production.

Fact three: Students and their families still view technical-professional education as second class. The viewpoint dies hard, since academic higher education traditionally has equaled a stable job with government agency.

PENDING REFORMS

Thus, China will soon unveil a reform plan for the *gaokao*, which will divide it into two separate test modes, one for technically inclined students and the other for the more traditionally academically oriented students. The technical *gaokao* leads to higher technical and professional education—specifically toward admission to 600 technical and professional colleges and universities.

The first mode, targeting technically inclined students, is meant to appeal to those who want to become engineers, senior mechanics, and so-called high-quality laborers. It will assess students' technical skills, as well as textbook knowledge. The second mode still targets the standard academic student and examines characteristically academic knowledge.

The 600 institutions of higher education that will be identified by the Ministry of Education would account for half of the total of public universities. They are being asked to restructure their teaching programs from academic education to applied technology and professional education.

MORE STUDENT CHOICE CAN EQUAL SOCIAL STABILITY

The government hopes this new *gaokao* reform will help propel the National Talent Development Plan and the National Plan for Medium- and Long-term Education Reform and Development. While this *gaokao* reform is sure to influence China's future higher education development, students will be the ones to make the choice. Their decision,

Thus, China will soon unveil a reform plan for the *gaokao*, which will divide it into two separate test modes, one for technically inclined students and the other for the more traditionally academically oriented students.

to undertake *gaokao* mode one or two, means that their life chances will be set by about age 16, when they are still in high school. And in fact, there is some reason to believe that many more will consider signing on to model one *gaokao*. Even before the reform some families wised up to the changing job market, in which graduates of professional/technical colleges were finding jobs and college graduates were struggling to anchor themselves in the workplace.

This is a critical point for a country that prizes a harmonious society and watches with concern at the instability in neighboring Thailand, Myanmar, and Ukraine (not to mention the Taiwan student movement). A large population of unemployed university graduates can spell trouble and become destabilizing—often overnight and with little warning.

DIFFERENT MODELS

After years of interest in the American community college model as a way to calibrate the rapid expansion of higher education, there is now a growing preference for something more akin to the German model of technical professional education. Only China's top-tier universities continue to look toward America's leading universities, for ideas about how to build world-class research universities. For the rest, it is looking elsewhere. China wants talented workers in

engineering, mechanics, and related fields to gain an education that goes beyond mere skill training and demands more expertise, in short-skilled workers better equipped with academic knowledge.

For this reform to work as planned, there are several hurdles. First, transforming 600 local-level public universities into higher technical and vocational universities will significantly alter the differentiation and stratification of the public system of higher education. This is not a small reform, and its success hinges on external efficiency—alignment with the changing workplace among other things. In short, the reform has to provide jobs and boost a higher quality of manufacturing and industrial output.

Second, the reform has to break a deep-seated aversion to anything but academic learning in higher education. This is not easy anywhere, no less in China where the well-known Confucian value placed on education—one that has changed the world—does not equate with vocational education. There is a reason for slight optimism. In 2013, according to the Ministry of Education, 1.4 million high school graduates sought higher vocational education. In Shanghai, it was 15 percent of high school graduates in 2013.

An only concern about this reform is not just its ability to change the hierarchy in people's minds about the superiority of an academic education, but how to revalue the cultural capital of a nonacademic degree when it comes to employment and social status. If nonacademic degrees become the ambit of rural students, it may further institutionalize and stratify society, further intensifying the urban-rural divide. Impoverished rural areas constitute a continually shrinking proportion of students in top-tier universities. There is reason to expect that they will be encouraged to veer toward mode-one *gaokao* by educational officials and school teachers. To offset their underrepresentation in top-tier universities, the Ministry of Education has already decided to increase the quota for these students in 2014—from 10 central and western provinces, from 30,000 in 2013 to 50,000. As top-tier universities gain more autonomy in student election, they are being asked to do the same. ■



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

Systematic Changes in China

QIANG ZHA AND CHUANYI WANG

Qiang Zha is an associate professor at the Faculty of Education, York University, Toronto, Canada. E-mail: qzha@edu.yorku.ca. Chuanyi Wang is a postdoctoral fellow at the Institute of Education, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China.

Chinese higher education struck the world with its amazing pace of expansion, since the late 1990s. In the meantime, the Chinese system has become a steep hierarchy, which invites enormous concerns about whether higher education could still facilitate social mobility. Behind the scene, it is no secret that over 30 percent of the graduates from low echelon institutions are now having difficulties finding jobs upon graduation, while the prestigious elite universities are accused of nurturing the “refined egoist” among their students. In the postexpansion era, the Chinese system clearly needs to address issues pertaining to widening the path of social mobility (perceptually and practically) and increasing the relevance of participating in higher education. Changes are indeed occurring in Chinese higher education.

CHANGES OCCURRING IN THE CHINESE SYSTEM

At the top of the hierarchy, there appears to be a paradoxical move toward “recentralization.” Chinese higher education clearly went through a process of decentralization in the 1990s, whereby around 250 universities that used to be administered by the central ministries were now put under the jurisdiction of the provincial governments. In the meantime, the local higher education sector grew quickly, dominating China’s higher education expansion since the late 1990s. Some 500 new universities emerged, from amalgamation and upgrading of local colleges, while even more higher vocational colleges and private institutions came into being. Consequently, the national universities now represent a much smaller share of the Chinese system—6.6 percent in terms of proportion of all institutions and 8.7 percent of entire enrollment in 2010 (down from 32.8% and 43.9% in 1989)—while the local sector now makes up the absolute bulk of the system, accounting for 93.4 percent and 91.2 percent respectively in 2010. These changes, together with such elite university schemes as Projects 985 and 211, serve in turn to further hierarchize the Chinese system.

Starting from 2004, China’s Ministry of Education (MoE), launched an initiative of cosponsoring a selected group of local universities with the provincial governments, particularly in those provinces without any national universities. The local universities selected in this scheme would

enjoy similar status as the national universities affiliated to the MoE, with enhanced support (fundamentally in terms of resources and strategic planning) from the ministry. Up to now, there are 35 such local universities that have been “upgraded” to this seminational status. Some other central ministries (e.g., Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Industry and Information Technology, Ministry of Transport, Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Water Resources, etc.) have been following suit and gradually cosponsored some 100 universities and colleges with the provincial governments. Most of these universities and colleges were originally run by those central ministries, and later decentralized to local control. Now, they are somehow “recentralized.” This move has put the aggregate size of national and seminational universities almost back to the level before decentralization.

Behind the scene, it is no secret that over 30 percent of the graduates from low echelon institutions are now having difficulties finding jobs upon graduation.

Changes occurred at the lower/local levels, as well. Hundreds of newly founded local universities emerged amid expansion of enrollment. Initially, they emulated the veteran universities for their curricular and program offerings and played a major role of absorbing the increased enrollment, together with the fast-growing sectors of higher vocational colleges and private institutions. However, they soon experienced a difficult time. In order to ensure the public of quality of their curricular and program offerings, the MoE put these new universities under a periodic evaluation and assessment regime and essentially benchmarked them against the mature universities. This not only applies enormous pressure upon them but also places them in a hopeless competition, with the peers with a much-longer history. Even worse, such a competition quickly extended to their graduates in job market. Their graduates often lost from the peers at the older universities on institutional reputation and program quality and even to those from some higher vocational colleges and private institutions, on relevance of their program concentrations and learned skills. As a result, many of the new universities now seek to transform their curricular and program offerings and are keen to label themselves as *Fachhochschule*—universities of applied sciences.

To facilitate such transformation, the MoE initiated a project in 2013 that aims to introduce the institutional fabric of European-originated applied type of universities to the Chinese system and supported the founding of a national alliance of such institutions. Given that the type of institution is new to higher education policymakers and practitioners in China, this alliance serves as a hub for drawing on the European experience and exploring their niches on Chinese soil. Its membership quickly grew to more than 150 local universities. This kind of “collective actions” was observed even earlier at the local level. For instance, in the province of Anhui, in central China, 16 universities (out of a total of 33 located in the province) formed a similar consortium in 2008, helping one another with absorbing the ideas, experiences, and functions of the German *Fachhochschule* into their own operations. Now a consensus has been formed among these newly founded universities at the local level—that they need to follow a path alternative to conventional universities and focus on curricular and program offerings in applied areas. They see this path as the solution to addressing their deficiency in competitiveness in attracting students and preparing their employability.

AN APPLIED UNIVERSITY SECTOR EMERGING IN CHINA

It appears that China is on the shift toward a binary higher education system that extends to the university level, from the current unitary and stratified one where all institutions are governed and measured according to one single set of criteria. While it is now premature, to state a binary system has already taken shape in Chinese higher education; and there is further evidence that supports such a speculation. The MoE stipulates that new universities are entitled to apply for offering advanced degree programs, after eight years of operating of undergraduate programs. Now, a few dozen of such universities are starting to offer master’s degree programs—all with clear relevance to local needs—and even professional doctoral programs. Lately, the MoE launched a pilot project, for a designated period from 2012 to 2017, which allows new universities to offer master’s and doctoral degree programs even before they fulfill the minimum years of operating undergraduate programs—as long as they can prove that their advanced degree programs are explicitly geared toward meeting the specific needs of the local, regional, and national development. Most recently, a MoE vice minister disclosed on March 22, 2014 that China would soon adopt dual track selection of university entrants, one for academic-focused universities, and the other for applied-type institutions. She further revealed that the MoE had prepared to convert around 600 local universities into those of applied sciences.

Thus, it is likely that Chinese higher education will have two parallel and discrete sectors. One will comprise

the national, seminational, and those local universities that are included in Project 211, as well as a few dozen traditional local universities. They are no more than 500 in total and provide a broad array of programs in the established disciplines and professions and increasingly in liberal arts and general education. They are academic and “cosmopolitan” in their outlook and, as such, support their academic staff to conduct intensive research and train the next generation of researchers. Less selective institutions will consist of the new universities, higher vocational colleges and private institutions. It is huge in size, incorporating close to 2,000 universities and colleges, which are local and teaching and service oriented. If they conduct any research, that exists as applied research. Limited upward mobility is now possible within the latter. A certain proportion of college graduates is allowed to continue to study in local universities, through participating in a competitive examination. With a shrinking age cohort in Chinese population, such mobility is expected to be enlarged and enhanced in the next decade. However, effective from 2008, all Projects 985 and 211 universities are not permitted to take college graduates through this articulation arrangement.

This shift helps diversify the interpretation of higher education quality and contributes to its relevance, while improving equity by providing alternative paths. This is of particular significance in a system like China’s, which has a strong tradition of meritocracy and elitism in higher education that emphasizes a single dimension for assessing merit and tends to vertically divide all higher education institutions. On the other hand, it remains to be tested if the same tradition of meritocracy and elitism could ultimately drive changes back in the academic direction (i.e., academic drift). Nonetheless, however, from the early 1950 to the early 1980s, when Chinese higher education was Sovietized, polytechnic universities were indeed granted high status in the system. ■

Graduate Education in Malaysia and Thailand

CHIAO-LING CHIEN AND DAVID W. CHAPMAN

Chiao-Ling Chien is a researcher at the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, in Montreal, Canada. E-mail: cl.chien@unesco.org. David W. Chapman is Birkmaier Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of Minnesota. E-mail: chapmo26@umn.edu. The full report is available in the UNESCO Institute for Statistics Document Library: www.uis.unesco.org.

Across Asia, higher education enrollment has experienced explosive growth over the last two decades, from 20 million in 1980 to 84 million students in 2011. To serve this growing enrollment, graduate programs have needed to expand, both to supply more instructors and to upgrade existing instructors' qualifications, in cases when unqualified instructors were hired to teach in response to increasing undergraduates. The expansion of graduate education has translated into positive outcomes. In the Philippines in 2002, for instance, only about 8 percent of faculty members in higher education institutions had doctoral degrees, with another 26 percent holding a master's degree. In 2012, the shares have increased to 13 percent and 41 percent, respectively.

In Malaysia and Thailand, the governments believe that investing in graduate education contributes to national economic development.

From the perspectives of many governments, expanding graduate education has an attractive secondary benefit. Many governments see universities as centers of research that will yield positive economic returns to the country. University research is typically done at the graduate level. Therefore, expanding graduate education is viewed as a means of increasing economic competitiveness of the country.

Higher Education in Asia: Expanding Out, Expanding Up, recently published by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, examines the dynamics associated with the expansion of graduate education, with a particular focus on middle-income countries in Southeast Asia. Included in the report is a case study of Malaysia and Thailand, conducted to elaborate the reasons that governments and universities have been expanding their graduate programs and the impacts of that expansion. The case study is based on interviews with senior administrators and faculty members in selected public research universities, officers in the Ministry of Education, and international organizations in the region.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES

In Malaysia and Thailand, the governments believe that investing in graduate education contributes to national economic development. The dynamics of Malaysian interviewees are that a substantial investment in education will build an educated workforce. The evidence of an educated workforce will attract international investment, which will boost national economic development. For this investment in

graduate education to yield the expected outcomes, top universities not only need to be good but must be recognized effective internationally. International university rankings were viewed by many interviewees as a way to earn this international attention and respect.

DESIGNATED RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES

Recent policies designating top-tier universities as research universities and increasing funding for university research activities exemplify the value governments are placing on expanding graduate education. In Malaysia, graduate enrollment has increased by 400 percent over the last decade, and this increase reflects the government's high priority in offering graduate education. The government aims to enhance indigenous research capability and reduce reliance on industrial research, conducted by foreign companies. To support this priority, the government has been generous in providing inputs into graduate education. In 2008 and 2009, the government designated five research universities, and these universities received an increase in public funding by 70 percent, compared with the amount in the previous year.

Similarly, graduate enrollment in Thailand has grown by 300 percent since a decade ago. One reason is the government's belief that Thailand's competitiveness in research is a significant indicator of the production and quality of human resources of this country. To this end, in 2009 the Ministry of Education initiated the National Research Universities Project with an additional 12 billion baht (US\$370 million). Currently, nine universities are selected in this project. These research universities are expected to achieve higher world university rankings.

UNIVERSITY RANKINGS

Both government officers and university personnel are concerned about their university's placement in international rankings. This thinking can be summed by an analogy expressed by a Malaysian interviewee: The performance of a nation's football team in an international competition tends to be the basis on which observers judge the football prowess of the entire country. If the national team does well, the presumption is that there is wider football strength in the country. Fair or not, the image of the whole country is usually based on the perception of a few. It is the same in higher education. International observers judge a higher education system on the basis of a country's leading institutions.

In Thailand, university personnel took a somewhat more benign view. They also sought high international rankings for their universities. However, the cost of raising their rankings could get in the way of other ends that they valued. Rankings are important, but relevance of universities to Thai society is also important.

PUBLICATIONS AS THE ROUTE TO HIGH RANKINGS

Since the publication rate is a key ingredient across most international university ranking systems, pushing faculty members to publish in top-tier international journals was viewed as an important strategy to high rankings. In Malaysia's research universities, the pressure to publish in top-tier international journals is intense. Universities have sought to raise publication rates by modifying accountability and incentive systems. The government, working through the universities, has introduced a system of key performance indicators, aimed at specifying the level of productivity—number of publications, amount of teaching, grants and public services—expected of each faculty member.

Research universities in Thailand also emphasize publications in top-tier international journals but with more nuance. Some faculty members are concerned that if they publish in top-tier journals in English language, the results will be largely inaccessible to the wider Thai society, most of whom do not understand English. There was a strong view that it was important for universities to give back to Thai society. Moreover, a frequent observation was that some faculty members may be less comfortable writing in English language at the level required for top-tier international journals.

Graduate students are viewed as important contributors to publications, both as they assist in conducting faculty members' research and as they publish as part of their graduate program requirements. In Malaysia and Thailand, PhD students in selective universities are required to publish their research in journals as a condition of graduation. Perceiving graduate students being valuable to help move their institutions up in university rankings, research universities involved in this study are in the process of reducing their undergraduate enrollment—while increasing their graduate enrollment, with a target ratio of 1:1 for undergraduates to graduates.

In summary, in both Malaysia and Thailand, the initial rationale for expanding graduate education was to provide qualified instructional staff to serve expanding undergraduate enrollment. In both countries, this rationale was eclipsed, to a large extent, by the view that graduate education would help fuel national economic development. The focus on economic development triggered an intensified emphasis on universities placing high in international rankings, which led to pressure for more research. This pressure led some faculty members to focus more of their time and energy on research, sometimes at the expense of their teaching. In short, "expanding up" has changed organizational dynamics and the nature of faculty work in important ways. ■

The Unified State Exam in Russia: Problems and Perspectives

ELENA DENISOVA-SCHMIDT AND ELVIRA LEONTYEVA

Elena Denisova-Schmidt is a lecturer at the University of St. Gallen, Switzerland and an Edmond J. Safra Network Fellow at Harvard University, United States. E-mail: elena.denisova-schmidt@unisg.ch. Elvira Leontyeva is professor at the Pacific National University in Khabarovsk, Russia. E-mail: elvira.leontyeva@gmail.com.

Russian universities have undergone two significant changes since the collapse of the Soviet Union: the dramatic cuts in state financial support that accompanied the adoption of a market economy and integration into the European higher education system through the Bologna process. Both reforms remain incomplete. Universities are still dependent on the state. There are more universities than necessary, and the level of education they offer is sometimes questionable. Corruption in many forms and in large volumes in the university admissions process and during university studies is the other challenge, with which many universities still have to deal.

CORRUPTION IN UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS

The university admissions process has been one of the most problematic issues in Russian higher education in terms of corruption. Until 2009, each university in Russia held its own entrance examination. The level of corruption in this area was the highest of all kinds of corruption in education. By 2004, it had reached 10.7 billion rubles (US\$455 million) per year. In order to solve this problem, university admission is now awarded on the basis of the EGE (Edinyi Gosudarstvennyi Eksamen—Unified State Exam) tests that serve as both a school final examination and for university entrance. The EGE gives potential students the opportunity to apply to several universities simultaneously, which had not been possible before. With the EGE replacing the previous entrance examinations, there is no longer a need to visit a university during the application process and spend a few weeks on campus—expenditures that not all families could afford. Now, however, corruption has moved largely from the universities to other areas—including the processes responsible for conducting the EGE itself.

PUBLIC OPINION AND EMPIRICAL RESULTS

The sociological surveys conducted regularly by the Levada Center, one of the best-known Russian opinion research institutes, show that a majority of respondents believe that,

with the introduction of the EGE, the number of bribes—*blat* (the use of informal networks to obtain goods and services)—and other violations in the university admissions process have remained the same (34%) or even increased (30%). Only a small group of survey participants (13%) believes that the EGE has helped to decrease those violations.

Our own research, conducted in 2013 at selected universities in the Russian Far East, shows similar results: 31 percent of the survey respondents observed some violations during the EGE; 14 percent of them observed these violations personally, while 17 percent referenced their relatives or friends. These violations include disseminating exam questions before the examination, using mobile phones (for Internet searches or SMS), receiving help from the on-site proctors, and reopening sealed test envelopes to correct mistakes.

Besides the EGE, there is another opportunity for cheating and corruption in the university admissions process. In our survey, 12 percent of the participants had heard about other types of violations during the university admissions process from their friends and relatives, and only 4 percent had any personal experience with them. These violations include monetary and nonmonetary payments, for example, to gain admission to a budgeted place—a place for a student that is paid for by the state and not by individual tuition. Another possible violation involves bribes or preferential treatment, such as receiving a special contract—preferential conditions for students, such as a contract between industry and university.

There are a few recent tendencies worth noting: the number of orphans, students with disabilities, and students with diplomas for achievements in academic competitions (*olympiady*) has increased significantly. Those three categories also receive preferential treatment during the university admissions process. The approach here is selective, however: one the respondents in our study mentioned that a real orphan was not considered, and other students complained that not all results of *olympiady* were counted.

WHO BENEFITS FROM HIGH EGE SCORES?

The first group of beneficiaries is school graduates—the potential students. High scores might open the doors of elite universities to them and increase the chance for getting a state-budgeted place. The second group is the universities. The Higher School of Economics monitors almost all Russian universities according to the average EGE scores of their applicants. Freshmen with more than 70 points (out of 100) are considered to be high-performance students, while freshmen with less than 56 points are the opposite. Universities that accept students with a score of less than 56 might be singled out by the Russian Ministry of Education and Research for negative sanctions. The third group of benefi-

ciaries is the secondary schools: the more graduates with high EGE scores they have, the better the schools' reputation. This interdependence of all involved actors—students, universities, and secondary schools—might make remedying the various forms of corruption at this level difficult. These forms of corruption might not even involve money: During the EGE, a school teacher might leave a class for a few minutes and thus give young people an opportunity to take out crib sheets or ponies. The teacher might be guided only by his/her concern for the professional future of the students.

The question for the future is whether this new system will hinder or actually promote corruption. In Russia, where corruption is endemic, it might not disappear completely. Nevertheless, the introduction of the EGE has been a very important step in the Russian education system, encouraging universities to work more transparently and permitting the students' mobility to increase significantly since its introduction. The data from Rosstat, the Russian Federal State Statistic Service, shows a high influx of students in regions (out of 85), which since 2009 have the highest educational standards. On the other hand, regions with low standards are suffering. Our data from the Russian Far East prove this tendency: every year, the major universities in urban areas enroll more and more students from small towns and villages. ■

Survey of *International Higher Education* Readers

ARIANE DE GAYARDON AND DAVID A. STANFIELD

Ariane de Gayardon and David A. Stanfield are graduate assistants at the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: ariane.degayardon@bc.edu and david.stanfield@bc.edu.

For the first time, we surveyed our readers concerning their views and perspectives in order to improve this publication. We are quite gratified by the very positive views expressed in the survey. Nearly 20 percent of subscribers from 86 different countries completed the survey. Of these, an overwhelming majority expressed satisfaction with *International Higher Education's* article length and geographic coverage. Respondents also indicated very clearly their sense that our content is of consistent quality and provides accurate and reliable information on the range of topics presented.

The demographic information provided by survey respondents revealed several noteworthy trends: 55 percent of our respondents are senior-level professionals, while 29 percent are at the midpoint in their career. Only 43 percent of respondents reside in Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The remaining 57 percent were well spread out across 82 countries and all continents, which aligns well with our goal for broad global distribution.

Ninety percent of respondents indicated that the geographic coverage of *IHE* content was acceptable or excellent, yet select survey comments highlight the fact that there is still some room for improvement. Some readers specified a desire for more articles about countries commonly underrepresented in the literature. Subscribers specifically mentioned they would like additional coverage of the Middle East, Latin America, Africa and, more broadly, the global south.

Among the topics suggested for ongoing attention from *IHE*, the most popular were internationalization and globalization, cross-border higher education, higher education reform efforts, comparative studies, and governance and administration. Furthermore, respondents are interested in specific country reports and regional analysis. Interestingly, academic corruption, student recruitment, academic freedom, and funding/finance are the topics of least interest to our readers. More generally, respondents appreciated the non-US and transnational nature of our coverage, as captured by this reader, “[*IHE* is] genuinely international and comparative, as opposed to focused on US perspectives on the rest of the world.”

The manageable length of *IHE* articles was a point of satisfaction for over 80 percent of respondents, which this reader summarizes well, “the articles are easy to read, well structured, and straight to the point, giving the reader a fast and precise response to what he/she was looking for.” A strong majority of respondents agreed that we should continue offering a balance of opinion/analysis articles and report-oriented articles. More than 90 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that *IHE* produces articles of con-

sistent quality, and 94 percent agreed or strongly agreed that *IHE* provides accurate and reliable information.

Some readers appreciated the timeliness of *IHE*; specifically, our ability to release articles related to current events happening around the world. One reader said, *IHE* is a “timely publication...[and] this is the most precious characteristic which distinguishes *IHE* from other [publications].”

Only 11 percent of respondents receive just the print version of *IHE*; 53 percent receive only the electronic version via e-mail; and 36 percent receive both a print and electronic copy. Though printing is increasingly cost prohibitive, we acknowledge the significance of the print version and plan to continue offering a paper copy as long as we maintain sufficient grant funding. Some readers, like this one, feel strongly that we should continue to offer print copies, “I love the fact that it’s still in print format. I keep all my copies and refer back to them over time.”

Our readers are quite satisfied with *IHE*, and we do not plan major changes. We were especially gratified by the numerous positive comments similar to this one:

“I think *IHE* is a remarkable contribution. It is obviously good for those policymakers who consider information sources. But it also is useful for the most-informed scholars. Nobody is an expert in all geographic or subject matters. A scholar can surmise much from even the pure descriptive accounts.”

The Center is extremely grateful for the thoughtful feedback provided by survey respondents and looks forward to receiving ongoing input from readers with new ideas for topics we can cover and new authors who can add their voices to these important conversations. We will continue to emphasize critical analysis of key higher education issues that are relevant to a global audience. We will strive to feature countries and regions that may not receive wide attention elsewhere. Most importantly perhaps, we will do our best to maintain a critical edge and provide alternative perspectives.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Carpenter, Joel, Perry L. Glanzer, and Nicholas S. Lantinga, eds. *Christian Higher Education: A Global Reconnaissance*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014. 346 pp. \$36 (pb). ISBN 978-0-8028-7105-3. Web site: www.Eerdmans.com.

An analytic overview of trends in Christian higher education worldwide, this

volume includes chapters concerning key countries and regions. Among the areas discussed are India, Korea, Kenya, China, Nigeria, western Europe, postcommunist Europe, the United States, Canada, and others. Some of the chapters discuss the historical development of Christian higher education, while others discuss only the current situation. The authors point to a

significant growth of Christian higher education worldwide.

de Wit, Hans, Fiona Hunter, Linda Johnson, and Hans-Georg van Liempd, eds. *Possible Futures: The Next 25 Years of Internationalization of Higher Education*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: European Association for Higher Education, 2013. 238

pp. (pb). ISBN 978-90-74741-34-9. Web site: www.eaie.org.

A multifaceted discussion of the central themes of higher education internationalization by many of the key researchers in the field, this volume also celebrates the 25th anniversary of the European Association for International Education. Among the themes are global trends in internationalization, patterns of globalization, the relationships between Asia and Europe in internationalization, Asian regionalization, African internationalization trends, student mobility, branch campuses, joint-degree programs, themes in internationalization at home, and others.

Global University Network for Innovation. *Higher Education in the World 5: Knowledge, Engagement, and Higher Education: Contributing to Social Change*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2014. 324 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-230-53556-5. Web site: www.guninetwork.org.

The social and community engagement of higher education institutions constitutes a complex set of academic and social relationships. This comprehensive volume examines many of the factors that are involved. Such themes as the social uses of knowledge, the involvement of universities in social service activities, the community involvement of universities, and others are discussed. A variety of national case studies are also included.

Mason, Colina, and Felicity Rawlings-Sanaei, eds. *Academic Migration, Discipline Knowledge, and Pedagogical Practice: Voices from the Asia-Pacific*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2014. 218 pp. \$129 (hb). ISBN 978-981-4451-87-1. Web site: www.springer.com.

The theme of this book is the migration of academic talent globally. The authors have all experienced academic migration themselves, and the chapters are based in part on personal experience and in part on research. Among the themes of the chapters are the impact of Chinese cultural heritage on university teaching, personal identity and academic culture,

cultural transfer and university teaching, and others.

Miller, Gary, et al. *Leading the e-Learning Transformation of Higher Education: Meeting the Challenges of Technology and Distance Education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2014. 257 pp. \$35 (pb). ISBN 978-1-57922-796-8. Web site: www.Styluspub.com.

Focusing on the role of leadership in e-learning, this book includes chapters on how e-learning is transforming higher education, the organizational context, how to support faculty members in online learning, the role of technology support services, and other themes. The authors are all engaged in higher education technology in the United States.

Paulsen, Michael B., ed. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*. Vol. 29. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2014. 585 pp. \$239 (hb). ISBN 978-94-017-8004-9. Web site: www.springer.com.

Now in its 29th year, this series features current research on higher education issues. Mainly focused on the United States, the chapters generally discuss a specific theme and provide a summary of relevant literature and research on the topic, as well as current trends. This volume features chapters concerning the changing nature of cultural capital, student ratings of instruction, an economic analysis of college enrollment, the history of land-grant universities, equity issues, and others.

Shin, Jung Cheol, and Ulrich Teichler, eds., *The Future of the Post-Massified University at the Crossroads: Restructuring Systems and Functions*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer, 2014. 252 pp. ISBN: 978-3-319-01522-4. Web site: www.springer.com.

The focus of this book is mainly on how research universities in advanced industrialized countries have reacted to a massified higher education system. Among the themes discussed are the social contributions of university research, the scholarship of teaching, research, and service, the role of service in research uni-

versities, the evolution of universities, internationalization as a response to globalization in Asia, the ethics of universities, and others.

Smelser, Neil J. *Dynamics of the Contemporary University: Growth, Accretion, and Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013. 139 pp (hb). ISBN 978-0-520-27581-2. Web site: www.ucpress.edu.

Sociologist Smelser examines the nature of the contemporary American university. The focus is on the structure of higher education and the theme of accretion of functions and roles. Included are considerations of roles of academic administration, academic stratification, commercialization, and others. Economic and political factors are also considered in explaining trends and issues. Although the context is the United States and particularly California, this discussion is internationally relevant.

Streitweiser, Bernhard, ed. *Internationalization of Higher Education and Global Mobility*. Oxford, UK: Symposium Books, 2014. 320 pp. £28 (pb). ISBN 978-1-873927-42-7. Web site: www.symposium-books.co.uk.

This valuable volume broadly concerning student mobility provides a conceptual background relating to mobility, as well as a range of case studies. Issues such as the value of mobility, cross-border higher education, challenges facing student mobility are considered. Case studies of mobility patterns are included—countries and regions such as European patterns of mobility, mobility in the Islamic world, the role of the Erasmus program, China, Cuba, and several others.

Teichler, Ulrich, and Ester Ava Höhle, eds. *The Work Situation of the Academic Profession in Europe: Findings of a Survey in Twelve Countries*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2014. 290 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-94-007-5976-3. Web site: www.springer.com.

Using data from the Changing Academic Profession global survey of attitudes of the academic profession, this

volume reports findings from 12 European countries. Among the themes are how academics perceive governance, views about the service function of universities, views about teaching, gender differences and attitudes, career paths of the academic profession, internationalization of the universities and the views of academics, and others.

Xing Jun, Ng Pak Sheung, and Cheng Chunyan, eds. *General Education and the Development of Global Citizenship in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Mainland China*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2013. 238 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-0-

415-62397-1. Web site: www.routledge.com.

General education is a fairly new concept in China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, but in recent years it has become more important. This book discusses a range of topics concerning general education in the broader Chinese context. Included in the consideration are how to train faculty for general education, outcomes assessment for general education in China, the role of the university in culture building, general education and curriculum design, and others.

CRITICAL INTERNATIONAL NEWS AT A GLANCE ON FACEBOOK AND TWITTER

Do you have time to read more than 20 electronic bulletins weekly in order to stay up to date with international initiatives and trends? We thought not! So, as a service, the CIHE research team posts items from a broad range of international media to our Facebook and Twitter page.

You will find news items from the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Inside Higher Education*, *University World News*, *Times Higher Education*, the *Guardian Higher Education network UK*, the *Times of India*, the *Korea Times*, just to name a few. We also include pertinent items from blogs and other online resources. We will also announce international and comparative reports and relevant new publications.

Unlike most Facebook and Twitter sites, our pages are not about us, but rather “newsfeeds” updated daily with notices most relevant to international educators and practitioners, policymakers, and decision makers. Think “news

marquis” in Times Square in New York City. Here, at a glance, you can take in the information and perspective you need in a few minutes every morning.

To follow the news, press “Like” on our Facebook page at: <http://www.facebook.com/pages/Center-for-International-Higher-Education-CIHE/197777476903716>. “Follow” us on Twitter at: https://twitter.com/#!/BC_CIHE.

We hope you’ll also consider clicking “Like” on Facebook items you find most useful to help boost our presence in this arena. Please post your comments to encourage online discussion.

ALTBACH FESTSCHRIFT PUBLISHED

The Forefront of International Higher Education: A Festschrift in Honor of Philip G. Altbach, edited by Alma Maldonado-Maldonado and Roberta Malee Bassett, has been published by Springer Publishers—Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2014. 333 pp. \$129 (hb). Web site: www.springer.com. This volume, which was prepared to coincide with a conference to honor Philip G. Altbach on April 5, 2013 at Boston College, features chapters focusing on themes relating to research undertaken by Philip G. Altbach. The authors are either students who worked with Professor Altbach or colleagues involved with the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. Colleagues include Ulrich Teichler, Jane Knight, Martin J. Finkelstein, Hans de Wit, Simon Schwartzman, Jorge Balán, D. Bruce Johnstone, Judith S. Eaton, Akiyoshi Yonezawa, N. Jayaram, Heather Eggins, Frans van Vught, Nian Cai Liu, Jamil Salmi, and others. Former and current

students include Patti McGill Peterson, David A. Stanfield, James J.F. Forest, Robin Matross Helms, Sheila Slaughter, Liz Reisberg, Laura E. Rumbley, and the two coeditors of the book: Alma Maldonado-Maldonado and Roberta Malee Bassett.

Chapters include topics such as higher education innovation in India, center-periphery theory, world-class universities, tuition and cost sharing, quality assurance, the academic profession and academic mobility, and various aspects of internationalization.

NEWS OF THE CENTER

The Center's highly productive research collaboration with the National Research University-Higher School of Economics in Moscow continues to produce exciting projects. The newest project relates to case studies of the impact of rankings on universities in 10 selected countries. Researchers will examine how policies relating to rankings and the general "rankings mania" impact institutions "on the ground." The result of our recent collaboration, relating to the phenomenon of faculty inbreeding in 8 different countries, will be published in the coming months as a book by Palgrave-Macmillan. Finally, a separate volume focused on the experiences of young faculty in 10 different countries—coedited by Masha Yudkevich, Philip G. Altbach, and Laura E. Rumbley—should be published later this year by the State University of New York Press. This is yet another result of our joint research activities with the Higher School of Economics in Moscow.

Philip G. Altbach continues his work on the 5-100 Committee on Higher Education Competitiveness of the Russian Government. This program recently awarded more than US\$300 million to a select group of Russian universities to reform with the aim of internationalizing, improving governance, and achieving more competitiveness on the world stage.

The Center has recently completed the fourth installment in its ongoing series with the American Council on Education, "International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders." The most recent number was focused on "Argentina, Brazil and Chile: Engaging the 'Southern Cone.'" The full set of existing Briefs will be published in book form later in 2014. Additional Briefs will be forthcoming in this series.

Philip G. Altbach represented the Center at the British Council's "Going Global" conference in Miami, Florida. Among other activities, he presented the findings of a study cocommissioned by the British Council and the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), and conducted by the Center and Global Opportunities Group, headed by David Engberg, on the rationales and outcomes of 11 national scholarship programs for overseas study. He will participate in the Higher School of Economics International Advisory Council meeting in St. Petersburg, Russia, in late May, and will be speaking at the European Association for International Education's conference in Prague.

IMPROVEMENTS FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

This issue of *International Higher Education* marks a significant change in our publication arrangements. We have joined the "Open Journal System," a publication network of the Boston College library. This new arrangement provides easier access to, and searchability of, *IHE* and more effective archiving of our issues. It also provides significantly improved visibility on Internet-search engines. While there may be an adjustment period for some of our readers, this new system greatly improves our reach.

We invite you to explore our new *IHE* homepage (<http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe>), which currently features this issue of *IHE*, as well as the previous two issues. All back issues of *IHE* will eventually migrate to the new site, and we will inform subscribers of this development at the appropriate time. For now, all back issues of *IHE* can be found in their more familiar location on the CIHE Web site: <http://www.bc.edu/content/bc/research/cihe/ihe/issues.html>.

A NEW INITIATIVE: HIGHER EDUCATION INTERNATIONALIZATION THEME ISSUE

Beginning at the end of 2014, *IHE* will add a fifth issue each year, specifically focusing on internationalization issues. This issue will be edited by Hans de Wit, director of the Center for Higher Education Internationalization at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan, Italy. This issue will bring *IHE*'s analytic perspective to the broad issues of internationalization. For further information, please contact Hans de Wit. His e-mail address is: j.w.m.de.wit@hva.nl.



Center for International Higher Education
Boston College
Campion Hall
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467-3813
USA

PRESORTED
FIRST-CLASS MAIL
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
N. READING MA
PERMIT 258

THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION (CIHE)

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 newsletter, a book series, and other publications; sponsors conferences; and welcomes visiting scholars. We have a special concern for academic institutions in the Jesuit tradition worldwide and, more broadly, with Catholic universities.

The Center promotes dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions throughout the world. We believe that the future depends on effective collaboration and the creation of an international community focused on the improvement of higher education in the public interest.

CIHE WEB SITE

The different sections of the Center Web site support the work of scholars and professionals in international higher education, with links to key resources in the field. All issues of International Higher Education are available online, with a searchable archive. In addition, the International Higher Education Clearinghouse (IHEC) is a source of articles, reports, trends, databases, online newsletters, announcements of

upcoming international conferences, links to professional associations, and resources on developments in the Bologna Process and the GATS. The Higher Education Corruption Monitor provides information from sources around the world, including a selection of news articles, a bibliography, and links to other agencies. The International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA), is an information clearinghouse on research, development, and advocacy activities related to postsecondary education in Africa.

THE PROGRAM IN HIGHER EDUCATION AT THE LYNCH SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, BOSTON COLLEGE

The Center is closely related to the graduate program in higher education at Boston College. The program offers master's and doctoral degrees that feature a social science-based approach to the study of higher education. The Administrative Fellows initiative provides financial assistance as well as work experience in a variety of administrative settings. Specializations are offered in higher education administration, student affairs and development, and international education. For additional information, please contact Dr. Karen Arnold (arnoldk@bc.edu) or visit our Web site: <http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/>.

OPINIONS EXPRESSED HERE DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEWS OF THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION.

EDITOR

Philip G. Altbach

PUBLICATIONS EDITOR

Edith S. Hoshino

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Salina Kopellias

EDITORIAL OFFICE

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

Tel: (617) 552-4236

Fax: (617) 552-8422

E-mail: highered@bc.edu

<http://www.bc.edu/cihe>

We welcome correspondence, ideas for articles, and reports. If you would like to subscribe, please send an e-mail to: highered@bc.edu, including your position (graduate student, professor, administrator, policymaker, etc.), and area of interest or expertise. There is no charge for a subscription.

ISSN: 1084-0613

©Center for International
Higher Education