INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

Number 84: Winter 2016

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

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*.

Subscribe to *IHE*

http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/user/register

Important information on CIHE's new MA in International Higher Education, and a new subscription policy for *IHE* on page 2.

CIHE Master's Program in International Higher Education

CIHE is pleased to announce the launch of a new Master's Program in International Higher Education. This 30-credit program (which can be completed in one academic year + summer) is designed to provide participants with a cutting-edge and highly internationalized perspective on higher education policy and practice in a globalized context.

The program is ideally suited for students interested in developing careers in strategic leadership for internationalization of higher education, in policymaking for higher education in international organizations, and related areas.

Building on the decades-long tradition at Boston College of offering academically rigorous and professionally relevant preparation in the field of higher education administration, the program specifically leverages CIHE's deep expertise and extensive knowledge network in the field of international higher education. Key features include a required field placement experience, innovative coursework (including onsite, online, and hybrid delivery), access to key thought leaders in the field of international higher education, and a highly individualized capstone project. Please direct all inquiries to Laura E. Rumbley, CIHE Associate Director, rumbley@bc.edu.

■ ■ ■ ■ ■ ■

The Editorial Team of *IHE* announces some changes in our subscription policy.

Over the past 20 years, *IHE* has been published and distributed (both in print and online) for free to our readers all over the world. This has been made possible thanks to grants received from the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the generous support of Boston College, and the free contributions by our authors. We also have published over the past two years two special issues on internationalization of higher education, in collaboration with the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation (CHEI) in Milan. We want to continue to provide *IHE* for free to our online subscribers in the coming years. We also want to continue to provide printed versions of IHE, but given the increasing costs of printing and mailing we must charge a modest annual fee of $35.00 for those who wish to receive the printed version. In addition, we would welcome donations (in any amount) from our online only subscribers to help support *IHE* in the years to come.

As of 2016, we are returning to four issues per year, but aim to increase the number of pages per issue from 32 to 36 (which means more content for readers). We will include in each issue specialsections on internationalization of higher education, in collaboration with CHEI, and on private and transnational higher education, in collaboration with our colleagues at SUNY Albany.

Information on the new fee regime (again, required only for subscribers to the print edition) will be forthcoming as we finalize technical details related to the payment process.

As always, thank you sincerely for your ongoing support of *IHE*, which we are committed to making as accessible as possible and of consistently high quality.

Philip G. Altbach, Editor
Laura E. Rumbley and Hans de Wit, Associate Editors

Another Year, Another Methodology: Are Rankings Telling Us Anything New?

Ellen Hazelkorn and Andrew Gibson

Ellen Hazelkorn is policy advisor to the Higher Education Authority (Ireland), and Emeritus Professor and Director, Higher Education Policy Research Unit (HEPRU). E-mail: ellen.hazelkorn@dit.ie. Andrew Gibson is senior research assistant, HEPRU, and PhD candidate, Trinity College Dublin. E-mail: Andrew.gibson@dit.ie.

Previously, when university rankings were discussed, one would have to start with the question "which one?" However, despite the fact that there are ten main global rankings, most attention is focused on: *Academic Rankings of World Universities (ARWU), Times Higher Education*, and *QS*. Yet, even after answering that first question, one can still ask, "yes, but which one?" This is because—between them—these three rankings have propagated 66 separate rankings and subrankings: rankings by region, by faculty, by field, by subject, and so on. All which goes to show that rankings are not just newsworthy, but also big business.

Traditionally, the focus of policy and media attention has been on the fascination and the melodrama of the relative volatility up or down—even by a statistically insignificant amount. Even students have been shown to make choices based upon such minor differences. Indeed, it is the sensationalism that accompanies such movement that has arguably helped drive the proliferation in the number and type of rankings, and especially the timing of their publication—which seems to coincide with major conferences or events.

Ranking organizations would dispute any deliberate intent. *US News and World Report*, for example, argued that modifications were a mark of improvement, or, as *THE* says, "change for the better." The latter has also justified such changes with reference to its various partnerships—its divorce from *QS*, its partnership with *Thomson Reuters* and most recently with *Scopus*.

Recent Methodological Changes

Methodological changes come in two broad forms. Changes can be structural: shifting weightings, specific indicators, "normalization" criteria, etc. by a few percentage points here or there. Or, there can be changes in the source data. Nonetheless, all this goes to highlight the arbitrariness of the methodology and the weightings.

In terms of source data, *THE* changed in 2015 from *Web of Science (WoS)* to *Scopus*. *WoS* includes only 12,000 journals compared with 23,000 in the latter. *Scopus* is regarded as giving better coverage to the humanities and social sciences, and so a broader range of universities' activities in more fields and subjects will be captured, chipping away at something of a science bias in the bibliometric indicators.

Another change effect was *THE*'s decision to exclude papers with over 1,000 authors on the basis that such publications could give a marginal institution outsize importance. This primarily affects fields such as particle physics, and, for example, projects from the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN). Without the full datasets being available, we have to assume that the exclusion of these research papers was responsible for the decline of Turkey's Boğaziçi University, which went from 139 in 2014–2015 to 501–600 in 2015–2016. This raises questions about whether such research should now go completely unrecognized, and whether some alternative system might be a fairer—and appropriate—solution.

Traditionally, the focus of policy and media attention has been on the fascination and the melodrama of the relative volatility up or down—even by a statistically insignificant amount.

In 2015, *QS* made changes to its methodology, which it called "refinements." The modification concerned how citations are calculated. Instead of having citations divided by the absolute number of researchers, it devised a model which normalized citation counts by field. This facilitated arts and humanities, social sciences, and engineering and technology research to rise to near parity with medicine and life/natural sciences. This means that universities with, for example, medical schools (which tend to be older and with a more established research reputation) will no longer be as advantaged, and newer institutions with strengths in other fields may rise. In an echo of *THE*'s move, *QS* is also excluding papers with more than 10 affiliated institutions.

In contrast, *ARWU*'s methodology is fairly stable. Accordingly, major upsets are unusual, and the same universities feature in the top year after year. One change *ARWU* did make, in 2014 and 2015, concerned how high citation papers (as captured by *Thomson Reuters*) are measured—with specific reference to researchers with dual institutional affiliations. From 2003, *ARWU* used a list of 6,000 highly-cited researchers, but a change in 2014 and 2015 introduced

a shorter list with 3,000 researchers. This led to some minor changes in scores, but no great upsets.

The Russian *Round University Ranking (RUR)* uses data supplied by *Thomson Reuters*. Research and teaching are given equal weightings at 40 percent, with "international diversity" and "financial sustainability" comprising the remainder at 10 percent each. An interesting point about this ranking, which is not otherwise groundbreaking, is that each university's scores for each indicator are available. This could make it an interesting alternative in an otherwise crowded market.

Are These Changes Telling Us Anything New?

There is plenty of international evidence showing how universities seek to manipulate or (more politely) influence their data. Because faculty numbers are a key denominator for research income, research students, publications, staff-student ratio, etc., there has been a consistent effort to recategorize faculty according to contract and employment status. There are determined efforts to clean up any mislabelling around institutional affiliation. There is also strong evidence around universities' efforts to raise student entry selectivity criteria, with knock-on implications for student completions, employability, and salary levels. While sensational, these examples are still relatively minor in the scheme of 18,000 higher education institutions worldwide.

Despite these changes, it is not clear that the rankings are telling us anything we did not already know. Universities change so slowly that it is difficult to understand how the level of change portrayed in annual rankings can realistically be ascribed to the institutions themselves. Ironically, the problem of fluctuation threatens to obscure the converse problem: the relative uniformity of rankings. Despite the appearance of movement, rankings are remarkably consistent; different institutions may appear in slightly different order, but essentially the same institutions appear at or near the top in all rankings. This should not be surprising because rankings are essentially measuring the same—wrong—things.

The tenacious "black box" nature of rankings depends upon governments, students, and the public not understanding or questioning what is inside. ■

Citius, Altius, Fortius:[1] Global University Rankings as the "Olympic Games" of Higher Education?

Maria Yudkevich, Philip G. Altbach, and Laura E. Rumbley

Maria Yudkevich is vice rector of the National Research University-Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russian Federation. E-mail: 2yudkevich@gmail.com. Philip G. Altbach is research professor and founding director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu. Laura E. Rumbley is associate director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: laura.rumbley@bc.edu.

[1]Note: *Citius, altius, fortius*—Latin for "faster, higher, stronger"—is the official motto of the Olympic Games.

What's in a metaphor? There are many metaphors that can be, and frequently are, applied to global university rankings. From our perspective, there are many game-like qualities to the global university rankings, and some notable parallels between these major academic contests and another key global competition: the Olympic Games.

Rankings, in parallel with the Olympics, are highly competitive, offering participants the potential to earn prestigious prizes or rewards, that can shape their prospects for the future in profound and quite tangible ways. For athletes, this may result in national and international fame and opportunities for lucrative endorsements. Similarly, universities demonstrating outstanding performance in the global rankings gain high international visibility; interest from desirable prospective students and faculty; money from private funding agencies, industry, philanthropists, as well as government.

The Global Rankings "Playing Field"

Both the Olympics and the global university rankings pull together actors who share both an appreciation for the highest levels of performance on a worldwide stage, and a drive to compete to win. Not all entrants in these contests are created equal, however. To perform well in these elite international competitions, being smart and rich helps. Deep familiarity and experience with the rules of the game is also a key asset, as success often hinges on leveraging key strengths and minimizing troublesome weaknesses.

Furthermore, inherent attributes may also explain the success enjoyed by some countries in the Olympic Games, as well as in the rankings. For example, the list of medalists in specific sports often represents countries where there are good natural training conditions for those sports. The phenomenon of inherent advantage also plays out in the world of rankings. Most obviously, it is generally accepted that the world's English-speaking countries and institutions are in a much more favorable position (vis a vis the rankings), in comparison to those situated in the non-English-speaking world, because their academic systems already function in the global language of science, and are home to many of the top scientific publications, and the peer reviewers who control access to those publications.

The Medal Count: Going for the Gold

Rankings positions—just like Olympic medals—are a zero-sum game. At the Olympics, there is only gold medalist, one silver medalist, and one bronze medalist. In the global rankings, the same holds true. There is only one #1 university, and only 100 institutions can be named to the top 100—even though, in reality, excellence is not limited to any specific number of academic institutions.

Some countries make substantial efforts to be serious contenders—both in terms of rankings and with respect to such major international sporting events as the Olympics—and spend a lot of money to achieve this goal. They name top performance in such arenas as a national priority and consider the achievements in these spheres to be important in terms of political dynamics, as well. Several of the university or higher education excellence initiatives in a range of countries—including China, France, Germany, and Russia—explicitly mention better performance on the rankings as a key goal. Marshalling resources to achieve greatness in a global competition of universities is not dissimilar to what we see as countries mobilize their sports teams to participate in the Olympics.

Excellence Begets Excellence: The Need for Feeder Systems

Among the ranks of the world's most elite athletes, and among the world's top universities, it is rare for winners to emerge from weak systems. This puts a premium on cultivating entire systems, which ultimately enable elite performance to emerge. To obtain top positions in rankings, it is necessary to invest in top universities, but also in the broader academic system in which these most competitive institutions operate.

Why is this the case? The best national universities need to have a renewable supply of new academic talent. Similarly, to be competitive in the Olympics, a well-developed and adequately funded infrastructure supporting child development and youth sports must be in place. Furthermore, for strong universities to meet their full potential, they require a competitive environment in which to operate. Ideally, they need to be placed in a position where they must actively compete with other universities for students, funding, and faculty. Without the experience of a competitive environment at the local or national level, it becomes extremely difficult for institutions to be competitive at the international level. The same can be argued in the context of sports: the opportunity to practice with, and compete against, the best in one's field provides aspiring champions with essential opportunities to discover their weaknesses, hone their skills, and stretch to new heights.

The ability of systems to draw talent to them is another parallel that can be made between countries that do well in the Olympics and those with strong higher education systems. In the Olympics, national teams representing a specific country may include athletes (or coaches/trainers) who are originally from other countries, but who accept citizenship in the adopted country and join the national team as legitimate national players. Many universities around the world are similarly engaged in attracting top talent to their teams in an effort to improve their competitive standing on the global university rankings.

Rankings, in parallel with the Olympics, are highly competitive, offering participants the potential to earn prestigious prizes or rewards, that can shape their prospects for the future in profound and quite tangible ways.

Lost Luster: The Dark Side of the Race for Gold

Sadly, there is a dark side to the competitions we see around us. From corruption in the world of professional soccer to the longstanding culture of doping in competitive cycling, including in the Olympics, there are clear examples that not everyone plays fair. So, while athletes may indulge in doping to enhance their performance, performance enhancing strategies in the world of university rankings could include publishing in fake for-profit journals that are mistakenly indexed in major databases, such as Web of Science and/or Scopus. Equally, it must be conceded that some of the ranking organizations are as focused on commercial gain as they are on objective measurement of the quality of universities.

Why does this kind of behavior take place? Achieving greatness in the rankings, as on the Olympic playing field, requires a decisive commitment to win, and the potential cost of failure may be enough to encourage contenders to do whatever it takes to secure a strong finish.

Citius, Altius, Fortius—The Right Motto, the Wrong Game?

Faster, higher, stronger—who would not be moved by such an inspiring call to greatness? However, while the awarding of rank-order medals on the basis of performance on a given day during an Olympic competition may satisfy the world's top athletes, the evaluation of the achievements of the world's universities must extend beyond the tiers of a podium or the rank-order positions on a list. A university's commitment to pursue a path toward greatness—faster, higher, stronger—should rest on a deep understanding of the complex and multifaceted nature of the university itself, and on a sophisticated examination of how the institution can best foster both its own health and dynamism and that of the broader public good. These bedrock efforts must be allowed to unfold beyond the fanfare of lights and anthems, in thoughtful, steady, and sustainable ways. At the same time, there needs to be recognition that not all universities should focus on Olympic level competition, but rather should focus on providing access, educating students well, and serving local and regional needs. The rankings, like the Olympics, are the preserve of a small number of highly competitive contenders. ■

A Good National System of Higher Education: the Lessons of the U21 Rankings

Ross Williams

Ross Williams is a professorial fellow at the Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, 3101. He leads the Universitas 21 *(U21) ranking project, details of which may be found at www.universitas21.com. E-mail: rossaw@unimelb.edu.au.*

It is the nature and quality of the higher education system as a whole, not just that of research intensive universities, that matters for the economic, social, and cultural development of a nation. However, the international rankings of universities are based heavily on research performance, largely ignoring teaching and training, scholarship, and community engagement. These rankings are influencing university behavior, especially in Europe, Asia, and Australasia, and act to reduce the diversity of higher education institutions.

In an attempt to move discussion away from institutions to higher education systems as a whole, in 2012 the U21 group of universities commissioned a project to quantify the performance of national systems.

The U21 Ranking Methodology

In an attempt to move discussion away from institutions to higher education systems as a whole, in 2012 the U21 group of universities commissioned a project to quantify the performance of national systems. The coverage is all tertiary institutions, that is, all institutions that offer at least a two-year program after final year schooling. Fifty countries are included, spanning the per capita income range from Indonesia and India at one end to high income developed countries at the other. Performance is evaluated over 25 variables grouped into four modules: resources, the policy environment, connectivity/engagement and output. The resource measures cover private and public expenditure as a share of GDP and expenditure per student. The policy environment measures include the degree of financial and academic independence of institutions, diversity of institutions, the monitoring of standards, and the views of business. Connectivity is measured by joint publications with industry and with international coauthors, web connectivity, surveys of business attitudes, and the relative importance of international students. The output measures include research performance, participation rates and the standing of a country's top three universities. Internationally comparative data are not available on the quality of graduates, but a measure of whether the mix and standard of graduates are meeting community expectations is provided by unemployment rates of graduates, relative to school leavers.

For each measure scores are standardized relative to the best performing country which is scored at 100. The measures are then weighted to give a score (out of 100) and rank for each of the four modules, and subsequently an overall score and rank. The overall score is obtained giving

a weight of 40 percent to output and 20 percent to each of the other three modules. A limitation of the rankings (but not the scores) is that not all countries are included, which means, particularly for countries with less developed systems, that a country's world ranking may be overstated.

Policy Uses of the Measures

As is the case with the rankings of universities, most media interest concentrates on the overall national rankings. But it is the scores and rankings for the modules and individual variables, together with the relationships between them, that provide the lessons for higher education policymakers.

Adequate resources combined with a favorable policy environment are necessary for a quality national system of higher education. Lessons can be drawn from looking at the correlations between the scores for the two input modules (resources and the environment) and the end-result modules (connectivity and output). Among the output variables, participation rates and population qualification rates are strongly correlated with expenditure, but it does not matter whether the expenditure is predominantly government financed (as in the Nordic countries) or private (as in Korea). On the other hand, research performance is strongly linked to university expenditure on research and development, which is largely government funded. A measure of the aggregate efficiency of the system is to compare a nation's rank on output measures with that on resources. To illustrate, two countries where the rank on research performance is much higher than the rank for resources are the United Kingdom and China. In both countries, government research funding is targeted to select universities, which suggests this is a quick way to raise research performance. Connectivity is also highly correlated with resources.

Are Nations Converging?

After four annual rankings some trends are noticeable. There has been a continual improvement in most indicators for most countries, so that for a country to keep its ranking it must improve faster than average. There is little evidence of convergence in national systems of higher education over the four years. Using the standard deviation of the scores as a measure of convergence, the overall scores actually show a small increase in divergence and the only module where convergence has occurred is connectivity. But the general finding hides significant movements for individual countries. The greatest improvers are China and South Africa; Chile and Hungary also improved their ranking. Countries that have fallen in rank include Ukraine, Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, Spain, and Turkey. Within the individual measures some convergence is discernable—for example, in participation rates and expenditure as a share of GDP.

What Systems Perform Best?

What, then, is the best national system of higher education? No single model dominates. The Nordic countries perform well with a system of relatively close cooperation between universities, government, and business, with high expenditure on research and development; similarly for Switzerland that is particularly strong in domestic and international connectivity. It is a moot point whether this model is possible, or even desirable, in a large economy where lines of communication are more complex. At the other end of the distribution, the more decentralized US system, less reliant on government funding, is ranked first overall. There is, however, one strong conclusion from the rankings: the worst performing national systems are those where there is considerable government control over institutions but low levels of government funding.

In formulating national policies, governments should look at the attributes of countries of similar size and income levels that are performing well. The attributes of a "good" system of higher education depend in part on a country's level of per capita income. At low levels of income there is a need to build up teaching and training; research is best concentrated on importing and spreading new ideas. In an auxiliary U21 ranking, countries are evaluated relative to their levels of GDP per capita. China, India, and South Africa rise up appreciably in the rankings using this measure.

The other side of the coin is to look at how measures such as connectivity, qualification levels, and research expenditure affect economic growth. The lags can be long here and the answers will have to wait for a few more years of data. Ideally, this exercise also requires the inclusion of more low-income countries, but for this better data are needed. ■

U-Multirank and Latin American Universities

Ana García De Fanelli

Ana García de Fanelli is a senior research scholar at the National Council of Research in Science and Technology at the Center for the Study of State and Society in Buenos Aires, Argentina. E-mail: anafan@cedes.org.

The first U-Multirank survey was launched in 2014. It is a multidimensional and user-driven approach to international ranking in higher education, and includes more than 850 higher education institutions worldwide, some

located in Latin America. This initiative has support and funding from the European Union.

Unlike other international rankings, such as the Academic Ranking of World Universities or the *Times Higher Education* ranking, that focus is mainly on research activity; U-Multirank addresses also a multiplicity of higher education dimensions such as teaching and learning, knowledge transfer, internationalization, and regional engagement. Additionally, and most importantly, users can select which areas of performance to include when comparing a choice of universities. In addition to data usually employed by other international rankings, such as bibliometric and patent data bases, U-Multirank collects information provided by institutions (via an institutional questionnaire) and students (through a survey of students at participating universities).

Unfortunately, information about nonresearch indicators is available only for a few Latin American (LA) universities. This article discusses whether more LA universities will be able to participate in this interesting and essential initiative in the near future. Similar projects in Latin America are discussed followed by an analysis on whether some of the data requested by U-Multirank in the institutional questionnaires.

U-Multirank addresses also a multiplicity of higher education dimensions such as teaching and learning, knowledge transfer, internationalization, and regional engagement.

Similar Experiences in Latin America

In response to research-oriented international rankings, LA universities have begun to engage in national and international projects, in order to supply data and indicators on the multiple dimensions of their operations and outputs.

The Integrated Information System for Higher Education Institutions in Latin America for the Common Higher Education Area with Europe (INFOACES), funded by the European Commission within the ALFA (Latin American Academic Training) program, has similar goals to U-Multirank. The network is comprised of 33 partners from 23 countries (18 in Latin America and 5 in Europe). The Polytechnic University of Valencia, in Spain, coordinates the project. INFOACES's web site provides users with basic information about universities and their web sites; lists of degrees offered by field of study; the total number of students at the institution (or the number of students enrolled in each degree program, if the data are available); and the number of faculty at the institution. Universities that are members of the network have access to a restricted database with further information for management decisions. They also have access to the Flexible Professional in the Knowledge Society (PROFLEX). PROFLEX is a platform for the implementation of a monitoring system of graduates through online surveys.

Although limited to Mexican higher education institutions, the Comparative Study of Mexican Universities (EXECUM), a database produced by the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, provides insight into additional perspectives. Its web site offers users comparative information with respect to teaching, research, and financing. It even offers specific results related to the Mexican quality-assurance policy, such as accredited programs and the number of researchers from the National System of Researchers (SNI). EXECUM contains areas with somewhat detailed information, such as science and technology; for other areas, such as teaching process and output, there is considerably less information.

Data Requested in Institutional Questionnaires

Existing initiatives in Latin America is a good starting point for the progressive inclusion of higher education institutions in U-Multirank. But data requested by the institutional questionnaires on teaching inputs and outputs and on funding issues are quite difficult to obtain from most LA universities.

For example, comprehensive data per institution on international students (especially incoming students and those participating in international exchange programs) are seldom available—the number of students with internships and the number of students who graduated within the standard period of study. With respect to graduates, LA universities, with the exception of some Chilean ones, generally lack a tracking system that makes it possible to identify whether alumni have continued to study or started to work. Some LA universities have a monitoring system for graduates in certain degree programs, but this is not carried out systematically. Some data on funding are also difficult to obtain, in particular the total revenue of institutions per category (core budget, tuition fees, external income from research, and income from licensing agreements). This is particularly challenging in the case of private universities. Finally, it is unclear how the funding of LA universities can actually be apportioned between research, teaching, and knowledge transfer activities.

Of course, we should take into account that the quantity and quality of statistics on LA higher education systems vary per country and even per category of institution.

Conclusion

The difficulty for LA institutions to collect these data and indicators certainly does not imply that they cannot be part of the U-Multirank or other similar tool, to improve transparency in higher education in the future. To achieve this goal, there should be suitable incentives (increasing potential benefits, lowering transparency costs) for universities to participate. Universities should also provide the right technological, human, and financial resources to produce this information.

Information on the higher education system has the characteristics of a public good: it is nonexclusive and nonrival. If such information is indeed on a public good, then governments have a responsibility to guarantee the provision of this service. It is unlikely that each LA university will on its own initiative produce the necessary quantity and quality of data to satisfy this social demand for higher education statistics. In particular, it is unlikely that they will sustain the effort to regularly collect data on teaching, learning output, and internationalization. To achieve this goal, LA governments must engage in this innovative enterprise and encourage universities, through funding mechanisms and other incentives, to produce information based on performance indicators and to publish them on a regular basis. ■

The Syrian Refugee Crisis and Higher Education

Hans de Wit and Philip G. Altbach

Hans de Wit is professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: dewitj@bc.edu. Philip G. Altbach is research professor and founding director of the Center. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu.

The rapidly escalating refugee crisis in Europe has been dominating the international news for several weeks, but surprisingly it is only very recently that the higher education community has become alert to its role and to the considerable dilemmas it will have to face. It is relevant to speculate about the needs and challenges of higher education as a result of this crisis.

The massive exodus of refugees, primarily from Syria, but also from Eritrea, Libya, Afghanistan, the Kurdish territories, and Iraq, numbering in the hundreds of thousands, must be added to already significant numbers trying over the years to move from Africa to Europe. The motivations for this massive migration are both political and economic: the refugees are escaping terrorism, civil war, and poverty in the countries they come from. Over the past several years the attempts of African refugees to cross the Mediterranean have been mainly perceived as a human tragedy resulting from economic hardship, and have received limited support from receiving countries and their communities and governments. The new influx of refugees from the Middle East, in particular Syria, seem to receive a more positive response, at least in Western Europe, although less so in some Central and Eastern European countries such as Hungary.

The motivations for this massive migration are both political and economic: the refugees are escaping terrorism, civil war, and poverty in the countries they come from.

The Human Capital Potential of Middle East Refugees

Why is that the case? In the first place, refugees from Syria escape a country where both the Assad government and Islamic State commit terrible crimes against the local population. They are perceived more as political victims (which fuels sympathy in the receiving countries), than as economic refugees. Refugees from Iraq and the Kurdish territories are seen in similar ways. In addition, and this is where education enters the equation, refugees from Syria, Iraq, and the Kurdish areas are perceived to be better educated and therefore, potentially easier to integrate into society and the labor market in the receiving countries. In the current competition for talent, these refugees are not only seen as victims and a cost factor for the local economy, but in the long run also as welcome new talent for the knowledge economy.

Many media reports feature articulate, English-speaking young professionals from the Middle East expressing their hopes to continue their education or obtain skilled jobs and contribute to European economies.

While struggling with issues of quotas and capacity, Germany is grasping this potential, and other European countries are also beginning to frame their policies in more sophisticated ways. Although the humanitarian factor is understandably dominant in current official statements, the German authorities also make it clear that these refugees can also be an asset for Germany and other European countries in the short and particularly the longer term. German universities are expecting to accept approximately 10,000 of the 800,000 refugees that are now entering the country.

At least for now, there is little discussion about potential "brain drain" problems for Syria and Iraq. The immediate challenges overshadow long-term consequences, and in any case most European and other industrialized countries have shown little moral concern about retaining talent from poorer countries. The literature is filled with discussions of "stay rates" and utilizing foreign talent, without regard for the needs of the countries of origin. While one may hope that well educated Syrians and Iraqis will return home when the situation improves, statistics show that relatively few refugees actually do that.

Responsibilities, Challenges, and Opportunities of the Academic Community

In a few countries, students, academics, universities, and governments are beginning to explore ways to integrate young Syrian and other Middle East academic refugees, students and no doubt also scholars and teachers into the educational system. This can be done by increasing the number of scholarships, speeding up the credential evaluation process, and providing language training and facilities such as dormitories. Organizations like the German Academic Exchange Service-DAAD, EP-Nuffic in the Netherlands, and the Institute of International Education in the United States can play an important role in getting the refugee issue on the higher education agenda—and advocate for scholarships and logistical help.

The universities themselves are of central importance. They can act quickly and independently in many ways. They can cut red tape relating to the admissions process, open study places for refugee students, and provide counselling and other services to traumatized students and their families. Since most students will lack appropriate credentials, universities can, through testing and other means, determine appropriate placement for students. In many cases, language and cultural training will be required.

All of this requires the commitment of human and financial resources. In a time of financial stress, this will not be an easy task. Governments, NGOs, and organizations such as the European Union can, and should, help.

One additional challenge must be mentioned, since it is a major concern of governments in the United States and the United Kingdom, and perhaps elsewhere. It is the need to provide some assurance that refugees admitted to universities are genuinely focused on education and will not turn out to be security risks. For Americans especially, the memories of 9-11 remain strong.

The universities themselves will find that a positive response to this crisis will also yield significant benefits in terms of internationalizing the campus and providing the academic communities with opportunities for social engagement.

There are also plans to create special universities for refugees in the region. There are apparently already three initiatives by Islamic foundations to build such universities in Turkey. The challenges for such plans are to find the right teachers, to guarantee continuity and quality education. Creating a new university is in itself a very difficult—and expensive—process. Doing so for traumatized students will be particularly problematical.

Many media reports feature articulate, English-speaking young professionals from the Middle East expressing their hopes to continue their education or obtain skilled jobs and contribute to European economies.

Conclusion

All these initiatives are commendable but the problems are enormous. As Riham Kusa wrote in Al-Fanar Media (September 1, 2015), the dilemma for a student is between paying a smuggler or seeking a scholarship. Unfortunately, the possibilities of success of the first option are higher than those of the second. The challenge for academic communities in Europe and elsewhere is to increase access of these refugees to higher education.

The longer the crisis lasts, the more difficult it will be to provide enough study places for refugees in higher education, and the more serious the brain drain impact is likely to be. Experience has shown that refugees who stay away from their home country for a long period and are well integrated in their new communities, are less likely to return. However, this cannot be an argument for the higher education community not to extend support to Syrian refugees, by offering more study places and scholarships for students, visiting scholarship positions to academics, and other measures. This applies to Europe, North America, and other parts of the world, and certainly to neighboring Arab states such as Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and Qatar, which have remained largely uninvolved and have let Lebanon and Jordan take most of the burden. ■

German Universities Open Doors to Refugees: Access Barriers Remain

Simon Morris-Lange and Florinda Brands

Simon Morris-Lange is deputy head of the research unit Expert Council of German Foundations on Integration and Migration, Berlin, Germany. E-mail: morris-lange@svr-migration.de. Florinda Brands is a migration policy expert, Berlin, Germany. E-mail: florinda.brands@gmail.com. The arguments and conclusions contained here do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Expert Council of German Foundations on Integration and Migration.

Europe, and Germany in particular, have seen a great influx of asylum seekers over the past months. In 2015 alone, the number of men, women and children seeking asylum in Germany is projected to reach a historic high of close to 1,000,000, which has proved to be a major challenge for the country's established processing channels. However, with great challenges come great opportunities: The majority of asylum seekers are under the age of 25 and well suited to help offset the decline of Germany's aging population. Many of the newcomers have attended or had planned to attend university before they had to flee their home country. This desire to learn has not gone unnoticed, as many German universities and other higher education institutions are opening their doors to asylum seekers. However, for many of them, taking up or continuing their studies remains a distant dream, as legal and financial barriers pose a seemingly insurmountable challenge. For Germany, a failure to address these barriers today could result in a lack of successful integration tomorrow, since around 35 percent of asylum seekers are expected to stay long term.

Legal Barriers

Although the questions surrounding asylum procedures and integration measures continue to be largely humanitarian, the German debate around the issue has undergone a major paradigm shift and is now also being held in the light of Germany's future workforce demands. In this context, the rulings around the country's lengthy asylum procedures have been criticized for condemning thousands of young and eager asylum seekers to idleness, whereas early access to education and training would foster integration in all segments of the labor market. Asylum seekers have to wait on average 5.3 months—and in thousands of cases well over a year—until they learn whether or not they have been granted protected status, which would allow them to move around freely and take up employment.

Technically, access to higher education is less restricted in Germany than in many other European countries. Already today, asylum seekers would not have to wait to enroll in one of the tuition-free study programs at German universities. As of August, none of country's 16 states (Länder) prevents its universities from admitting asylum seekers who have yet to receive protected status. Nevertheless, only a handful of newcomers can be found in lecture halls across the country. This is in part due to the residency requirements imposed during the asylum process. Throughout this months-long wait for a decision, asylum seekers are required to reside in the administrative district they have originally been assigned to (Wohnsitzauflage). Since not all districts are home to a university or a university with a certain specialization, asylum seekers are unable to enroll until they have been granted permission to move to another administrative district. And although there is legal precedence for this, the red tape involved has discouraged most prospective students from trying. Those few who are not yet deterred often end up unable to prove that they possess the needed qualifications to enroll in a study program. Generally, German universities require international applicants to provide a foreign school-leaving certificate or a foreign academic credential in order to be admitted. At least one of these credentials needs to be considered equivalent to its German counterpart. So even if an applicant has managed to bring his or her diplomas to Germany, the documents may not be considered sufficient by a university's admissions office.

Financial Barriers

In addition to legal obstacles, financial requirements pose another barrier for asylum seekers. Although studying at a German university is still free of charge (with the exception of a very modest biannual administrative fee of around EUR 100 to 300), the newcomers are required to pay for learning materials and their own living expenses, which on average amount to around EUR 800 per month. However, asylum seekers are not allowed to work during their first 15 months or until they are granted protected status, which often takes more than a year. As a result, the vast majority has to make do with non-cash benefits and a monthly government sponsored allowance of EUR 212. And while there are government-backed stipends for students (BAföG), asylum seekers are not allowed to apply for this type of financial aid until their asylum case has been decided. Even recent government pledges to expedite asylum processing will not make much of a difference for the would-be students, since asylum seekers can only apply for BAföG once they have resided in Germany for at least 15 months (recently lowered from the original four years). Finally, this situation is further complicated by restrictive regulations around opening

a bank account for asylum seekers, which can make it very difficult to receive stipend money, pay for rent or university fees.

Emerging Solutions

To help lower these and other access barriers, the federal government, state governments, universities, and civil society initiatives have come up with some concrete measures: In August, the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research pledged to reserve an additional 2,400 places at Germany's pathway colleges (Studienkollegs), which prepare prospective international students for university studies in Germany. In conjunction with this measure, some states like Lower Saxony and Saarland have agreed to drop formal admission requirements for applicants with sufficient German language skills, who successfully complete a Studienkolleg program. Meanwhile, the state of Baden-Wuerttemberg is offering 50 scholarships of up to EUR 750 per month to Syrian students whose asylum case has been decided. In addition, dozens of universities such as the University of Hildesheim and the University of Bayreuth encourage asylum seekers to take German lessons or audit courses. Others go one step further: The Ludwig Maximilians University in Munich has started to admit asylum seekers as exchange students so that they can study for academic credit even without German-language skills. These efforts are underpinned by various grassroots initiatives such as Kiron, a tuition-free online university for asylum seekers, which offers accredited degrees in partnership with brick and mortar universities, such as the University of Rostock.

In August, the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research pledged to reserve an additional 2,400 places at Germany's pathway colleges (Studienkollegs), which prepare prospective international students for university studies in Germany.

With the help of these and other initiatives and programs, asylum seekers are increasingly able to play a more active role in their educational and professional development. However, since integration is not a one-way street, universities will need to be prepared to help their new students adjust to student life on and off campus. ■

The Scourge of Fraud and Corruption in Higher Education

Goolam Mohamedbhai

Goolam Mohamedbhai is former Vice-Chancellor, University of Mauritius, and former Secretary-General, Association of African Universities. E-mail: g_t_mobhai@yahoo.co.uk.

No sector appears to be immune from fraud and corruption, not even those that have a direct impact on society's welfare: health, education, sports, politics, or religion. Higher education is no exception. "Corruption for resources, fame and notoriety places extraordinary pressures on higher education institutions (...). In some instances, corruption has invaded whole systems of higher education and threatens the reputation of research products and graduates, regardless of their guilt and innocence." This quote, which comes from Transparency International's *2013 Global Corruption Report: Education* captures the situation. That corruption had infected higher education has been known for decades. What is perhaps not realized is its magnitude, its extent and that it is constantly growing. Hardly any week goes by now without the appearance of an article on corruption in higher education. The stories cover not only individual students or faculty but also whole institutions and even countries. Corruption in higher education has even crossed borders and become global. And what is surfacing is probably only the tip of the iceberg.

Corruption in higher education affects the developed and the developing world equally, even if the motivation and the actors are different. In simplistic terms, in the West, corruption arises more frequently from the commercialization of higher education, from the growing tendency to convert the university into a corporate, money-generating entity, and from the strong linkages between university and industry, the latter often funding and controlling the research of the former. In the developing world, corruption results more often from the pressure to obtain admission to prestigious universities, especially to professional programs, and to succeed once admitted. It also results from the compulsion among faculty to raise additional income and to quickly climb the academic ladder through publications and research.

Global Scan

A quick scan of recent stories on fraud and corruption in some countries around the world gives an insight into the seriousness of the situation.

Australia. In April 2015, the Four Corners program of the Australian Broadcasting Corporation revealed examples of how the standards of Australian universities are being compromised through corrupt practices, mainly as a result of the pressure on them to recruit foreign students and to ensure that they pass the exams in order to obtain much-needed funds. The examples given included the involvement of fraudulent recruitment agents, universities graduating poorly qualified or unqualified nurses, widespread plagiarism, cheating and exploitation. The program was appropriately labelled "Degrees of Deception." In 2014, a story appeared describing how fraud and corruption within and outside Australia's immigration services enabled thousands of foreign students to acquire illegal permanent residency visas in Australia, thereby resulting in unemployment of Australian graduates.

Corruption in higher education affects the developed and the developing world equally, even if the motivation and the actors are different.

Russia. In September 2014, a paper was published in the online journal *International Education Studies*, describing the alarming situation of corruption in modern Russian higher education. It mentions that nearly 50 percent of Russian students—about 7.5 million in the 2008/2009 academic year—had to face corruption, and adds that "the corruption component of the whole industry could be compared with the budget of a small country." The paper gives examples of the wide range of corrupt practices in higher education, mentioning the case of a dean who accepted a bribe of €30,000 for a PhD admission, and feedback from the Moscow Police that some 30–40 professors are caught each year for accepting bribes for good grades.

Africa. It was reported that in May 2015, South African authorities shut down 42 bogus colleges and universities that were offering fake and unaccredited programs, including three bogus, supposedly US-based universities offering degrees in 15 days. In Nigeria, which has the largest higher education system in Africa, areas where corruption occurs most frequently among academic staff are in promotions, journals and book publications, extortion of money for handouts and marks, and sexual harassment. In a 2012 anonymous survey among 475 students in three East African universities, about a third of the students admitted to plagiarism and to fabrication of references, 25 percent to collusion in an examination to communicate answers, and 5 percent to impersonating someone else in an examination. Even a small country like Mauritius has not been immune to fraud. A couple of supposedly branch campuses of private Indian universities, set up in Mauritius without the necessary approval of Indian authorities and offering degrees that would not be recognized in Mauritius or India, are in the process of being closed down.

China. A 2015 article in the e-journal *International Higher Education* refers to corruption in China's higher education system as a "malignant tumor" and mentions that since the 1990s, corruption has had a serious impact on the academic activities of Chinese universities. With regard to research, it gives examples of plagiarism, of researchers pocketing research grant funding, and of favoritism in the appointment of research staff. Previously in China, professors used to enjoy a high status, with pay and conditions commensurate with those granted to high-ranking officials. Since 1988, however, the grade has been differentiated into 6–8 levels, which is unique in the academic world. This has led to a dramatic increase in the number of professors, resulting not only in a loss of their status, but equally facilitating the promotion of many of them on the basis of personal connections rather than on academic merit. Similarly, the dramatic increase in the number of doctoral students has led to corrupt practices in the approval of doctoral programs of universities by the Ministry of Education and in the appointment of doctoral advisors.

India. Perhaps the most shocking corruption scandal, known as the Vyapam scam, has just surfaced in India. Vyapam is a government body in the Indian state of Madhya Pradesh and is responsible for conducting entrance examinations for government jobs and for admissions to higher education institutions, including the much sought-after medical colleges. There had been earlier reports of irregularities in Vyapam, but until recently no one had imagined the scale of the admission and recruitment scam, involving politicians, businessmen, senior officials, and some 2,500 impersonators in examinations. More than 2,000 people have been arrested. Worse, tens of people directly involved in the scam have died, some in suspected cases of murder and suicide. The matter has now been referred to India's Central Bureau of Investigation.

Degree Mills

The sale of fake degree certificates of well-established universities and the operation of institutions that provide degrees with hardly any period of study, commonly known as degree mills, are now well-known. There are reported cases

of even politicians, religious leaders, and other senior officials in various countries, developed and developing, who have purchased fake degrees. Most of the degree mills are located in North America and Europe, while others are scattered globally in hidden locations. There are also higher education institutions that operate without any accreditation, or which have been accredited by bogus accreditation bodies, known as accreditation mills.

South African authorities shut down 42 bogus colleges and universities that were offering fake and unaccredited programs, including three bogus, supposedly US-based universities offering degrees in 15 days.

So far, attempts at stopping the operation of fake degree manufacturers and degree mills have had limited success. UNESCO has created a portal that lists all the recognized higher education institutions in different regions of the world, which is helpful. Wikipedia has, on its web site, a list of unaccredited institutions of higher education, listed alphabetically, from all over the world. It also has a similar list of unrecognized higher education accreditation organizations. While such lists are equally helpful, the legitimacy of the information on the Wikipedia site is uncertain and the site itself acknowledges that the lists may be incomplete. No organization has so far established and made public a list of fake degree manufacturers, or degree or accreditation mills, no doubt fearing legal and political repercussions, or perhaps because such institutions often tend to be ephemeral, disappearing as quickly as they appeared.

A Way Forward

Fighting corruption in higher education is a mammoth task, mainly because it concerns so many different actors and stakeholders within and outside the sector. But fighting it is a must because, if allowed to spread, the national, and global consequences could be very serious. There are several actions that have been taken at institutional, national, and global level to address corruption in higher education, and these need to be reinforced and extended, and their experiences widely shared.

The University of Nairobi, Kenya, has developed an anti-corruption policy document covering the activities of the whole institution, with a special section on teaching and conduct of examinations. Since the 1990s the University of Mauritius has put in place a transparent, computerized selection system which uses the secondary school qualifications of candidates for their admission to all programs. Turnitin is a well-known software to detect plagiarism, and there are also now several free plagiarism detecting tools available online, such as PlagTacker or Anti-Plagiarism. The small, private Botho University in Botswana has put in place an Academic Honesty Unit and has effectively reduced plagiarism among its students through the use of Turnitin and a simple Plagiarism Policy.

At a global level, Transparency International has established an Anti-Corruption Helpdesk that provides on demand to subscribers the relevant available research on any corruption-related question. The Center for International Higher Education of Boston College, US, has created an online Higher Education Corruption Monitor—which provides updated resources (news, articles, videos, etc.) on corruption in higher education around the world, serving as a forum for awareness-creation and information exchange. UNESCO's International Institute for Education Planning (IIEP) also has a web-based resource platform, ETICO, targeting the issue of ethics and corruption in education, including higher education. The US-based Council for Higher Accreditation (CHEA) has a special section on degree and accreditation mills on its web site and, in 2009, issued a statement together with UNESCO on how to discourage degree mills in higher education. More recently, in July 2015, the CHEA International Quality Group produced a Policy Brief outlining how quality assurance can make a difference in fighting corruption in higher education.

In March 2015, the IIEP organized a Policy Forum on Planning Higher Education Integrity, which brought together some 60 experts and stakeholders from around the world to discuss recent and innovative initiatives in addressing fraud and corruption in higher education. At the conclusion of the Forum, participants called for the creation of an international coalition on higher education integrity. It is time now to move forward to set up such a coalition to devise appropriate strategies, policies, and actions for combatting the scourge. The coalition could perhaps be initiated by Transparency International and it should comprise all the major associations and organizations that have experience in dealing with corruption in higher education. The guiding principle for the coalition should be that higher education is neither a business nor an industry, but a social good impregnated with values. ■

Toxic Academic Culture in East Asia

Rui Yang

Rui Yang is professor and associate dean of cross-border/international engagement in the Faculty of Education at the University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong. E-mail: yangrui@hku.hk.

The recent rise of East Asian universities has greatly impressed the academic world. East Asia's advance in higher education is both actual and perceived. The bubbling and gurgling in the media and in the literature need to be interrogated. Questions still remain about the real potential of East Asian universities, and whether they can truly break the bonds of Western hegemony. While recognizing the substantial collective progress East Asian societies have made in higher education over the past decades, we should not lose sight of some of the challenges they are facing. One critical factor that has not been as well discussed is how their future success could be undermined by the toxic academic culture currently endemic in the region.

An Endemic Culture

Academic culture refers to the attitudes, beliefs, and values held by academics in relation to various aspects of their work. It has strong impact on what is done, how it is done, and who is involved in doing it, concerning decisions, actions, and communication on both instrumental and symbolic levels. A number of terms have been used to describe the academic culture in East Asian universities, such as integrity, ethics, misconduct, and even corruption. Academic culture has been cited as a significant impediment for East Asian higher education to reach a leading status in the world. Corrupt academic culture damages the standing of institutions and the academic community badly. An academic culture that is based on meritocratic values, free inquiry, and competition is largely absent in East Asia.

Throughout the region, academic dishonesty has long been an issue, from students cheating to fraud by scientists. Research shows that academic dishonesty is increasing in Hong Kong and Taiwan. South Koreans dub their nation as the "Republic of Plagiarism." Perhaps more successfully than any other people of the world, the Japanese have developed a social system capable of ensuring order and proper behavior. However, Japan is by no means immune from academic fraud. The 2000s witnessed much publicity over high-profile cases of scientific misconduct. More recently, the Japanese academic establishment was stunned by Haruko Obokata's fabricated data, doctored images, and plagiarism.

Academic misconduct is particularly serious in China. Since the 1990s, academic culture has fast become decadent and this "tainted" culture has penetrated deeply into the higher education sector from regional to national flagship institutions, and permeated every aspect of university operations. Mirroring the wider society, it takes various forms, and those involved include students, professors, academicians, and institutional leaders. Within the Chinese higher education system, being promoted into government or even staying within universities with administrative roles can mean far more substantial financial rewards than what pure academic work can bring. Chinese scholars are therefore more and more prone to becoming trapped in the pursuit of administrative standing, rather than devoting their time to legitimate academic research.

Devastating Effects

Under the influence of a corrupt academic culture, the practice of *guanxi* restricts the free movement of staff, students, and resources, and career advancement of faculty. Decision-making is not based on academic merit, but on personal relationships and preferential treatment. Plagiarism and the falsification of scientific results are common. Those in powerful positions carve up major research grants. Without many opportunities left for diligent individuals, academics seek instant success and quick bucks, and misconduct is often found in daily practices. This toxic culture has devastating effects on higher education development and the region's modernization programs, leading to distortions and inefficiency at both institutional and systemic levels. The practices damage the morale of individuals and institutions, ruin the academic atmosphere of East Asian universities, and pollute the minds of young students. It is serious enough to keep the development of the region's advanced science from success.

Throughout the region, academic dishonesty has long been an issue, from students cheating to fraud by scientists.

As a reaction to rampant academic dishonesty, it is fair to point out that state education policies have begun to stress the need for preventing research misconduct. The Chinese government, for example, has stepped up efforts to build academic norms and research integrity since the 2000s, through developing standards and regulations, setting up special agencies, issuing policy papers, organizing national forums or seminars, and promoting international

cooperation. With growing awareness of such a serious issue in the region, some East Asian universities have established their own units to deal with academic fraud and corruption. While it is reasonable to expect some positive instantaneous policy impacts, when considering the width and depth of the issue in the societies, it is just not realistic to hope that the problem will be uprooted in the years to come.

Despite a few scandals, Japan distinguishes itself from its regional neighbors in academic culture. This explains why Japan has been the best performer in the region, as illustrated by its unrivalled 21 Nobel Prizes in science and technology, while other East Asian societies have had none until 2014. It is important to note that Japan's early Nobel Prizes were won when Japan was in extremely difficult conditions. Similarly, the latest and only Nobel Prize in science and technology based on work conducted in the region was awarded to a Chinese scientist in 2015. Because her work was done almost exclusively during the 1970s, when China was suffering from economic hardship and political isolation, her achievement is no outcome of China's contemporary academic culture.

As a reaction to rampant academic dishonesty, it is fair to point out that state education policies have begun to stress the need for preventing research misconduct.

Conclusion

Academic culture matters hugely. East Asia's corrupt academic culture hurts the region's higher education directly, with profound impact on everyday operations. Only Japan has achieved a good academic culture. Unfortunately, it is far beyond the scope of the higher education sector to solve these widespread, deep-rooted social problems, though the situation differs among the region's societies. The toxic academic culture is another expression of East Asia's greatest challenge: universities have not yet figured out how to combine the "standard norms" of Western higher education with traditional values. The Western concept of a university has been adopted only for its practicality. East Asian higher education development is fundamentally about the relations between Western and indigenous higher education traditions, a relationship that has rarely been managed well. ■

International Higher Education and the "Neo-liberal Turn"

Peter Scott

Peter Scott is professor of higher education studies, Institute of Education, University College London, UK. E-mail: P.Scott@ioe.ac.uk.

In its original form, international higher education, which emphasized staff and student mobility and collaboration between universities across national frontiers, was one of the most idealistic, even altruistic, aspects of higher education. The myth-ideal of the wandering scholar in the Middle Ages was reinforced by the role played by imperial universities in educating colonial (and, ultimately, post-colonial) elites and also the role played by modern higher education systems in these countries in terms of aid and capacity building as well as the continued training of elites in the developing world. Today, international education is perhaps the aspect of higher education most associated with markets and competition; its language is now dominated by talk of market shares of international students and global league tables. So complete has been this reversal of perceptions of, and practices in, international higher education, that it passes almost without comment.

The major reason for this reversal has been the impact on higher education of the so-called "neo-liberal turn," the drift away from the social markets and welfare states developed in the 20th century as a response to recession, depression, and world wars—and which, remarkably, survived the shocks of the 2008 financial crisis and subsequent global recession. In the United Kingdom, there is now a strong, if contestable, belief that the ideals of mass higher education—democracy, social justice, individual "improvement" in a still recognizable Victorian sense—are out of sync, out of sympathy, with the dominant ideas of our age: wealth generation, growth, and competitiveness. In a global setting the same has happened. The older ideals of international education—solidarity, development, mutual understanding—have been replaced by new market imperatives summed up in a much over-used word globalization.

Three Shifts

The "neo-liberal turn" has many guises, from the rigidly ideological to the flexibly pragmatic. It is a broad church composed of true believers and outwardly conforming agnostics. For some, it must be embraced by higher education as the major, or perhaps only, driver of future development; for others, it must be accommodated as an inescapable but

contingent set of circumstances. Reductionist definitions of the "neo-liberal turn," therefore, are dangerous. But three big trends stand out:

The first is the shift from the post-war "welfare state," forged in the shared memories and solidarities of world war and economic depression, to the so-called "market state." This has comprised both structural and cultural changes. The first include the retreat from high levels of personal taxation and the consequent increase in state borrowing (and the impact of that borrowing on financial markets) and the shrinking of publicly funded services. The second include the redefinition of the core purposes of the state that have seen a shift from the traditional sense of the state as embodying the public good to the idea of the state as both a "regulator" and also "customer."

The "neo-liberal turn" has many guises, from the rigidly ideological to the flexibly pragmatic.

The second aspect of the "neo-liberal turn" is globalization (actually much older and more complex than is often suggested by contemporary, over-excited accounts). It is older because "world societies" have existed in past history and also because global markets have existed for at least half a millennium. It is more complex is because the interactions between global brands and local cultures are highly nuanced and also because there are many forms of globalizations. Some of these "other" globalizations are at odds with the apparently hegemonic free-market geopolitical forms, violently so in the case of fundamentalism and terrorism (which, in turn, have legitimated the frightening contemporary phenomena of the "national security state"). One of the impacts of the discourse about globalization has been to regard not only all goods but also services as tradable "commodities." Although the debate about the incorporation of higher education within the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) accords is currently muted, it is surely only a matter of time before higher education surfaces in the debate about the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) between the United States and the European Union, and a related trans-Pacific trade treaty.

The third aspect is the revolution in communications—or, more broadly, communicative cultures. This contains many strands—the rise of social networking but also the mediatization of politics as "celebrity" and "brand"; the erosion of traditional print-based "literacies" (pessimists would go further, and lament the death of "logos"); the creation of "virtual" communities (highly beneficial in the case of science, less so in the context of cyber-sex or cyber-crime); the "hollowing-out" of traditional institutions (such as political parties or trade unions), the replacement of traditional top-down hierarchies by "flat" and "instant" linkages (courtesy of Google *et al.*).

Impact on Higher Education

As a result higher education, international and domestic, now has to operate in very different social, political, economic, and cultural environments than those taken for granted when our contemporary mass systems were first created almost half a century ago. But the impact of these new environments has been more than simply a drive to monolithic markets.

Changes in the nature of the state have certainly weakened its ability to maintain public systems of higher education. Both ideas—of the "public" and of "systems"—have been eroded; the former because it seems to imply publicly provided or funded services, and the latter because it appears to require a degree of top-down "planning" at odds with the free play of "markets." But the inexorable advance of high-fee funding regimes is far from assured, as countries as different as Chile and Germany have demonstrated by rejecting fees. In addition, the power of the state over higher education has reemerged in the form of more intrusive regulation.

Globalization has multiple and ambiguous impacts. It has produced great opportunities—for example, in terms of cross-cultural learning or transnational education. But it has created new barriers—most notably, in the context of immigration controls. Although free-market globalization is currently its dominant form, other forms exist—actual and potential. New globalizations of resistance to the "neo-liberal" turn or of solidarity built round environmental, equity and ethical concerns are already emerging.

Finally, changes in communicative cultures have radically shaped student expectations and their patterns of learning—as well as problematized the traditional structures of higher education. At present our understanding of this transformation is dominated by Massive Online Open Courses (MOOCs) and the power of IT-powered diagnostics and analytics to fine-tune higher education to "satisfy" student-customer needs; the mechanics of e-learning and e-assessment; and worries about Twitter-ish triviality. But there are other aspects of the communications revolution—for example, open-source and "instant" publication, the potential for global research alliances or for more intense engagement with "user" communities—with more collectivist than commercial implications. ■

The United Nations, International Higher Education, and Knowledge Diplomacy

Nanette Svenson

Nanette Svenson is an adjunct professor at Tulane University and consultant for the United Nations and other international organizations. More on the UN, higher education and training appears in her book, The United Nations as a Knowledge System. *E-mail: nanette.svenson@gmail.com.*

The term "knowledge diplomacy" has been used with increasing frequency in recent years to describe many things, including how international higher education (IHE) can become an instrument of soft power and a tool through which smaller nations may position themselves to negotiate beyond the parameters of their traditional power base. As the quintessential agent of world diplomacy, the United Nations (UN) should be included in these discussions as they relate to knowledge—even with regard to IHE, though this is not an area typically associated with the UN. Motivated by the furthering of social learning, center-periphery knowledge transfer, research generation and improved public relations, the UN has begun to engage in IHE programming. This article examines the nature of this activity and offers commentary on which aspects of it hold more potential for advancing the goals of the UN and its members.

University Degree Programming

Much of UN international higher education involvement revolves around university level training and degree granting. The UN has established a number of programs and schools through partnerships with other academic and professional organizations. Their purpose has been to bridge gaps between theory and practice in key areas of global governance and development, and to complement national academic institutions' programming.

The United Nations University (UNU) was established in 1972 as a global think tank and postgraduate teaching organization. Headquartered in Tokyo and endowed by the Japanese government, UNU has 16 partner institutes and programs in different countries, that concentrate on issues related to peace and security, human rights, governance, science and technology, and sustainable development. Most UNU work focuses on partner institution research, though in 2012 the university also began to grant Master's degrees. The University for Peace in Costa Rica, founded by the UN General Assembly in 1980, grants graduate degrees in disciplines related to peace and security and engages in non-degree programs and research, often collaborating with international partners. The World Maritime University (WMU) is a postgraduate maritime institute in Sweden, founded in 1983 by the International Maritime Organization (IMO), another UN specialized agency. WMU emerged in response to a global shortage of qualified maritime experts, especially in developing nations, and provides various Master's degrees and professional certifications. The IMO also founded the International Maritime Law Institute (IMLI) in Malta in 1988 to train international maritime law specialists. IMLI offers graduate degrees, maritime diplomas and various short courses. Similarly, the International Labor Organization International Training Center established the Turin School of Development (TSD) in 2009 to introduce a series of postgraduate programs and courses on international labor legislation and development. TSD is the result of a partnership with the University of Turin, several other schools, and various UN agencies.

Much of UN international higher education involvement revolves around university level training and degree granting.

All these UN university programs have pursued local and international accreditation, attracted multinational faculty and students, and created new degree programs linked to UN knowledge and objectives. Collectively over the past three decades they claim thousands of graduates from countries all over the world and host a range of international conferences, research projects, and academic publications.

Non-degree Programs

Beyond its university degree granting and research, the UN has pioneered other IHE initiatives that support shorter-term activities and facilitate partnerships between IHE institutions globally. Included in this type of endeavor are the UN Academic Impact (UNAI), Model UN (MUN), and UN internship programs, as well as UN sponsored faculty chairs and curriculum-building projects.

UNAI, launched in 2010, aims to link universities more closely with the UN, promote UN objectives, and create a global university network for peace and development. Nearly 1,000 schools worldwide have joined, agreeing to create new programs aligned with UN principles related to education, global citizenship, sustainable development, and conflict resolution. Examples of these include the Ukraine's national university pre-school for underprivi-

leged children and Cornell University's recently launched International Architecture and Rural Development major. Almost as old as the UN itself, MUN is a UN-supported, externally managed educational simulation of UN experience and academic competition for university and high school students. MUN teaches UN principles and protocol, develops research and debate skills, and broadens participant knowledge on diplomacy, international law, and global politics. MUN conferences with thousands of participants are held annually throughout the world. UN internships, available through the UN Secretariat, specialized agencies and regional centers for graduate students with majors related to UN topics, are another component of UN IHE programming. Students offer unpaid labor in exchange for work experience and academic credit within a branch of the UN. UNAI, MUN, and the UN internship programs all seek to educate university students on UN activity, objectives, and careers, ideally fostering more socially responsible youth.

Other UN IHE non-degree programs include collaborative faculty exchange and curriculum development. The UNESCO university twinning and networking scheme, for instance, promotes a series of faculty chair positions and networking communities within universities around the world. This program involves 650 institutions in over 120 countries and drives higher education and research capacity building through sponsorship of exchange opportunities in areas related to UNESCO fieldwork—education, sciences, culture, and communication. Additionally, several other UN agencies with expertise, information, and educational experience in particular areas are beginning to partner with universities on projects that broaden curricula. Examples include the International Anti-Corruption Academy (IACA—a UN Office on Drugs and Crime-INTERPOL project that offers a broad professional training curriculum and executive graduate course in Anti-Corruption Studies) and the UN Food and Agriculture Organization's guides for food security, statistical analysis, and online curriculum development. These capacity development services have been widely accessed by developing country institutions.

Knowledge Diplomacy Potential

UN international higher education knowledge diplomacy activity spans a broad mix of programming and is still relatively new. Nevertheless, regarding its potential for advancing UN and member state ideals and goals, several observations can be made. The UN does not have higher education delivery in its mandate or experience base; therefore, any UN university program is dependent on host government endowments and external resources. This is expensive and sometimes unsustainable. Also, the UN's degrees are not yet prominently recognized and its university-oriented research is not its most widely disseminated and utilized product, which raises questions of cost-benefit justifiability.

UN IHE endeavors yield most when tied to projects and issues immediately relevant to national economies, academic institutions, and professionals rather than to UN-generated agendas. Thus, the non-degree granting UN brokering of IHE professional and information exchange seems a more natural and cost effective fit. Countries on both sides of the equation have embraced UN provision of funding, networking, information, documentation, and publication for IHE exchange and there is significant room for expansion of these activities. That UN information, experience and infrastructure can be beneficial to international higher education programs is certain; less clear is how the UN can best package and market these resources for optimal impact. ■

The Changing Landscape of International Education Research

Douglas Proctor

Douglas Proctor is a PhD candidate in International Higher Education at the University of Melbourne, Australia. E-mail: douglas.proctor@ieaa.org.au. *A full report presenting analysis of 2011–2013 data from the IDP Database of Research on International Education, and an infographic presenting key 2011–2014 trends, are available on the International Education Research Network web site at www.ieaa.org.au/iern.*

Given the uneven landscape of higher education around the world, it is not surprising that research on international higher education has its own topography. It is concerning, however, that large areas of the research terrain in international education have yet to be charted.

A recent analysis of data from the IDP Australia Database of Research on International Education has shown that research on international education is predominantly focused on the Anglophone world—with over 53 percent of all research published between 2011 and 2013, looking at English-speaking countries. Similarly, research on international education is strongly associated with the higher/postsecondary education sector, despite the multisector nature of international education itself. Students are also the predominant focus of this research, rather than the faculty who teach them, the industry and business sectors that subsequently employ them, or the broader internationalization agendas of their institutions.

Mirroring the findings of the third global inventory of higher education research centers/institutes and academic programs—published by the Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) in 2014, this analysis from the IDP Database of Research on International Education points to a concentration of international education research on a small number of countries and on a narrow range of topics. As such, just like the skewed global landscape of higher education, it appears that the landscape of international education research is neither flat nor fully explored.

Data Collection

This analysis is informed by data held in the IDP Database of Research on International Education, which contains details of more than 13,300 books, articles, conference papers, and reports on various aspects of international education from around the world. As part of a recent project undertaken by the International Education Association of Australia under the banner of its International Education Research Network initiative, detailed analysis was undertaken of the 2,511 database records relating to research that had been published in 2011, 2012, and 2013.

Given the uneven landscape of higher education around the world, it is not surprising that research on international higher education has its own topography.

Naturally, certain caveats apply to this analysis. Given its Australian origins and sponsorship, the coverage of Australian material in the Database of Research on International Education is comparatively strong. However, the database has always referenced research published in other countries, and the capture of non-Australian research has increased steadily overtime. That being said, at this time only English-language materials are referenced.

The following findings are based on a detailed analysis of database records, including keywords or phrases, country of focus, research method, and publication type. Unless otherwise specified, data are presented in aggregate across the three years.

Key Findings

About 3,831 separate keywords are recorded for research published in 2011, 2012, and 2013—with an average of 7.3 keywords attributed per record. Although 63 percent of these keywords are only used once or twice, an analysis of the most-common keywords points to hot topics in international education research and shifting trends in research focus overtime. As such, based on the 21 keywords/phrases that are deployed over 200 times, the principal focus of this research has been on international students in higher and postsecondary education, with a secondary focus on internationalization and study abroad/student mobility (for domestic students). Year-on-year trends show continued growth in the use of these particular keywords, while other leading keywords (such as "educational markets" and "cultural differences") are in marked decline. Other leading keywords showing steady usage overtime include "educational policy," "student attitudes," "globalization," and "student experience."

In terms of geographic focus, each record in the database identifies (where relevant) the country or region that is the subject of the research. This does not necessarily match the location of the researcher(s), although there is a strong correlation between the two. Over the three years in question, 142 separate countries/regions are listed. Of these, 35 percent only feature once, while the six most popular countries/regions (Australia, the United States, the United Kingdom, China, Europe, and Canada) are listed over 100 times each. Analysis of year-on-year trends for these six countries/regions points to an increasing focus on the United States and the United Kingdom, with a corresponding drop for Australia. No doubt, this partially relates to the growing inclusion of non-Australian research in the database. Trends relating to China, Europe, and Canada are generally flat.

From a regional perspective, 23.9 percent of all research is focused on Asia or on an Asian country, second only to Oceania with 28.2 percent. Europe (21.2%) and North America (16.8%) follow closely behind, while other continents feature very little. Just under 10 percent of all international education research is centered on Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and the Caribbean.

In terms of research method, international education research is undertaken in both qualitative and quantitative paradigms. Case studies and interviews are particularly popular methods (with 20.6% and 17.6% of all records respectively); however, when combined, a range of quantitative methods—including surveys, student surveys, questionnaires, and statistical analysis—make up 26.5 percent of all research methods. Year-on-year trends nevertheless indicate that quantitative methods have become less popular overtime, as have interviews, with a strong surge in the use of case studies and comparative analysis between 2012

and 2013.

In relation to a publication type, the publication of choice for international education research is the journal article, with 49.3 percent of all publications. Book chapters (16.3%) and research reports (15.1%) are the next most popular avenues for publication. Journal articles have shown continued growth year-on-year—to the detriment of other publication types, for which trends are flat or in decline.

Given its interdisciplinary nature, international education research can be found in a very wide range of publications—420 separate journals and 199 separate publishers of research reports feature in the 2011–2013 data. The leading journals in this field, however, are the *Journal of Studies in International Education,* the *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, and Higher Education,* as well as *International Higher Education* (Boston College CIHE) and NAFSA's *International Educator* magazine. With six books to its credit, the Institute of International Education is the most prolific publisher, while the British Council, the Institute of International Education, and various Australian government departments have published the greatest numbers of research reports.

Conclusion

Just as it is a complex endeavor to gather comparative international data on higher education research centers and programs, it is equally hard to gain an accurate picture of research on international education. Although analysis of data from the IDP Database of Research on International Education is a useful starting point, a range of caveats exist in relation to the quality and rigor of the data.

Yet, this analysis provides an indication of the scale of international education research in recent years and has allowed conclusions to be drawn on trends in research topic, method, and publication type. The findings point to an uneven landscape for international education research. While the future contours of this terrain remain to be mapped, subsequent analysis incorporating 2014 data should help to identify changing trends in the landscape of international education research. ■

The Many Traditions of Liberal Arts—and Their Global Relevance

Philip G. Altbach

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and founding director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu.

The liberal arts are seeing a modest revival globally. In the struggle between specialization on the one hand and general or liberal education on the other, specialization has mostly won. In much of the world, higher education study is organized to prepare people for the workforce and most often for specific professions. Further, highly specialized curricula predominate in many countries—a student enters a particular faculty and nearly all of the classes are oriented toward a specific discipline, leading to graduation with specialized knowledge in that field. A few countries, such as the United States, have maintained some commitment to the idea of education for broader knowledge and intellectual competencies—the underlying concept of liberal education.

Yet, quite surprisingly, the idea of liberal education has taken on new salience in the global higher education debate. This has occurred for several reasons. There is increasing recognition that both the labor force and educated individuals require "soft skills" as well as vocationally relevant content-based knowledge. These include the ability to think critically, communicate effectively and efficiently, synthesize information from various academic and cultural perspectives, and analyze complex qualitative and quantitative concepts, among others. Further, the 21st century economy no longer ensures a fixed career path. University graduates face a diverse, complex, and volatile job market. The specialized curriculum is no longer adequate to prepare people for the new knowledge economy requires capacity to innovate and there is growing consensus that this capacity requires broader range of knowledge that crosses disciplinary boundaries—perhaps a revival of the idea underlying the European medieval universities.

So far, the modest global resurgence of liberal arts education is largely but not exclusively concentrated in the elite sector of higher education, although with considerable variation among institutions.

Liberal Education

There is no universally accepted definition of liberal education. Most think of it in terms of an approach to knowledge as well as in more detailed curricular terms. Liberal

education is typically traced to Western traditions—such as Socrates' belief in the value of "the examined life," and Aristotle's emphasis on "reflective citizenship." But as discussed here, there are important non-Western roots of liberal education as well. Contemporary advocates focus on the value of critical thinking, and a broad knowledge of key scientific and humanistic fields as requirements to understand the complexities of post-industrial society. Most broadly, liberal education is contrasted to the more narrowly vocationally-oriented approach to higher education that has come to dominate much of thinking in the 21st century. Advocates argue that education is much more than "workforce preparation"—and that contemporary society demands a broader and more thoughtful approach to post-secondary education.

Non-Western Liberal Arts Traditions

Perhaps the earliest example of an education philosophy akin to contemporary liberal education comes from China, where the Confucian tradition emphasized a general education with a broad approach to knowledge acquisition. Two key Chinese education traditions, the Confucian *Analects*, dating back 2,500 years, and traditional Chinese higher education that dates back to the Eastern Zhou dynasty (771-221 BCE) have elements of what might be called liberal education. The Five Classics, as they were known then, were featured books that covered many "fields of knowledge." At the same time, Confucian higher education prepared students to take the imperial examinations for the civil service—examinations that included some general knowledge. Thus, the Chinese higher education tradition emphasized a broad interpretation of the meaning of knowledge, while adhering to the Confucian ethical and philosophical tradition.

While rarely considered, there are some similarities in approaches to the philosophy of education found in Western antiquity and in Confucian ideas. Confucius believed that humans were inherently good and thus the purpose of education was "to cultivate and develop human nature so that virtue and wisdom and, ultimately, moral perfection would be attained." While institutional structures, curriculum, and the purpose of higher education no doubt differed from the contemporary understanding of liberal education, an argument can be made that a commitment to developing students with aptitude that reflected a broad array of knowledge areas links the Chinese higher education to modern ideas about liberal education.

It is also significant that today's *gao kao* national university entrance examination is a successor to the imperial civil service examinations. While the *gao kao*, much criticized yet still the norm in China, is hardly compatible with current concepts of liberal education; it, like its imperial predecessor, requires the student to have a broad knowledge base.

In a different context and with very different intellectual roots, Nalanda University, flourished in northeastern India for almost a millennium until 1197 CE. Reflecting both the Hindu and Buddhist traditions, Nalanada hosted lectures by the Buddha, and at its height had more than 10,000 students and 1,500 professors. While the curriculum focused primarily on religious texts, broader knowledge was also taught and the university welcomed students and scholars from many intellectual traditions. Buddhist philosophy defined education as a means of "self-realization" and a process of "drawing out what is implicit in the individual" by gaining knowledge that would free a person from "ignorance and attachment." Like the Confucian tradition, Nalanda is another example of a philosophy with a specific focus—in this case on religious knowledge—but with understanding belief that meaningful education also requires broader disciplinary perspective.

Yet, quite surprisingly, the idea of liberal education has taken on new salience in the global higher education debate.

The oldest continuously operating university in the world is the Al-Azhar University in Cairo, Egypt. Established in 975 CE, the university has been among the most important centers for Islamic thought since its founding. From the beginning, Al-Azhar not only focused on Islamic theology and Sharia law, but also on philosophy, mathematics, and astronomy as they related to Islam. In the 1870s, the university added science faculties as well. At other post-secondary institutions in much of the Islamic world, the curriculum was based on Islamic concerns but often included other subjects in the sciences and arts—recognizing that comprehensive knowledge was necessary for an educated person, reflecting a unified philosophy of education.

As illustrated here, in many classical non-European higher education traditions, institutions and educators were committed to a curriculum that included a wide range of disciplines and knowledge. While the foci, organization, and specific requirements of the curriculum varied significantly, these traditions illustrated a commitment to understanding reality from a range of intellectual traditions.

Conclusion

In the contemporary, and so far modest, reconsideration of the liberal arts globally, rich, non-Western traditions have been largely ignored, even while the debate is taking place

in Asia. The current motivations to reconsider higher education curriculum are related to 21st concerns and the need to respond to the needs of the labor market, but the underlying verities of liberal education remain as valid now as they did in the time of Confucius, the Buddha, and Islamic sages. ■

Neo-Nationalism: Challenges for International Students

Jenny J. Lee

Jenny J. Lee is professor of higher education at the University of Arizona, US. E-mail: Jennylee@arizona.edu.

There are more students studying outside their borders than ever before, with numbers doubling over the past decade, and forecasts that these numbers will rise even more rapidly in the years to come. Yet, with the rise of international demand, come added challenges for universities seeking to become more globally adaptive to their internationally diverse students. While some cultural adjustment is to be anticipated, what international students might be less prepared for are difficulties that are attributable less to any shortcomings of the student, but to the shortcomings of the home environment. Despite institutional leaders' best efforts, members of the university and local community might not be prepared or willing to welcome those perceived as outsiders. Resistance against international students has been well documented in various media outlets, in the form of discriminatory acts, from subtle stereotyping to physical attacks.

Although most international students have a very positive experience studying abroad, there are others who suffer silently. Based on some recent survey research of international students across seven universities in South Africa, when asked to whom they would report if they encountered unfair treatment, 32 percent indicated that they would not report to anyone.

Rise in Regional Mobility

With the rise in global mobility, there has been a rise in regional mobility as well. International study within one's region is occurring most notably within the European Union, but regional study is also taking place in East Asia, Latin America, Southern Africa, and other parts of the world. Due to regional cooperation agreements, improved university quality, and increased cross-border travel, there has been an emergence of regional hubs that are attracting increasing numbers of students seeking an international degree, but desiring to stay closer to home. With this phenomenon, one might suppose there would be fewer discriminatory concerns for those maybe appearing less like "foreigners" abroad. Challenges such as language barriers, homesickness, and cultural adaptation might be assumed to be less troubling for those from neighboring countries than those from more distant regions. However, this is not the case.

Neo-nationalism

In the United States, international students from non-Western and developing countries tended to report more unfair treatment and hostility than students from Europe, Canada, and Australia, which I describe as forms of neo-racism. Neo-racism is discrimination not solely based on biological differences, but also includes differences in culture in this postcolonial era. Neo-racism would help to explain why students from China, for example, might encounter a very different set of troubles in the United States, in comparison to Chinese American students. Neo-racism, however, would not aptly apply to international students being discriminated against within their region. As such, my latest research has uncovered a new form of discrimination that has less to do with one's race and more to do with one's nationality. Whereas nationalism refers to identification with one's nation, neo-nationalism, like neo-racism, extends this concept to the new global economy. Simply put, neo-nationalism is defined as discrimination based on national identity. With increasing internationalization, national identity is being reintroduced and reconceptualized as forms of global competition. That is, neo-nationalism has the potential to negatively impact an international student's experience, particularly in studying in one's region. Negative treatment might occur even despite sharing the same race as the majority culture, and may even result in worse treatment compared to a student from a different race and geographical region.

Cases of South Korea and South Africa

South Korea and South Africa are two emerging market countries that have both experienced major increases in immigration, including from international students. These countries play significant roles as regional hubs, providing international higher education to nearby countries. Among both overall migrants and cross-border students, the major source of these populations comes from shared borders. Meanwhile, both South Korea and South Africa, much like the major global destinations of the West, have also been subject to negative reports of hostile treatment targeted against unwanted "foreigners."

South Korea hosts approximately 86,000 international students and attracts most of this population from China (69%). In a comparison between students from different regions, East Asian students reported greater difficulties and unfair treatment compared to students from Europe, North America, and even other parts of Asia. Chinese students in particular reported feeling less welcomed compared to those from other countries, including other East Asian countries. A Chinese student explained, "Korean students tend to socialize well with students from Western countries and also not bad with Japanese students. But they don't do so with, particularly, Chinese students." Such experiences were explained as based on negative stereotypes about China, and were manifest in a range of discriminatory acts. Common examples included the following: "I made my best effort to search jobs but I was rejected since I was foreigner. Actually, managers didn't recognize it while we were speaking, but I told them honestly since I thought I should not be embarrassed of being Chinese. Then, soon they rejected me." Another student said, "The dorm mother said she never accepted Chinese to live here, since they were dirty and noisy." Such accounts cannot be explained as discrimination by race, but based on national origins.

Resistance against international students has been well documented in various media outlets, in the form of discriminatory acts, from subtle stereotyping to physical attacks.

Such discrimination based on nationality, despite sharing the same race, is not isolated to East Asia. In the case of South Africa, the majority of its approximately 73,000 international students are from Southern Africa (74%), with the largest group from its border country, Zimbabwe (27%). As in South Korea, international students in South Africa reported mistreatment on the basis of nationality. A student explained, "Zimbabweans are treated badly because of our political and economic challenges." Another African student shared, "People seem to be uncomfortable with my being Nigerian." Accommodation is a common problem for international students; as one Zambian student reported, "We as foreigners are usually treated with contempt by South Africans. When it comes to accommodation, we are treated unfairly. We would be charged twice the amount that South African citizens pay." In comparison to other international students, a student from Malawi explained, "Home students are more welcoming to students outside Africa than to those from within Africa... home students do not associate with African international students. However they are always friendly to those coming from overseas."

Complex Challenges Ahead

Although the dominant hosts in the West continue to grapple with successfully integrating international with local students, similar challenges exist for regional hosts, despite educating a majority of culturally similar international students. While neo-racism might be observed in major Western destinations, such as the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia, neo-nationalism might also be at play, particularly in emerging economies that serve as educational destinations within the region, such as South Korea and South Africa. As some recent research has revealed, the difficulties that international students encounter are global. Even so, neo-racism and neo-nationalism are two different but powerful challenges in this increasingly complex global society. ■

Challenges of Student Mobility in Southeast Asia

Thu T. Do and Duy N. Pham

Thu T. Do is a doctoral student in higher education administration, Saint Louis University. E-mail: tdo10@slu.edu. Duy N. Pham is a doctoral student in research, educational measurement and psychometrics, University of Massachusetts-Amherst. E-mail: dpham@umass.edu.

Influenced by globalization in the beginning of the 21st century, Southeast Asia has experienced a remarkable development of student mobility: The number of Southeast Asian students studying abroad is increasing significantly, and the number of international students in Southeast Asia is gradually increasing. While the benefits of student mobility programs are clear, Southeast Asian countries face several challenges when trying to develop them further.

Recent Developments

Southeast Asian countries rank among the top 25 countries of origin for international students studying in the United States, including Vietnam (8), Indonesia (19), Thailand (20), and Malaysia (24). By 2011, these four countries, plus

the Philippines, accounted for 214,000 students primarily studying in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia. The increase in student mobility also results from international cooperative education programs via franchising and twinning agreements, and branch campuses between Southeast Asian countries and foreign higher education institutions. There are currently 25 branch campuses in Southeast Asia: 1 in Indonesia, 6 in Malaysia, 13 in Singapore, 3 in Thailand, and 2 in Vietnam.

Southeast Asia is not only sending its students abroad, but it has also developed national academic systems to attract foreign students. Owing to their ambition to use English as a medium of instruction in higher education, and to relatively low tuition fees and living costs, Southeast Asian countries have gained momentum in the global student market competition. Leading countries such as Singapore and Malaysia have aimed to become regional education hubs; they have become education exporters. According to the *Guardian*, Singapore welcomed 52,959 international students from 120 countries in 2014. Similarly, Malaysia had 63,625 international students from 160 nations. Singapore and Malaysia ranked among the top 20 destination countries for international students. The majority of international students studying in Southeast Asia are from Southeast Asia, South Korea, China, and India.

The flow of international students from Western countries to Southeast Asia, though small (approximately 5,000), has also gradually increased in the last few years. These students are primarily American, Australian, and British, and are coming to emerging and developed Southeast Asian countries such as Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand. In addition, Southeast Asia has also experienced an influx of international students from Middle Eastern countries, including the United Arab Emirates, Oman, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, and Lebanon. In the wake of the events of September 11, 2001, the United States adopted a more restrictive visa policy toward applicants from Middle Eastern countries. Consequently, the flow from some Islamic countries into Southeast Asia has gradually increased. Iran accounted for 21.44 percent of more than 61,000 international students in the Philippines in 2012. In Malaysia, recruiters have widened their market search for international students, targeting countries in the Middle East.

Challenges

The above-mentioned growth of student mobility is a proof of the success of governments and higher education institutions in these countries on the internationalized higher education market. However, Southeast Asian countries encounter challenges that hinder them from reaping advantages, and from continuing to develop transnational education programs.

Periphery. The peripheral status of Southeast Asia in knowledge production is the most significant challenge, and is considered the root of other challenges. In fact, not many Southeast Asian countries have been primary producers of new scientific knowledge and cutting-edge technologies. Among the list of top 500 research universities listed by the Academic Ranking of World Universities, only two Southeast Asian universities—both from Singapore—have ever appeared on the list. Since the ranking focuses on research productivity and prestigious awards for outstanding research, this fact reveals that higher education institutions in Southeast Asia are remarkably peripheral in expanding the borders of knowledge and contributing to knowledge production.

Southeast Asian countries rank among the top 25 countries of origin for international students studying in the United States

The peripheral standing of higher education institutions in Southeast Asia also makes the institutions of the region less attractive for study abroad. For example, Southeast Asian students are less likely to go to other Southeast Asian countries for a degree or even an exchange program. Instead of selecting higher education institutions within the region, many wealthy families from Vietnam, Malaysia, and Indonesia attempt to send their children to English-speaking institutions outside the region for an international degree. This is a problem for institutions in Southeast Asia, since they tend to lose the best or the richest students to foreign institutions.

Brain-drain. In the last few decades, statistics show that most students move from East to West and from non-English-speaking countries to English-speaking countries. Also, many successful professors and academic staff currently working in the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, or Japan are coming from Southeast Asia. This is brain drain, and though the issue of brain drain varies among Southeast Asian countries, it poses a real challenge for them. The more developed countries in the region, such as Singapore, tend not to lose their best and brightest to Japan or Western countries. However, for other countries of lower academic quality, the fact that most of their bright students and outstanding academics go to study or work at foreign institutions represents a loss of human and financial resources to create and develop their own reputable universities. The majority of intelligent students and pro-

ductive academics from Vietnam are studying or working outside their home country. For instance, nearly 100 percent of the brightest high school graduates from the best high schools in Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City go abroad for undergraduate education. Similarly, most of the Vietnamese students who achieved medals in the International Mathematical Olympiads are working as academics in developed countries.

English as a Language Barrier. The fact that English is not the official language of instruction and publication in many countries in the region is another obstacle to attracting international students and to participating in the broader scientific community. With the exception of Singapore, the Philippines, and Thailand, most universities in the region offer very few courses in English. This is one reason why few international students come to those institutions for exchange programs, let alone a degree. If the effort to provide more courses in English at an acceptable cost is not successful, it is foreseeable that universities where English is not a language of instruction will not become attractive places for a large pool of international students.

It is crucial that the countries of Southeast Asia recognize the challenges described in this article. Clearly, they should frame higher education policies in order to overcome the challenges to reduce negative impacts and improve quality and educational effectiveness. This is a way to improve their level of higher education and increase their contributions to social development. ■

France Debates International Student Fees

Ariane de Gayardon

Ariane de Gayardon is a PhD candidate in Higher Education at Boston College. She is also a graduate research assistant at the Center for International Higher Education. E-mail: ariane.de.gayardon@gmail.com.

With 4 million students studying abroad in 2012, student mobility has become one of the most prominent features of the internationalization of higher education. But host countries receiving an ever-increasing number of international students are starting to think over their funding strategy. In an age of global austerity, it is legitimate to question whether international students' education should be as subsidized as domestic students' education.

This question was under scrutiny in France during the first half of 2015, as a report by France Stratégie—a think tank working for the prime minister—suggested the introduction of international tuition fees. France is not the first country to face this debate and will not be the last, but it takes special significance in the third most attractive country in the world and in a country where half the international students come from Africa.

Welfare States

European welfare states have proven particularly vulnerable to the debate around the financing of higher education for non-domestic students, as they subsidize heavily higher education, which is conceived as a right. In a time of financial hardship for higher education globally, the welfare states are questioning whether they should continue to accept international students under these lenient financial conditions. The fact that such debates have been omnipresent in the Nordic countries, the archetypes of welfare states, in the past decade shows how prevalent this question has become. Denmark and Sweden now charge tuition fees to international students, and Finland will likely start doing so in 2016 despite mixed reviews of the trial period and resistance from student unions.

The State of French Higher Education

France is without doubt a welfare state, with a very low-tuition higher education system. In 2014–2015, the tuition fees were at about US$210 annually for undergraduate students—domestic or foreign. Indeed, according to OECD, the French government was funding 80.8 percent of public higher education expenditures in 2011. It was estimated that the government funding of tertiary education exceeded US$12,500 per student per year, up from US$7,700 in the 1980s. This trend parallels a continuous increase in the number of students. It is in this context, unsurprisingly, that the question of who should be subsidized arose.

In 2015, a report entitled Investing in the Internationalization of Higher Education was published by the French Prime Minister's think tank. It suggested the introduction of tuition fees covering the full cost of higher education for international students. The fund thus saved would be used to foster the internationalization of universities. But the French context includes specificities that make this debate particularly compelling.

Attractive to Whom?

France is a unique country because of the position it holds as a host country for mobile students. It was ranked the third most attractive country by UNESCO in 2012, drawing as much as 7 percent of the 4 million international students.

Interestingly, the ranking is dominated by countries that charge international students high tuition fees—including the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia.

The issue of international student fees in France sparked acute debate at least in part because of the origin of its students. Nearly half of the international students studying in France come from Africa, a heritage from France's colonial past. Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Senegal, and Cameroon are in the top 10 countries of origin. It is very unlikely that these students can afford more than US$12,500 of tuition fees. Actually, in the present circumstances—i.e., with very low tuition—82 percent of international students in France declared in a survey that studying in France constitutes a financial strain for them and their families. In these conditions, it is impossible to contemplate such an increase in tuition fee without considering the consequences for these students who want and need to get access to a good higher education system. Additionally, the question of the public good needs to be raised, as France is currently helping countries that are in less fortunate economic conditions, by providing them with the skilled labor that is essential in today's economy.

This question was under scrutiny in France during the first half of 2015, as a report by France Stratégie—a think tank working for the prime minister—suggested the introduction of international tuition fees.

From France's point of view, however, the trade-off is in the quantity and diversity of international students in the system. There is no question that an increase in international tuition fees would have an impact on the number of mobile students coming to France. The 2015 report forecasts a 40 percent decrease, a number that will be hard to gain back. Replacing the international students that will be put off by tuition fees would indeed be extremely difficult, as France does not have the capacity to attract the students that can and are ready to pay—especially when one considers the language barrier and the competition of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia among others.

Last but not least, this question needs to be properly examined economically. In 2014, economic benefits from the presence of international students in France were estimated at nearly US$5 billion with a positive balance of US$1.6 billion once the cost of tuition was removed. This far exceeds the US$930 million the 2015 report estimates would be saved from moving to full cost tuition fees. The economic benefits of having international students participate in the economy might very well be worth the investment in their education.

Conclusion

In July 2015, the French government put an end to the debate about international tuition fees by stating that international students will continue to pay the same tuition fees as domestic and European ones. But the debate itself opened the door to the possibility of establishing higher tuition fees for international students in the future. Finland, for instance, resisted the trend for a few years but is now set to introduce such fees in September 2016. When the debate resurfaces, France will once again need to consider the role of international students in the system, but also its role as a developed nation in educating foreign students. Therefore, the debate should not stop at mere economic arguments, but also focus on the diversity in the system, the global and national public good, and even foreign affairs. ■

UK Teaching Quality Under the Microscope: What are the Drivers?

Robin Middlehurst

Robin Middlehurst is external policy adviser and professor at Kingston University London, UK. E-mail: r.middlehurst@kingston.ac.uk.

The UK higher education system is typically rated highly in relation to the quality of teaching, according to different metrics. In the 2015 national *Guardian* league table, for example, student satisfaction with teaching across 119 institutions responding to the survey ranged from 77.6 percent to 93.3 percent, while in the most recent National Student Survey (2015), the range of overall student satisfaction across 156 responding institutions was between 74 percent and 98 percent. National performance indicators also demonstrate that the United Kingdom (overall) is facilitating access to higher education for under-represented groups, is focusing on supporting student progression and educational attainment, and has strong success in the employment of its graduates.

For decades the United Kingdom has had strong external quality review mechanisms that focus on teaching, learning, assessment, and curriculum design—at program level through professional, statutory, and regulatory bodies—and at institutional level through the Quality Assurance Agency. Internal and external quality assurance is supported by a comprehensive "UK Quality Code for Higher Education." In addition, the United Kingdom is a pioneer in developing a "National Professional Standards Framework" (UKPSF) for teaching, learning, and assessment in higher education. Individuals who complete programs accredited against the UKPSF can become "Fellows" of the national Higher Education Academy, the United Kingdom's national agency for quality enhancement. There are now more than 60,000 HEA Fellows, including a number from overseas.

New Initiatives on "Teaching Excellence" in England

Nonetheless, three significant initiatives are underway to focus even more attention on the quality of teaching and learning, and its assessment and measurement. These include: the Funding Bodies Quality Assessment Review (2014–2015) which proposed a fundamental shake-up of internal and external approaches to quality assessment; a "Teaching Excellence Framework" announced by the new Minister in London and outlined in a "Green Paper" published on 6.11.15; and a Parliamentary Inquiry just beginning into both these proposals and their potential impact on the system. These developments are producing a torrent of debate in the UK, while doubtless prompting quizzical looks from observers abroad. So what are the drivers?

There is certainly no obvious "burning platform" in relation to teaching quality in the United Kingdom, rather the reverse. All institutions are focusing ever more attention on teaching, learning, and the quality of students' educational experiences. While precise drivers of change are difficult to capture in a fluid political context, three sets of national drivers offer a possible rationale for UK developments. Some have wider international resonance.

A Political Perspective

The first driver is political, focused on England. For the last decade, and under governments of different political persuasions, English higher education has been deregulated, with new private providers gaining degree-awarding powers, university title and access to student loan funding. Tuition fees have been introduced and raised, with OECD statistics highlighting the shift from largely public to increasingly private funding of the system, particularly in relation to non-STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths') subjects. At the same time, research funding has been concentrated in fewer institutions; and ring-fenced at a time of cuts in the teaching budget. Conservative Ministers in the last and present governments have raised two sets of concerns about what may be happening in higher education (as a consequence of these government policies). The first concern is about value-for-money linked to the new fees and fee-levels; fees are paid up-front by government and re-paid later by graduates. The second is about the priority and prestige linked to research, potentially at the expense of teaching, particularly when viewed against the incentives driving the Research Excellence Framework. The new higher education Minister in England has announced that a "Teaching Excellence Framework" should rebalance research and teaching priorities and incentives.

An Economic Perspective

The second driver is economic, still with a focus on England but with wider resonance. The new government, elected in May 2015, has pledged to continue the austerity policy begun in response to the global economic crisis of 2007–2008. Changes in funding described above are part of this context, with more radical cuts likely soon. To achieve deeper cuts and to meet other policy objectives including further marketization, the government is seeking to change the regulatory architecture of the system in potentially radical ways. Alternative providers have been lobbying hard both for access to student loans and for a "level-playing field" in relation to regulation. On the other hand, "traditional" universities have lobbied for a reduction in external scrutiny, on the grounds of cost, burden, and proven quality, favoring a move to a "risk-based" quality assurance system. Within the scope of the funding bodies' review of quality assessment, the US regional accreditation system and the new Australian risk-based quality standards have been closely examined as potential models for the United Kingdom.

A Social Perspective

The third driver offers a social perspective in a UK-wide context, but with wider international resonance. The UK higher education system is now a diverse, mass system with steadily increasing levels of participation. However, while progress is being made and monitored nationally, it is not yet an equal system in retention, progression, and success for all students or in terms of social mobility. Disadvantaged students include those from lower socioeconomic groups, black and minority ethnic students and students with disabilities. As more data on these target groups of students are collected and analysed, the cross-institutional picture becomes clearer; it is also possible to identify institutions that are using data systematically to improve student outcomes and those that are not. A wider use of metrics to assess quality and teaching excellence is proposed in all the

current reviews.

There are of course other drivers of importance to institutions and government such as promoting innovation in teaching and sustaining international competitiveness in recruiting international students. However, the political, economic, and social drivers outlined are those in the forefront of debate. Unsurprisingly, there are strong echoes of these issues in other countries, including the extensive critiques and debates surrounding US accreditation. ■

Higher Education in Kosovo: A Prolonged Transition

XHAVIT REXHAJ

Xhavit Rexhaj is vice-rector for International Cooperation, AAB University, Pristina, Kosovo. E-mail: xhavit.rexhaj@aab-edu.net. This article appeared in a different format in Stepping Into a New Era, *edited by A. Glass (European Association for International Education,* 2014 Conference Conversation Starter*).*

Together with the Kosovar society, Kosovo's higher education system has been going through a long process of transition: it has evolved from a completely destroyed and deeply politicized system in the late nineties, to a system striving to provide quality teaching to its students and to integrate into the European Higher Education Area.

Kosovo's population of 1.8 million is one of the youngest in Europe, with 45 percent under 25 years of age and more than a quarter not yet 15. According to 2011 census data, 6.72 percent of Kosovo's population holds a tertiary qualification, comparably lower than in other Western Balkan countries, where the share ranges from 8 to 14 percent. Fifteen years after the war of 1999, Kosovo's higher education system has increased student access to academic services from 12 to 55 students per 1,000 inhabitants between 2005 and 2014. The period also saw a significant structural transformation in the higher education landscape.

Unplanned Expansion and Structural Changes

The number of public universities rose from only one, the University of Pristina (UP, established 1970), with 27,000 students in 2007, to six universities with instruction in Albanian language (established between 2010–2013) and one with instruction in Serbian in (established in 2000), altogether catering to over 75,000 students in 2014. Meanwhile, the private higher education sector ballooned. Between 2004 and 2014, the number of private institutions (called "colleges" or "higher schools"), licensed and accredited by the authorities, rose from two to twenty-five. The private higher education sector provides services to roughly one third of the total student population in Kosovo, mainly at bachelor and master levels, and numbers continue to increase.

The Impact of System Expansion and Increased Participation

Scarce statistical data from the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology and the Kosovo Agency of Statistics on student enrollment and graduation at UP for the period 2008–2013, show a rapid increase in student numbers. This increased participation appears to have had a devastating effect on the quality of education and on student performance, since the overall number of graduates has only decreased, both in real and relative terms. In the academic year 2008–2009, 5,161 students graduated, or about two thirds of around 7,000 students who had registered at UP in 2005. In the same year, 2008–2009, the UP admitted 10,007 new students. Three years later, in 2011, 4,496, or only 44 percent of those enrolled, graduated to join the labor market. Consequently, the intake increased by more than 40 percent over the three years (2005–2008), whereas the output instead of increasing, was reduced in nominal terms by around 10 percent. Data indicate that there has been a drastic fall of system performance—expressed in significantly increased attrition and decreased graduation rates—as a result of uncontrollably increased participation and the same trends continues to this day.

An almost threefold increase in student numbers between 2008 and 2013 in the public sector was not accompanied by a similar increase in government funding (less than 40 percent); teaching staff numbers (less than 30 percent); or new infrastructure. Public universities in Kosovo spend annually between €300 and 500 per student, in average 3 times less than in other countries in the Western Balkan countries and 15 times less than in OECD countries. Until June 2014, students in public universities paid a low annual tuition fee of €100 (US$130). In an effort to gain political support during the national election campaign of 2014, the government curtailed these fees by 50 percent. As a result, transfer and administration costs to collect these fees exceeded the value of the income collected. The expansion of the system was not followed by more resources. Instead, existing resources were redistributed across a dramatically expanded sector, with the teaching staff and funds of UP allocated to more public institutions. It is only sensible to assume that this situation has negatively affected teaching quality and student learning.

Marginalized Research

In addition to teaching quality, academic performance and research efforts have been reduced to an absolute minimum. Ministers of education and their strategic plans eagerly claim that Kosovo is a "Knowledge Society." However, the country's universities produce little or no knowledge for their society in terms of rigorous academic research, applicable learning or skills. Instead, the higher education system has gradually been turned into an incoherent assembly of teaching colleges (re)transmitting outdated content to younger generations. With increased number of students, most funds for research are necessarily directed to supporting teaching, with research losing its attraction as a mode of academic activity.

For many academics, scientific research has become a hurried way to ensure equally swift academic promotion, conveniently followed by a raise in salary. The aim of "doing research" is therefore to ensure personal academic employment stability in an ever-changing, transitory context. The situation has worsened over the years, with professors, and recently even a rector, publishing their work in dubious, pseudo-scientific journals in India just to be promoted to their professorship entitlements. Lately, however, these pitfalls have not gone unnoticed by the media. In early 2014, UP's rector resigned from his post following student protests and extensive media coverage, both national and international. Moreover, investigative journalists are actively unveiling dubious practices by professors and university lecturers.

The Role of the Higher Education System

The government policy to augment student participation in higher education appears to have significantly derailed the higher education system. Universities have come to play a social and political role, rather than serve an academic purpose. Increased participation in public and private institutions has not increased the number of graduates or their employability. It appears only to have served the purpose of postponing their entrance into the overflowing labor market, as unskilled workforce. Apart from this, establishing a university in every larger town may bring votes in times of elections, as was the case during the national elections of 2014. But it replicates throughout Kosovo the problems affecting the main university in the capital city.

Latest Developments

During 2014 there have been a number of more promising developments in Kosovo's higher education. A new minister of education has been appointed and a new rector was elected at the University of Pristina. The new minister commenced a series of legal and structural reforms at the system level, while the new rector engaged in institutional and academic reforms at UP. Since a meaningful education reform takes at least seven years to show results, it remains to be seen how far reaching and effective these efforts will be. Nevertheless, they give the impression that there is a light at the end of the tunnel for Kosovo's higher education.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Clancy, Patrick. *Irish Higher Education: A Comparative Perspective*. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration, 2015. 325 pp. Euros 28. ISBN 978-1-910393-04-8. Web site: www.ipa.ie.

This unique volume provides a thorough analysis of Irish higher education from a comparative (mainly European) perspective. Current statistical information as well as narrative are provided. Among the themes discussed are the expansion and diversification of higher education from an Irish and broader perspectives, access issues, admissions and retention, the student experience, the academic profession, higher education and the labor market, funding issues, and others.

Cloete, Nico, Peter Maassen, and Tracy Bailey, eds. *Knowledge Production: Contradictory Functions in African Higher Education*. Cape Town, South Africa: African Minds Publishers, 2015. 295 pp. (pb). ISBN 9781920677855. Web site: www.africanminds.org.za.

Focusing on research universities in sub-Saharan Africa, this book analyses aspects of the development, mainly, of eight "flagship" institutions in Africa. Among the topics considered in data-based chapters are the performance of these universities, the role of South Africa as a PhD hub for Africa, academic incentives for knowledge production in Mozambique and Kenya, student engagement and citizenship, the role of science councils in Africa, and others.

Dougherty, Kevin J., and Rebecca S. Natow. *The Politics of Performance Funding for Higher Education: Origins, Discontinuations, and Transformations*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015. 257 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-1-4214-16908. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

Performance funding ties state support for public higher education to institutional performance on specific outcomes. Looking at case studies of 8 US states, the authors examine how performance funding is defined and measured, and how it affects funding. A special focus is on the policy-related aspects of this topic.

Gerber, Larry G. *The Rise and Decline of Faculty Governance: Professionalism and the Modern American University*. Baltimore, MD:

Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015. 250 pp. $29.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4214-1462-1. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

A historical overview of shared governance in American universities, this book argues that as the organization and ethos of American universities has become more professional, the power and authority of the faculty has declined. The faculty itself became more professionalized in the 19th century, and this enhanced their power and authority within the universities. More recently, with the corporatization and expansion of higher education, the faculty has lost out.

Geuna, Aldo, and Federica Rossi. *The University and the Economy: Pathways to Growth and Economic Development.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2015. 208 pp. $120 (hb). ISBN 978-1-78254-948-2. Web site: www.e-elgar.com.

An analysis of the various ways that universities contribute to the economy, this book examines both the economic impact of universities and the internal aspects of the economics of universities. Among the topics considered are university-industry knowledge transfer, higher education and economic welfare, the economic role and impact of university research, and others.

Hall, Budd, Rajesh Tandon, and Crystal Tremblay, eds. *Strengthening Community-University Research Partnerships: Global Perspectives.* Victoria, Canada: University of Victoria, 2015. 305 pp. (electronic edition only). ISBN 978-1-55058-562-9. Web site: www.unescochair-cbrsr.org.

Focusing on community-university partnerships, this volume provides an overall analysis of global trends, and a series of case studies from Argentina, Brazil, Canada, India, South Africa, the United Kingdom, the United States, Uganda, and others. The cases provide discussion of a wide range of different kinds of partnerships and linkages.

Jenkins, Laura Dudley, and Michelle S. Moses, eds. *Affirmative Action Matters: Creating Opportunities for Students Around the World.* Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2014. 221 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-0-415-50807-0. Web site: www.routledge.com/education.

A global discussion of affirmative action initiatives—programs to improve the situations of racial, gender, or other groups in higher education—this book provides case studies as well as a general overview of national perspectives. Among the countries included are South Africa, Ethiopia, the United States, Brazil, India, and Bulgaria. A useful bibliography on the topic is also included.

Keenan, James F., SJ. *University Ethics: How Colleges Can Build and Benefit from a Culture of Ethics.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2015. 281 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-1-4422-2372-1. Web site: www.rowman.com.

Author Kennan argues that ethics is not often discussed in the context of American higher education and advocates a more active discussion and analysis of the ethical aspects of university life. He specifically focuses on the ethics aspects of cheating in academe, undergraduate misbehavior, diversity and race, athletics, gender, and others.

News of the Center

The Center is developing plans, in cooperation with the Global Leadership Institute (GLI) at Boston College, to provide professional development training focused on internationalization and leadership for administrators from a group of Russian universities, all connected to the 5–100 Project sponsored by the Russian Ministry of Higher Education. This project will include a 2-week module at Boston College in spring 2016, followed by a 2-week module in Europe, coordinated by Dr. Fiona Hunter of CHEI, the Centre for Higher Education Internationalisation of the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan.

Similarly, in collaboration with the United Board (UB) for Christian Higher Education in Asia and GLI, work is advancing on plans to host a group of 15–20 UB Fellows for a 3-week leadership and professional development seminar in July 2016.

The Center continues to work closely with the Higher School of Economics in Moscow. Our newest collaborative publication, under the title *The Global Academic Rankings Game: Changing Institutional Policies, Practice, and Academic Life,* will be published by Routledge in early 2016. Work is also underway on an 11-country analysis of the experiences of international faculty, which should culminate in a publication in 2016 or 2017.

Hans de Wit is currently involved as a co-editor of two books in process: *Global and Local Internationalization* (Sense), with Elspeth Jones, Jos Beelen, and Robert Coelen, and *Globalization of Internationalization* (Routledge), with Elspeth Jones, Nico Jooste, and Jocelyne Gacel-Avila. Philip Altbach's newest book, *Global Perspectives on Higher Education,* will be published by Johns Hopkins University Press in early 2016.

The Center is advancing its plans to launch a new master's degree in international higher education in 2016/2017. More information on this program will soon be forthcoming..

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.

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 (print)