

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

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, French, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, and Vietnamese. Links to all editions can be found at <http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe>. *IHE* articles appear regularly on *UWN's* website and monthly newsletter.

For weekly global higher education news and comment see our partner

**University
World News**



facebook.com/
Center.for.International.
Higher.Education



twitter.com/BC_CIHE

International Issues

- 2 Too Much Academic Research is Being Published
Philip G. Altbach and Hans de Wit
- 4 Knowledge Production for All
Alma Maldonado-Maldonado and Jenny J. Lee
- 5 China-US Cooperation in Higher Education: A Critical Stabilizer
Gerard A. Postiglione and Denis Simon

Mobility and Internationalization

- 7 Not Your Parents' Internationalization: Next Generation Perspectives
Laura E. Rumbley and Douglas Proctor
- 9 International Student Mobility in Israel
Annette Bamberger
- 10 Italy: Brain Drain or Brain Circulation?
Chantal Saint-Blancat

Language Issues and the Role of English

- 12 English-Taught Bachelor's Programs in Europe
Ann-Malin Sandstrom
- 13 Hybrid Internationalization in Korea
Hee Kyung Lee and Byung Shik Rhee
- 15 National Policies and the Role of English in Higher Education
Xinyan Liu
- 16 Malaysia: National Language Policy and Employability
Viswanathan Selvaratnam

Focus on Japan

- 18 International Faculty in Japan
Futao Huang
- 19 The International Baccalaureate in Japan
Yukiko Ishikura
- 21 Japan: World Class Universities for Social Innovation
Akiyoshi Yonezawa

Focus on South Africa

- 23 The Recent Crisis in South African Universities
Jonathan Jansen and Cyrill Walters
- 24 Student Pathways in South Africa
Rebecca Schendel

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. Opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center for International Higher Education.

The Center is closely related to the graduate program in higher education at the Lynch School of Education, Boston College. The Center offers an M.A. and a Certificate of International Higher Education. For additional information see: <https://www.bc.edu/IHEMA> <https://www.bc.edu/IHECert>

EDITOR
Philip G. Altbach

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Hans de Wit

PUBLICATIONS EDITORS
Hélène Bernot Ullerö, Lisa Unangst

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT
Salina Kopellas

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.), your country of residence, and area of interest or expertise. There is no charge for a digital subscription; a fee of \$35/year applies to a subscription to the print version.

ISSN: 1084-0613 (print)

Too Much Academic Research Is Being Published

PHILIP G. ALTBACH AND HANS DE WIT

Philip G. Altbach is research professor and founding director, and Hans de Wit is professor and director, Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. E-mails: altbach@bc.edu and de-witj@bc.edu.

There is a crisis in academic publishing and in the global knowledge distribution system generally—there is too much pressure on top journals, there are too many books and articles of marginal quality, predatory journals are on the rise, and there is a tremendous pressure on academics worldwide to publish. The decision by *The Review of Higher Education*, a highly respected academic journal, to temporarily suspend submissions due to a backlog of more than two years' worth of articles awaiting reviews or publication, set off a twitter storm and much debate in the corridors of academia about the future of academic publishing, and in particular its essential foundation, blind peer review.

These fundamental problems are artifacts of several developments in global higher education in the past half-century—especially massification and the rise of national and international rankings of universities. Related to this is the sociological phenomenon of isomorphism—that most academic institutions want to resemble the universities at the top of the academic pecking order—and thus seek to become research intensive. And finally, a growing trend in doctoral education is to dispense with the traditional PhD dissertation and replace it with the requirement for doctoral students to publish several articles based on their research in academic journals, in effect moving responsibility for evaluating doctoral research from university committees to journal editors and reviewers.

A DYSFUNCTIONAL AND UNNECESSARY SYSTEM

Our argument is a simple one. There is too much being published because the academic system encourages unnecessary publication. Drastic cutbacks are needed. Reducing the number of academic articles and books would permit the peer review system to function more effectively, would reduce or eliminate the predatory journals and publishers that have emerged recently, and would, perhaps most importantly, remove massive stress from academics who worry about publication instead of teaching and service.

In his 1990 book *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities*

for the professoriate, Ernest L. Boyer argued that the evaluation of academic work should include all aspects of the responsibilities of the academic profession, and that the large majority of professors who are not employed in research-intensive universities should be evaluated for their teaching and service, and not for research. He argued that most academics need to keep abreast of research trends and current thinking in their fields, but do not need to produce new knowledge. Those few academics at nonresearch universities wanting to do research and publish should, of course, be permitted to do so.

At the same time that research is deemphasized for most academics, the recognition and respect given to teaching must be enhanced. Both institutional and individual isomorphism must be eliminated—not an easy task but by no means impossible through a combination of carrots and sticks. Most universities that are not research intensive should, and largely do, focus on teaching. Faculty members should be rewarded for good teaching and for service to society and industry and not expected to do fundamental research. The German Humboldtian model, where all universities have a research mission, is wasteful and unnecessary

There is a crisis in academic publishing and in the global knowledge distribution system generally—there is too much pressure on top journals.

to maintain quality. The demand by universities of applied sciences and other nonresearch universities to be given research funding and granted PhD programs—and the inclination of politicians to support them—goes against that trend. The growing numbers of universities of applied sciences in Europe and elsewhere should not have a research function but should remain true to their name and focus on teaching supported by applied research. Professional doctorates are an alternative path to research-based PhDs for people not aiming for a research-focused career.

If a careful differentiation is made and research publication is required only in the research universities, our guess is that the quality of research and development will increase and more than half of current so-called research articles could be eliminated.

QUALITY WITH CONTROL

To restore rationality to the publishing system, the sheer volume of articles and books must be reduced. We do not advocate that knowledge production be concentrated in the rich

countries, but rather that knowledge production be concentrated mainly in research universities in *all* countries. The established journals should pay much more attention to diversity of viewpoints, methodologies, and subject matter. The traditional monopolies of the research paradigms and subject areas evident in most prestigious publications need to be broken with more representation of quality scholars and authors from developing and emerging economies, as well as gender and other forms of diversity.

We call for quality but also for control of what quality is by the academic community instead of by nonacademic rankers, publishers, and citation and impact measurers. The solution is not to produce more research of poor quality. Quality, and not quantity, should be the objective, in combination with bringing quality control back to the academic community, while making sure that that control is not dominated by small groups in research universities in the rich countries.

POSSIBLE REFORMS

The first steps, of course, are to define the differentiated missions of academic systems, to place academic institutions in appropriate categories, and to link financial allocations to missions.

The knowledge distribution system needs major change. Research-intensive universities and appropriate professional societies, and government funding and other agencies need to take much more responsibility—and control—over a system that has become overly commercialized and in part corrupted. Predatory journals and publishers need to be weeded out. The extortionate prices charged by many of the monopolistic private-sector publishers, such as Elsevier and Springer, need to be reduced. The peer review system, which is at the heart of the maintenance of quality of scientific research and publication, needs to be strengthened. We are arguing essentially that the publishing system is out of control and, at this point, in a deep crisis, because of the amount of material seeking publication and being published. The volume has overwhelmed the publishing system and has introduced overcommercialization and corruption.

Our argument and proposal for a solution to the problem is to reduce the amount being published, not by interfering with the freedom of academics or concentrating power in the hands of the traditional academic power-brokers. We propose simply recognizing that most universities, and most academics globally, focus on teaching and that the large majority of universities recognize their important roles as teaching-focused and do not seek to become research-intensive institutions. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10767>

Knowledge Production for All

ALMA MALDONADO-MALDONADO AND JENNY J. LEE

Alma Maldonado-Maldonado is researcher at the Departamento de Investigaciones Educativas (DIE)-CINVESTAV in Mexico City, Mexico. E-mail: almaldo2@gmail.com. Jenny J. Lee is a professor at the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Arizona, Tucson, US, and a visiting scholar at the University of Cape Town, South Africa. E-mail: jennylee@email.arizona.edu.

Who should be responsible for producing research and where should it take place? By allocating the role of creating knowledge to faculty employed at top institutional producers (as determined by their position in global university rankings), stratified higher education systems are perpetuated while participation in knowledge production is curbed. The current system is already challenged in terms of inclusivity and diversity. Preserving this vertical differentiation worldwide, in a context of widening higher education participation, may not be the best strategy when knowledge has been recognized as a key factor to combat inequalities in the world.

There are two major and related consequences to consider when limiting research locations. First, assigning the research function to select universities could affect the diversity of those who produce knowledge, thus limiting the breadth of knowledge produced. Across nations, faculty at these institutions tend to be less diverse in terms of gender, race, and class. Second, reserving the research function to any country's top research universities will inevitably increase stratification *within* countries.

Already, there is abundant research (including from scholars in nonresearch universities) documenting how individuals belonging to minority races and ethnicities and with a low socioeconomic status are disadvantaged in terms of access to higher education. In fact, research universities also have the most selective admissions procedures, limiting social mobility and favoring individuals from the highest socioeconomic strata, while disadvantaging ethnic minority students by relegating them to less resourced universities. These demographic concerns also apply to faculty.

Rather, research should be promoted across types of institutions, with greater efforts on strengthening as well as legitimizing local knowledge, thereby allowing scholars in less studied parts of the world to become part of the global dialogue. When people who produce knowledge are more diverse, there are more possibilities to expand on the kinds of questions that are asked, the methodologies that are used, and the possibilities for more varied approaches,

interpretations, and even discoveries. The number of international coauthorships is increasing and this trend is also an effect of growing higher education participation worldwide and the way some emerging economies are actively increasing their role as knowledge producers.

EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION

Indeed, there is a crisis in publications, at least partly facilitated by pressures to publish. Related problems include Western biases in peer review and dominance in top journals worldwide. These two contextual elements should be considered in a broader discussion on research production and publications.

Faculty from top universities live under constant scrutiny by evaluation mechanisms oftentimes reflective of global rankings criteria. Universities expect these faculty to publish in top journals in English (which may not be their home language, and thus may not be read locally). Research with more relevance to the immediate context might not be measured as having high "impact." This widely accepted, but hardly questioned criterion of "impact," based on international citations alone, further advantages core players while marginalizing the rest. Universities need to reorient evaluation systems by stressing the importance of producing local knowledge that matters to the local context while informing global audiences.

Assigning the research function to select universities could affect the diversity of those who produce knowledge, thus limiting the breadth of knowledge produced.

Accessing publications in top journals is restricted to the universities, organizations, and individuals who can afford them, leaving much of the world without access to this new knowledge and further reducing their ability to influence citation indexes. Democratizing knowledge production does not prevent problems originating from the saturation of publications around the world, predatory journals, or issues of plagiarism and ethics. Yet such problems do not get solved by sending the message to simply stop publishing. Rather, evaluation systems should also consider the value of local languages and the broader range of publication outlets.

"ACADEMIC CAPITALISM"

Inequality gaps are especially evident when research is

commodified. According to World Bank data on payments and purchases of intellectual property by the United States, Brazil, Argentina, and Chile (Balance of Payment, US\$) during 2017, the United States profited by US\$79 billion, whereas Brazil lost US\$4.5 billion, Argentina US\$2.1 billion, and Chile US\$1.4 billion. This data demonstrates the unequal financial dynamics of the knowledge economy and exemplifies the importance of knowledge production for development. Intellectual property consumption results in a financial deficit for countries that create less knowledge. Given these current inequalities, maintaining the same global structure and the same national stratification, especially for low knowledge producers, is not the answer.

TRAINING GRADUATE STUDENTS

Research and teaching do not have to be mutually exclusive and faculty work in these areas is not always zero-sum. Training graduate students is especially important in the current knowledge society. Students today must be skilled in the research process, whether or not they become academics, in order to recognize rigorous research as well as understand how to participate in it. Given the challenge for students worldwide to access top institutions as a result of stratification, knowledge creation should be a core educational component across all university types.

RESEARCH CAPACITY BUILDING

In the current knowledge society, students and scholars, particularly in nonresearch universities, should learn how to be active contributors of knowledge, rather than mere consumers. Especially in low-income countries lagging behind in research production, capacity building should integrate research and teaching.

Additional promising strategies to build knowledge production capacity include investing in and monitoring research funding, creating reputable publication outlets and monitoring predatory journals—as well as educating students (undergraduate and graduate) about the difference—and rewarding meaningful research that addresses local needs and informs local and international audiences.

FINAL REMARKS

In sum, global knowledge production would be severely weakened if the recommendation of limiting the types of institutions or the categories of faculty conducting research was followed through. Moreover, simple solutions do not fix complex problems—and may create even worse challenges. The message cannot be to dissuade particular types of universities or categories of faculty from doing research. The problem with such utilitarian approaches is that they do not change the status quo and serve to justify cultural hegemony. Reducing the number of research publications may

weaken the market for predatory publishers and might address some forms of corruption but would also limit the participation of marginalized groups. The future of research, teaching, and service is to be innovative, interdisciplinary, and borderless. Limiting research to elite universities will not change the current global order. At present, knowledge and wealth are inextricably linked; only if we start changing the dynamics of this order can we start reducing inequality gaps within and across countries. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10787>

China–US Cooperation in Higher Education: A Critical Stabilizer

GERARD A. POSTIGLIONE AND DENIS SIMON

Gerard A. Postiglione is honorary professor and coordinator of the Consortium of Higher Education Research in Asia, University of Hong Kong, China. E-mail: gerry.hku@gmail.com. Denis Simon is executive vice-chancellor of Duke Kunshan University, China, and professor of China business and technology at the Fuqua School of Business at Duke University, Durham, US. E-mail: denis.simon@duke.edu.

As the United States and China were engaged in normalizing relations in the late 1970s, Chinese leader Deng Xiaoping became adamant that China should have “a thousand talented scientists” who would be recognized around the world. By “trumpeting the need for more qualified scientists and engineers,” Deng wanted quick approval to send several hundred Chinese to study at top American universities. Over the past 40 years, diplomatic relations between the United States and China have steadily grown, even considering periodic strains over economic, political, and military issues. Expanded economic and financial interdependence along with finely tuned statecraft have ensured that cool heads prevailed in times of stress, and thus cooperation across a wide array of domains has seemingly kept expanding over the last several decades.

TRUMPING OUT A THOUSAND TALENTS

Unfortunately, those days of relative calm and foresight may be ending abruptly thanks to the Trump-initiated trade war, which Alibaba’s Jack Ma says, “may last for 20 years if it’s unfortunate.” And there are emerging signs that US–China cooperation in higher education may be in for a serious jolt for the first time in four decades. Even the-

most optimistic observers must admit that we already have entered a somewhat “rough patch.” China’s Thousand Talents Program (TTP), which brought around 7,000 top-level scientists and researchers back to China over the 10 years of the program, the majority from the United States, may be the first target. That strategic program is now viewed by the US National Intelligence Council as a potential means to transfer sensitive technologies to China from the United States. China views it as an American effort to constrain China’s rise, especially its progress in science and technology, business, and manufacturing. Of particular concern to the United States is the Chinese “Made in China 2025” program, which aims to catapult the PRC into the ranks of the world’s top technological leaders. The ubiquitous US News show “60 Minutes” revealed proactive investigations of Chinese scholars in the United States resulting in potential permanent career damage. US universities may not fire TTP scholars, but it could affect the federal funding of various American universities. China insists that TTP is intended to recruit world-class scientists, and not to grab critical American industrial know-how.

More Chinese scholars may be convinced to head to European universities instead of the United States.

After decades of goodwill in academic exchanges between China and the United States, the Trump administration seems anxious to put a damper on the entire network of collaborative relationships. In May, the Trump administration announced that the validity of visas issued to Chinese graduate students studying in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) related fields, especially robotics, aviation, and high-tech manufacturing, would be limited to only one year. Many Chinese scholars in the United States are beginning to feel that they are under suspicion. This sentiment also is increasing toward Chinese-American citizens more generally, according to Chi Wang, former head of the Library of Congress’s China section, who worked for the US government for 50 years.

A BONUS FOR AUSTRALIA, CANADA, THE EUROPEAN UNION, ISRAEL, AND RUSSIA

More Chinese scholars may be convinced to head to European universities instead of the United States. The United States’ withdrawal from several multilateral agreements, including trade pacts in Asia, has produced a vacuum at a time when China has become more outward looking with

its new 60 plus country “Belt and Road initiative.” China clearly is willing to take advantage of the vacuum left by the United States. The so-called “post-American” world will likely open significant new opportunities for expanding Europe’s cooperation in higher education and research with China.

The real worry is that the ongoing trade war between Beijing and Washington could slow down scholarly exchanges and collaboration between China and the United States—just at a time when Chinese scientific and technological progress offers more and more to American partners. While such a slowdown could affect China’s science and technology ambitions as it strives to transform from a manufacturing-led to an innovation-driven economy, the Chinese will likely turn to new cooperative partners such as Israel and Russia as well as the European Union, Canada, and Australia. While US actions may increase PRC anxiety, we must remember that Chinese leaders have great patience and strong determination; they will adapt and find ways to strengthen university partnerships outside the US domain. Hostile policy toward Chinese students and scholars by the US government may make good election strategy for the Trump administration, but it ignores the fact that the solution to almost every major global issue will require some form of close Sino-US consultation as well as cooperation.

RECALIBRATING FOR RESILIENCE AND SUSTAINED COOPERATION

Fortunately, most US campuses in China are not encountering serious difficulties. One exception is the relationship between Cornell University and Renmin University in the field of industrial and labor relations; Cornell apparently has decided to withdraw from that relationship because of issues surrounding academic freedom. That recognized, at a recent Forum in Beijing cosponsored by the China Education Association for International Exchange and Duke Kunshan University, the consensus was that Sino-American cooperation in higher education within China remains quite steady and vibrant. The degrees of major American university campuses in China still are accredited in the United States. If academic freedom on these campuses were seriously curtailed, it could end the authority of the US campuses in China to issue degrees that are equivalent to those at the home campuses. This would undermine the foundation of most cooperative education joint ventures.

At the September 27, 2017 US-China University Presidents Forum held at Columbia University, Henry Kissinger, the architect of US-China relations that led to normalization in 1979, said that the only alternative to positive relations between Washington and Beijing is global disorder. At that meeting, China’s then Vice-Premier Liu Yandong said

that China and the United States should enhance people-to-people exchanges to build stronger ties where the two countries have the least disagreements and the most consensus. Sino-US competition on the annual university international rankings may become more intense as PRC universities strive to attain world-class status, but that pales in comparison to what strong bilateral university relations means for addressing global problems and maintaining geopolitical stability. Before Trump, China-US ties clearly were more resilient and dynamic. The two countries could carry out strategic and forward-looking dialogues around critical issues for mutual benefit. At present, universities in both countries may not be able to eliminate the trade distortions and confrontations that currently occupy the attention of the Trump and Xi Jinping administrations, but there is much they can do to keep US-China relations on an even keel as the relationship reconfigures itself to better reflect current political and economic realities. Students from both countries eventually will become future leaders in government, business, and academia; hopefully, greater mutual understanding developed through cooperative learning and cross-cultural exchange will help to soften some of the current mistrust and pave the way for more reasoned and balanced conversations in the years ahead. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10796>

Not Your Parents' Internationalization: Next Generation Perspectives

Laura E. Rumbley and Douglas Proctor

Laura E. Rumbley is associate director at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. E-mail: rumbley@bc.edu. Douglas Proctor is director of International Affairs at University College Dublin, Ireland. E-mail: douglas.proctor@ucd.ie.

Internationalization of higher education is generally considered to be a “young” phenomenon—as a field of inquiry, an area of professional practice, and a strategic undertaking for higher education institutions. Even so, there is today a sizable corpus of published material on the subject, and a recognized cadre of experts whose work has shaped the field in profound and long-lasting ways. The contemporary “founders” of the study of internationalization stand out for the contributions they have made in proposing and defining key terms, positing conceptual frameworks, shap-

ing relevant debates, drawing the attention of a multitude of stakeholders, and connecting theory with policy and practice.

The intellectual evolution of internationalization has occurred in tandem with the development, around the world, of a community of organizations dedicated to serving international education through programming, knowledge development, and/or professional training for those working in this field. Some of these organizations are decades old, including the Institute of International Education in the United States, which celebrates 100 years in 2019; the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), founded in 1925; NAFSA: Association of International Educators, which was established in the United States in 1948; and The Netherlands-based European Association for International Education, which dates from 1989. These entities—and the plethora of related organizations and associations that operate at national, (sub)regional, and (inter)continental levels around the world—have set the scene for much of the conversation and the action agenda connecting international education globally. Indeed, the founding scholars and organizations in international education have had an immensely influential role in determining how we understand and enact internationalization in higher education worldwide.

Acknowledging both the utility and the “baggage” that the past provides, important questions arise as we simultaneously reflect on where we have come from and where we are headed, as we hurtle toward the end of the second decade of the twenty-first century: How and in what ways can “next generation” perspectives on internationalization of higher education lead us meaningfully into the future? Why does innovation—both in terms of sources of information and content—matter? From our perspective, the increasing complexity of the global higher education landscape, the rapid evolution of internationalization dynamics, and the high stakes connected to quality in higher education and human capital development in a global context, make it crucial to (re)focus the conversation on internationalization across new modes, new contexts, and new topics. Considering these matters through a collection of new voices from around the world is also vital, if we are serious about understanding and responding to the possibilities and challenges that lie ahead.

NEW MODES, NEW TOPICS, NEW CONTEXTS

Previous exploration into various data sources has given us a clear indication that research on higher education is overwhelmingly concentrated in a relatively small number of research centers located in a select number of (wealthy, largely English-speaking) countries. Furthermore, research output specifically on internationalization in higher educa-

tion is similarly clustered, emanating disproportionately from Australia, Europe, and North America. Certain topics are also overrepresented in the literature at our fingertips, ranging from the American study abroad experience to the international student adaptation process and to the single program or institutional case study analysis. Quite literally, a *world* of dimensions related to the phenomenon of internationalization remains poorly researched or ignored altogether.

To rectify this situation, commitments to explore new modes, new topics, and new contexts for internationalization must be made by key stakeholders. These stakeholders include governments and policy organizations that frame lines of inquiry to explore and fund for research; established researchers with the ability to determine their individual agendas for ongoing scholarship, and to influence peers within their networks; as well as graduate students and young academics undertaking preliminary theses, dissertations, and early post-doc projects, and the advisors guiding these early career individuals.

Given the complex and dynamic world in which we are living, new topics for internationalization should be finding their way into our collective knowledge base every day.

NEW CONTEXTS: THE “WHERE”

Internationalization is clearly a worldwide phenomenon, yet the bulk of research is still produced by—and concerned with—large English-speaking countries in the global North. As such, new contexts for internationalization include countries and regions of the world, categories of institutions, and other settings where there has been limited research to date. Examples we are familiar with of research being undertaken in relation to new contexts include a focus on remote geographic locations and/or highly marginalized communities (e.g., due to the predominance of a non-widely spoken language, or the prevalence of insecurity or cultural isolation), or in contexts of extreme economic crisis or deprivation. What do we really know about internationalization of higher education in contested borderlands, in relation to indigenization movements, in regions with highly inhospitable climates, or in remote rural or wilderness settings? We know of several young researchers who

are digging into these topics, and more need to be encouraged.

NEW TOPICS: THE “WHAT”

Given the complex and dynamic world in which we are living, new topics for internationalization should be finding their way into our collective knowledge base every day. We note with excitement a number of early career researchers who are looking at how internationalization of higher education serves the surging numbers of individuals coping with forced migration around the world. Others are helping us learn from internationalization efforts undertaken at primary and secondary education institutions in different contexts and to reflect on how internationalization intersects with the formation of individual identity, national identity, and regional engagement in various regions of the world. Still others are exploring ways in which we may leverage internationalization in the approach to training future academics, or advancing the work of university-based schools and faculties of education, among other themes. The need for attention to new topics in relation to internationalization is acute, and broader exploration of the landscape around us requires sustained attention and support.

NEW CONTEXTS: THE “HOW”

New methods for researching internationalization push us collectively toward important considerations about how our knowledge base is developed in this field. The work of a number of early career researchers we are familiar with is giving us insight into everything from the possibilities of mining existing data sets for deeper understanding about the choices of internationally mobile students and the dynamics of their satisfaction; to the potential for topic modeling to make sense of a wide-ranging pool of government policies and initiatives focused on internationalization in different national contexts; and the philosophical and historical considerations of Protestant roots undergirding the Western theory of internationalization. From biological processes to narrative analysis, the methodologies for exploring the phenomenon of internationalization can be taken in a range of compelling directions that should offer consequential insights over time.

MAY THE FORCE BE WITH THE NEXT GENERATION

An uncertain future for internationalization offers both opportunities and challenges for the next generation of scholars and scholar-practitioners who are committed to ensuring that international engagement and global learning play their rightful role in advancing both high quality and equitable education, knowledge development, and social relevance in the coming decades. The work of the rising

generation of internationalization specialists has significant potential to achieve these ends, building creatively and dynamically on all that has come before. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10772>

International Student Mobility in Israel

ANNETTE BAMBERGER

Annette Bamberger is a PhD candidate at the Institute of Education, University College London, UK. E-mail: a.bamberger.14@ucl.ac.uk.

With respect to research, Israeli universities have impressive international funding and publication and citation rankings; however, with respect to receiving international students, Israel performs poorly compared to the OECD average of 9 percent, with only 1.4 percent of its student population coming from abroad. This has caused concern and attracted the attention of the Council for Higher Education (CHE)—Israel’s central body charged with coordinating the higher education (HE) system—and of its funding arm, the Planning and Budgeting Committee (PBC). In a new multi-year plan announced in July 2017, internationalization was identified as a key focus, with the goal of doubling the number of international students to 25,000 within five years.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

While the first students at Israeli universities in the pre-State era were predominantly from Eastern Europe, since the early decades of the State, most students in Israeli universities have been local. Due to the intractable Israeli–Palestinian conflict, regional student mobility to Israel is nearly nonexistent. Yet, international students have not been ignored. Starting in 1955, international student programs targeting American Jewish students on a junior year/semester abroad were developed as a result of the coordination between universities, the government, and diaspora community organizations. In addition to the academic component (emphasizing the Hebrew language, Jewish studies, Israel studies, and Middle Eastern studies), cultural and social activities, tours throughout the country, and encounters with local Israelis also formed an integral part of the programs. Since the language of instruction in these programs was predominately English and students required specialized

support (for visa, housing, etc.), separate infrastructures gradually developed to service these programs and students. While the programs were open to all, and international students from a variety of backgrounds welcomed, the programs were primarily targeted at a Jewish population, as demonstrated by marketing and recruitment; funding; support services; and formal and informal curriculum.

In contemporary times, international offerings at institutions have expanded to encompass short courses, summer programs, and degree-granting programs at the undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral levels. International degree-seeking students—at the bachelor’s and master’s (without thesis) levels—continue to be predominantly Jewish. While tuition paid by these students may represent revenue ventures for some institutions, the state, nonprofit organizations, and Jewish diaspora organizations provide students with financial support with an eye toward promoting solidarity, Jewish identity, and Israel–diaspora relations throughout the world.

Due to the intractable Israeli–Palestinian conflict, regional student mobility to Israel is nearly nonexistent.

In the past, Israel attracted an impressive proportion of the American study abroad population to these programs; in the 1996 *Open Doors* report, Israel was the eighth most popular destination for study abroad for American students, with almost the same number of students studying in Israel (2,621) as in all South America (2,683). However, as international student mobility rapidly increased, Israel began to lose ground to other destinations and, in 2017, Israel fell to an unranked position with 2,435 students. This decrease has multiple causes, including the precarious security situation. However, it is clear that Israel has not been able to maintain its competitive positioning in the United States.

In addition to the traditional Jewish population in international programs, Israel has also fostered exchanges and partnerships for student mobility, particularly with countries of strategic economic and political importance. Beginning in 2008 with the opening of a national Tempus office and the subsequent expansion of Erasmus +, there has been an influx of European students to Israeli campuses; in 2015–2017, the Erasmus + program brought 2,471 students and staff from the European Union to Israel. Furthermore, since 2012, there have been significant government initia-

tives to bring closer collaboration with China and India—including sponsorship of Chinese and Indian research students (master thesis, PhD, and postdoctorate)—with academic cooperation forming a basis for partnership.

The new multi-year plan of the CHE builds on these patterns and aims to expand the intake of two categories of international students: 1) excellent research students with a special focus on China and India; and 2) excellent Jewish students, particularly from the United States and Canada. Policy documents and reports emanating from the CHE reveal the drivers behind these new policies: Israel hopes to build close economic and political relationships with these countries, while strengthening the academic level of its higher education institutions and its R&D capabilities to compete in the “global knowledge economy.” It is conspicuous that motives of peace building and cross-cultural understanding are absent, despite the ongoing conflict. The overall outcome is that Israel has an internationalization policy containing two distinct strands: research students, particularly from countries with which Israel wants to improve economic and political ties; and students from the Jewish diaspora, connecting to the identity of the state as the Jewish homeland. This is reflected in the latest CHE statistics from 2016, which show that, overall, there are slightly more Jewish (5,370) than non-Jewish students (4,700) in Israel, and that there is a clear split between the research and nonresearch tracks. Research students (master with thesis, PhD, and postdoctorate) are predominantly non-Jewish, while Jewish students are predominantly in nonresearch tracks (study abroad, BA, taught master).

CHALLENGES

In the current plan, a number of issues receive insufficient attention, such as the historical infrastructures for international students and the potential challenges of attracting and supporting different types of students, and there is little guidance about how the two strands should be managed. The two target groups—with different normative references and personal, ethnic, and religious connections to the country—will pose a challenge to Israeli universities trying to attract, accommodate, and support both groups. In line with institutional missions, there is evidence that some universities are focusing on one group. According to a report from the CHE in 2016, the Weizmann Institute of Science, a research institution, has the lowest percentage of Jewish students, while IDC Herzliya—which specializes in bachelor and taught master programs—has the largest Jewish student population. Universities aiming to attract both populations and with substantial concentrations of both populations may face the greatest challenges in developing

a comprehensive internationalization strategy. Will the new international student scheme be a success? Will there be a (further) specialization (and separation) in “research” and “nonresearch” international students? And in this case, is this not a missed opportunity to bridge and reimagine international higher education in Israel?

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10774>

Italy: Brain Drain or Brain Circulation?

CHANTAL SAINT-BLANCAT

Chantal Saint-Blancat is a former associate professor of sociology at the University of Padua, Italy. E-mail: chantal.saint-blancat@unipd.it.

For scientists, mobility has always been evident, as research has no boundaries. International scientific mobility has notably increased in recent times with the globalization of knowledge. At present, Europe is a paradigmatic case. In the past decade, EU policy has shaped, and strongly promoted, scientific and educational mobility by means of the Marie Curie Fellowship Scheme and other scientific grants managed by the European Research Council. Yet, brain circulation involves fierce competition and there is a risk of a growing concentration of “bright minds” in countries that have dedicated more attention and resources to scientific research, such as Germany or the United Kingdom, at the expense of others such as Greece, Italy, or Spain. The EU’s open labor market can easily transform itself into a brain-drain/brain-gain situation. In such a context, the Italian case study is particularly noteworthy. Recent data indicates that Italy has an outgoing flow of scientists, that few of them return, and that, unlike other countries, Italy cannot count on an incoming flow of foreign scientists to replace them.

Research funded by the University of Padua and conducted between September 2013 and July 2015 shows relevant results on the complexity of scientific mobility, adding evidence to the existing theory on brain drain and brain circulation. The study drew on 83 in-depth interviews conducted with Italian scientists (mathematicians, engineers, and physicists) working in Europe and on the results of a subsequent survey based on computer-assisted web interview questionnaires sent to 2,420 Italian scientists (gener-

ating 528 responses). It focused on clarifying the reasons why Italian scientists chose to go abroad, and in most cases did not return, as well as how they interpreted their personal and professional experience. The sample was balanced in terms of discipline, gender, and professional status.

LOOKING BACK AT THEIR CAREER TRAJECTORIES

The reasons behind the scientists' mobility were apparently uninfluenced by gender or scientific discipline. Most interviewees did not plan to emigrate for good, they just took up an opportunity to do research elsewhere and gain experience, sometimes because they saw little chance of a career in Italy. Most respondents had moved abroad when still quite young and early in their careers (on average, they were 30 years old when they left Italy). Mapping their trajectories reveals somewhat random processes rather than the outcome of rational decision-making, a willingness to take risks, and even a certain naivety.

THE EU'S OPEN LABOR MARKET CAN EASILY TRANSFORM ITSELF INTO A BRAIN-DRAIN/BRAIN-GAIN SITUATION.

What they found abroad was exactly what they were looking for and did not encounter at home: a country appreciative of science and research, a society where a PhD degree represented a real value, better research and career advancement opportunities, better salaries, international reputation, meritocracy, and fair recruitment systems. Scientists seek mainly recognition. Their achievements and fulfilment certainly play a major part in keeping them abroad. Nearly all of the respondents stated that they appreciated how their scientific competence was valued in other European countries, and the greater autonomy they enjoyed in developing their own projects. As one scientist underlined, "It's one thing to find any old job, quite another to find a job where your specific expertise as a researcher or your high qualifications are appreciated."

Lifestyle issues and the situation in the country of origin also emerge as key variables among reasons for leaving. Scientific mobility brings into question not only how academic institutions are run, but also the state, the welfare system, and a country's society at large. When asked how they would define brain drain, as many as 90 percent of the respondents stressed that their experience did not fit into this category. They would rather speak of an "asymmetric

brain exchange," underlining that their home country is not able to convert brain drain into a brain circulation, as Germany has been doing since 1954, or China more recently. They pointed out some possible strategies to transform Italy's loss into a resource.

THE DIASPORA OPTION: A MISSED OPPORTUNITY?

All scientists who were interviewed in the qualitative part of the study recognized that they had received excellent scientific training in Italy. In fact, most of them continued to collaborate with Italians doing research in Italy or abroad, "not because they are Italian, but because they are good." To improve the Italian higher education system, 50 percent of the respondents indicated that providing incentives for foreign scientists to join the Italian academic system would be the most effective scheme. According to them, the brain circulation logic allows for cumulative processes of academic mobility and collaboration, a perfect setting for brain transformation in terms of innovation and scientific internationalization. From this perspective, building a diaspora knowledge network and enrolling Italian scientists abroad as accessible social capital mediators who could potentially be mobilized, could be a better solution in the long term than "return" policies. But diaspora mobilization cannot be taken for granted.

One of the most significant results of the research is that expatriate scientists felt that while it was important for them to serve as a resource for Italy, they did not think that Italy saw them as a resource. As one of the respondents stated, "What do those of us living abroad represent? We are a unique value ... because we are a sort of antenna, sensors that can capture precisely what is happening outside Italy ... For this to happen, an easy first step is to conduct a census. A network of contacts. And, personally, I can say that I'm strongly motivated to do anything I can to give back to my country a part of all that it gave to me ... but I have never found the way." ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10773>

International Higher Education would like to thank the Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY) for its support of coverage of higher education in Africa and for its general support of our publication. CCNY has long recognized the importance of higher education in Africa and beyond, and this generosity significantly enables both our work as well as that of our partner at the University of Kwa-Zulu-Natal in South Africa, home to the International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA).

English-Taught Bachelor's Programs in Europe

ANNA-MALIN SANDSTROM

Anna-Malin Sandstrom is policy officer at the European Association for International Education (EAIE), the Netherlands. E-mail: sandstrom@eaie.org.

The significant growth in English-taught bachelor's (ETB) courses has raised debates within the sector of higher education. In the Netherlands, a public debate on the impact that degree programs in English have on the Dutch language and the quality of education is currently taking place. A lobby group has—unsuccessfully—taken two Dutch universities to court for teaching too many degree programs in English. Just like Dutch, the local language(s) of many European countries are often not widely used outside their national borders. This has led higher education institutions (HEIs) to increasingly offer degree programs in nonlocal languages, predominantly English, as part of their internationalization efforts. The development started at the master's level and has lately spread to the bachelor's level.

This article is based on an analysis of the findings of the European Association for International Education (EAIE) and StudyPortals: *English-taught bachelor's programs—Internationalising European higher education* (2017). The study explores how widespread ETBs are in Europe and what their perceived benefits and challenges are, as well as their predicted future. The findings derive from an analysis of a StudyPortals database on English-taught programs offered by HEIs in 19 European countries, complemented by qualitative data collected in 2017 through interviews with staff at HEIs and national agencies in the Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland, and Spain.

THE ENGLISH-TAUGHT BACHELOR'S PROGRAM LANDSCAPE IN EUROPE

The number of ETBs in Europe has increased exponentially in the past decade. According to the interviewees, ETBs have not only become widespread but are now seen as a deliberate strategic internationalization activity at HEIs. The second edition of the *EAIE Barometer: Internationalisation in Europe* study further evidences this: 33 percent of the 2317 respondents indicated programs in nonlocal languages as a priority activity within their institutional internationalization strategy.

There are, however, large variations in the number of ETBs available to students when comparing countries in Europe. Among the countries included in the study, the highest reported numbers are in Turkey (545), followed by the Netherlands (317) and Spain (241). The countries with the lowest number of ETBs are Romania (32), Latvia (39), and Austria (59). The most common disciplines in which ETBs are available are reportedly business and management, social sciences, and engineering and technology.

When comparing the number of institutions offering ETBs by country, Germany leads the group with 69 HEIs, followed by the Netherlands (42) and France (41). Cyprus (10), Latvia (9), and Romania (8) are the countries with the lowest numbers. A somewhat different picture emerges when reviewing the percentage of HEIs offering ETBs in each country. Switzerland—where almost all institutions offer such programs—is the country where ETBs are the most widespread across the higher education sector, followed by the Netherlands (75 percent of HEIs offering ETBs) and Denmark (70 percent). Romania (9 percent), France (13 percent), and Poland (14 percent) are the countries with the lowest proportion of HEIs offering ETBs. Overall, ETBs appear to be a more common aspect of internationalization at institutions in smaller Northern or Western European countries.

The number of ETBs in Europe has increased exponentially in the past decade.

LACK OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILLS AND STUDENT RECRUITMENT CHALLENGES

Introducing ETBs brings its own distinct challenges. Our research shows that the lack of English language skills among faculty and staff is a key obstacle, with some interviewees expressing a concern that this might adversely affect the quality of education. Other prominent challenges in developing ETBs, particularly in the programs' first years of operation, are related to identifying popular ETB fields of study among students, and enrolling (diverse groups of) international students. In some countries, the admission of international students is further complicated by rigid national regulations pertaining to secondary education diploma recognition. Issues related to integrating international students and ensuring efficient international classrooms also emerge as challenges.

ETBs AS A VEHICLE FOR INTERNATIONALIZATION

Despite these barriers, the professionals who were interviewed feel that ETB programs have a positive impact on their respective institutions. ETBs have resulted in more internationalized administrative procedures, higher international student numbers and diversified classrooms, as well as increased numbers of international staff and improved English skills among staff. Some also feel that ETBs have facilitated the mainstreaming of internationalization. As such, ETBs appear to have a positive effect on the development of internationalization at the institutional level and can be seen as a mechanism enhancing the process.

ETBs also seem to have a positive impact beyond the institutions themselves. According to national agency representatives, ETBs have financial benefits both for the institutions and the local economy, and they bring increased opportunities for internationalization at home and for attracting international talent to the country. Some national agency staff also mention increased quality as an additional benefit of developing ETBs. Others, however—both at HEIs and at national agencies—raise concerns over a potential lowering of educational quality due to insufficient language skills among teaching staff and the cancellation of higher quality programs offered in local languages.

AN OPTIMISTIC AND MORE THOUGHT-THROUGH FUTURE FOR ETBs

Overall, research shows that most actors are positive about ETBs, both at the institutional and national levels. As one interviewee hypothesizes, this could be partly because ETBs have not yet reached a critical mass in most European countries (unlike in the Netherlands) and are not seen as a particularly controversial topic for analysis and discussion. The interviewees believe that their HEIs will continue offering ETBs in the future and that the demand and, as a result, the supply of such programs will continue to increase globally. At the same time, interviewees recognize a growing need to be strategic about their ETB offering and to identify niche programs. The future is likely to bring both quantitative and qualitative changes to ETBs in Europe, as well as, potentially, an increased discussion about the value of such programs when they become a more common feature of the education landscape. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10775>

Hybrid Internationalization in Korea: A Promising Development?

HEE KYUNG LEE AND BYUNG SHIK RHEE

Hee Kyung Lee is a graduate student in the Department of Education, Yonsei University, Seoul, Republic of Korea. E-mail: hkleez@yonsei.ac.kr. Byung Shik Rhee is professor of higher education and director of the Center for Global Higher Education, Department of Education, Yonsei University. E-mail: beyoung@yonsei.ac.kr.

Over the past several decades, a large number of students have participated in cross-border higher education, mostly in major English-speaking countries. However, students in developing countries are now looking for other options. Through inbound internationalization strategies such as increasing the use of English on campus, Korea has become one of those destination countries.

Recently, Korean higher education institutions (HEIs) have witnessed a new, fast-growing internationalization model that combines existing features of internationalization—the typical study-abroad model in which international students are taught in the host country’s primary language and the decade-long Korean internationalization model in which international students are educated in separate academic programs—with recently developed, demand-based educational programs. We would call this combination a demand-based, locally oriented, hybrid model of internationalization, or simply a *hybrid model*. Although it is too early to tell how good it is, we hope that our assessment will help HEIs in non-English speaking developing countries to explore new internationalization strategies.

THE LAST DECADE’S POPULAR APPROACH TO INTERNATIONALIZATION IN KOREA

To internationalize its HEIs, Korea has focused on creating “English-friendly” learning environments. HEIs have recruited foreign faculty from elite institutions and established English-speaking international colleges such as Underwood International College at Yonsei University. The number of courses taught in English continues to grow. For example, Pohang University of Science and Technology has become a bilingual campus that uses both Korean and English as formal academic and administrative languages.

Moreover, since 2005, the Korean government has been offering scholarships to incoming international students through the Study Korea Project. It has also created a global education hub by inviting five renowned univer-

sities from English-speaking developed countries, such as George Mason University and the State University of New York, to the Incheon Free Economic Zone. This internationalization approach has turned out to be quite successful: over a decade, the number of undergraduate, degree-seeking international students has increased from 9,835 in 2005 to 45,966 in 2017.

WHAT IS WRONG WITH THAT APPROACH?

Despite the unprecedented growth of international student enrollments in Korea, this decade-long strategy appears to be only partially successful, for three reasons. First, the use of EMI alone does not seem to attract incoming international students. Most of them are from Asian countries, mostly China, and are not interested in learning in English as much as studying in English-speaking countries. Studies show consistently that quite a few came to Korea because of the attractiveness of learning Korean culture and language.

Second, it may not be cost-effective in the long run. Because this strategy does not meet the academic demands of most incoming international students, Korean HEIs can only offer a limited academic environment to those students. Therefore, recruiting international students may require a supplemental, attractive scholarship program that is costly to both the government and participating HEIs.

To internationalize its HEIs, Korea has focused on creating “English-friendly” learning environments.

Third, Korea is not in a good position to showcase its English-friendly environment as a strength since English is not Korea’s primary academic language. Although a decent number of academic staff earned their final degrees in English-speaking countries, so did faculty in other countries. Any other country with financial and human resources can pursue this very same strategy. Overall, it is not as demand-driven, cost-effective, and competitive as we had hoped.

A RECENT DEVELOPMENT: AN EMERGING HYBRID MODEL

Recently, in Korea, a new model of internationalization has emerged, which we propose to call “demand-based, locally oriented, and hybrid,” or simply *hybrid*. As an example, Global Leaders College (GLC) at Yonsei University only accepts students whose educational background is unrelated to Korea. They take classes separate from the rest of the

students at the university. What is unique is that this institution has created, and teaches, what its students would like to take—a Korean culture and language program.

Why is the hybrid model better? First, it is more cost-effective. Since there is neither enrollment limit nor tuition cap for international students, participating HEIs can charge students more tuition and generate revenue. Cost saving is also possible because English-speaking faculty are no longer needed.

Second, this model secures benefits to both providers and receivers of the program. By offering programs tailored to the students’ academic needs, such as step-by-step Korean language support and a “Korean Language and Culture Education” major, GLC recognizes and respects the reason why international students chose to study in Korea. Faculty do not have to worry about the negative impact of English on the quality of their teaching. In fact, this is a model for any country wanting to use its unique advantages to internationalize its higher education.

IS IT SUSTAINABLE?

Adopting this hybrid model may mitigate the biased conception that non-Western countries can promote national competitiveness only by successfully integrating into the global academic network that communicates in English. Adopting it also values the strengths and competitive edge of each nation’s educational capacity. As the dominance of English is currently at stake with the rise of anti-immigration policies in the major English-speaking countries, leveraging Korean culture and language as a resource is novel and opportune.

But is this model sustainable? Perhaps. The popularity of Korean culture continues to be on the rise, as demonstrated during the PyeongChang 2018 Winter Olympics, with opening and closing ceremonies enlivened with K-pop music. But how long will Korean culture and language remain culturally attractive? Equally important is how right this strategy is—or perhaps the question should instead be about what should be sustained. This hybrid model does not solve the highlighted existing issue of internationalization, academic capitalism—it even contributes to maintaining it. It sounds right that HEIs should accommodate the demands of international students because students pay for them, but we should not let a market-driven approach prevail in internationalization endeavors. International students may have come simply to consume educational services. Nevertheless, HEIs have a social duty to foster cross-cultural and global understanding among students, especially those who cannot afford to study abroad, and the exclusive nature of this hybrid model, which limits interactions between international and local students, restricts

such opportunities. It is not mobility itself that should be sustained, but the students' experiences gained from the change of academic and social environment provided by mobility.

MOVING FORWARD

Korea has undoubtedly become a regional education hub, as it produces and furthers knowledge about Korean culture and language that incoming international students ask for. Although this strategy may bring more profit to HEIs, English-driven internationalization strategies will also remain important. Not only do they provide a valuable learning experience for domestic students, but English is the academic language of the current era.

For the hybrid model to become sustainable, we need to make it more inclusive and help international students not only to feel satisfied during college but also to thrive after graduation. Students should gain something long lasting and meaningful for the money and time they invested in the program. As a result of their diplomas, have they become more tolerant toward cultural differences? Moving forward, are they able to utilize such attitudes at work and in daily activities? When adequately addressing these limitations, the model can serve as a complement to the English-driven internationalization model popular in non-English speaking countries. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10788>

National Policies and the Role of English in Higher Education

XINYAN LIU

Xinyan Liu is a master's degree student in the International Higher Education program at Boston College, US. E-mail: liupm@bc.edu.

This essay is based on a study with the same title, commissioned by the International Association of Universities (IAU) in Paris, and accessible at [HYPERLINK "mailto:liupm@bc.edu"liupm@bc.edu](mailto:liupm@bc.edu).

As the impact of globalization widens and deepens, higher education worldwide has been actively responding by internationalizing tertiary institutions. The use of English as medium of instruction (EMI) has been one among many initiatives undertaken. That is partially attributed to the status of English as the current lingua franca of the aca-

demical community in research, publishing, and teaching.

The status of local language(s) in non-English-speaking societies is sensitive to the introduction of English as the main language of knowledge production, especially in regions or countries that have faced various forms of oppression. The preservation of the language and culture of minority groups or of the main national group can be impacted, depending on how English-medium policies are implemented. The use of EMI cannot be analyzed independently from the broader national language policy. With responsibilities to ensure both equity and access, and to contribute to global knowledge in a visible way, many non-English-speaking countries are facing a dilemma.

The applicability of EMI varies greatly depending on the general development of higher education.

Past research and debate have mostly focused on northern European countries, as they were among the first to introduce EMI. With English spreading globally with unmatched momentum and speed, it is crucial to examine the impact of the phenomenon on a larger scale. In this article, we broaden the discussion by including a diverse group of countries including Brazil, France, Malaysia, South Africa, and Spain. The two key aspects discussed here concern existing national policies regarding language in higher education in the target countries and the role of English in their respective higher education systems.

LOCAL LANGUAGES VS ENGLISH

In relation to the development of EMI, some themes are consistent throughout the five countries of the study, but there are also significant differences. The fact that fluency in English boosts employability considerably has become a strong incentive for higher education institutions, since they are responsible for educating the workforce for a knowledge-based labor market. In particular, employability also implies mobility, in step with rising global trade relations and collaborations. South Africa shows higher employability rates for graduates who are proficient in English. In Malaysia, students *feel* that English proficiency is essential to find a job or get a promotion.

While this might be an evident conclusion to draw, research finds considerable value in maintaining local languages in South Africa, Malaysia, and in the Catalan and Basque regions in Spain. Local languages serve as an im-

portant national/regional solidarity symbol and are necessary to access public service positions. In addition, a strong command of one's mother tongue facilitates learning a second language.

In the five countries of the study, how the government chooses to address EMI in the national education system greatly influences attitudes toward language, access, equity, and the effectiveness of the policy. South Africa is linguistically diverse and the government claims to promote progressive policies regarding multilingualism. Yet the lack of resources and the sensitive connection of the issue with racism are significant obstacles. Malaysia has a multiethnic population among which the national language is well accepted as a unifying tool, but who gets to learn English depends on social class. France counts several regional languages, with French as the national language; a particular challenge nowadays is the rise of a number of immigrant languages, and it is unclear how the government will institutionalize multilingualism going forward. In Spain, minority languages also have considerable political presence in the regions where they are spoken, and the population is trying to adapt to English.

These societal realities bear on the populations' attitudes toward languages, which could translate into the successful acquisition of a language or in abandoning one. Regardless of the policy direction, if individuals do not identify with a certain practice, trying to enforce a policy will not be effective. For example, if people in South Africa feel that Afrikaans carries colonial connotations, or if people in Catalonia feel that Castilian (standard Spanish) is a symbol of a central government with which they no longer identify, the status of these languages may become threatened. Education plays a strong role in promoting diversity and teaching tolerance, and the practice of multilingualism at higher education institutions could serve as a good example for the larger society.

APPLICABILITY OF EMI IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The applicability of EMI varies greatly depending on the general development of higher education, how many resources the government is able to put forth, and how much the population is prepared to invest in learning. Among the five countries of the study, Spain and France have mature higher education systems. Under the EU umbrella, their status as developed countries guarantees financial security and political support; local languages are strongly prevalent and introducing English is a successful endeavor. The situation is different in Brazil, Malaysia, and South Africa. These are former colonies, which has an impact on the current state of national economic development. Local languages could be pushed into the periphery if the use of English is

further promoted, with all of the benefits it brings. In South Africa and Malaysia, introducing English is not a new policy. The struggle lies in whether it is a good idea for the system as a whole to accept the potential traumatic baggage that comes with extensively using a colonial language and recognizing it as an indispensable tool in the world today, at the expense of the effort to indigenize and reclaim a culture and a social order that was lost.

These three countries are also confronted with a higher level of social inequality. In Brazil and Malaysia especially, where foreign language education in the public system is less than adequate, the wealthy can afford English language courses and succeed in university or on the job market. Inequality is perpetuated. In South Africa, the interaction between class and race is magnified, given the history of apartheid.

There are no simple solutions to any of the obstacles mentioned above when introducing EMI. Furthermore, the process needs to be constantly reviewed with a critical eye for its potentially long-lasting impact on the higher education and knowledge system. Each national context comes with a unique set of historical and societal factors that influence stakeholders differently within the system, which makes it valuable to conduct global comparative research on this topic, to encourage learning from each other's victories and mistakes. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10792>

Malaysia's National Language Policy and Graduate Employability

VISWANATHAN SELVARATNAM

Viswanathan Selvaratnam is the former director of the Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development (RIHED) and a former higher education specialist at the World Bank. E-mail: selvaratnam432@gmail.com.

Malaysia's public-private higher education providers graduate over 200,000 candidates yearly. One in five remains unemployed—the equivalent of 35 percent of the country's youth. The National Graduate Employability Blueprint, 2012–2017, highlights that over 50 percent of the graduates are below par in terms of competency in subject knowledge, languages (English in particular), communication and writing skills, and work attitude. The 2013

JobStreet.com survey points out that 70 percent of employers are of the opinion that the quality of the country's recent graduates is average and that their command of English is poor.

The mismatch between demand and supply of high-quality human capital is preventing Malaysia from fulfilling its aspiration to be a creative, innovative, technology savvy, and export-oriented high-income country by 2020. The new Pakatan Harapan (Alliance of Hope) government has postponed that goal to 2023.

MALAYSIA'S HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM

Malaysia's public-private higher education provision is politically driven with varied sources of funding and a racially polarized student enrollment. Public provision is highly subsidized and driven by a politically resolute, race-based, affirmative action strategy, with the national language as the teaching medium. Since independence, English has been a compulsory second language in public schools. However, in the last four decades, it has been undermined by poor quality teaching and usage. This has drastically hampered schools from preparing students for tertiary education in English, for them to keep pace with the accelerating growth in new global knowledge and compete in the fast changing graduate labor market.

The expectation was that competition among for-profit and market-oriented providers with English as teaching medium would produce quality human capital to meet the economy's skill needs. On the contrary, all these education providers are drivers of credentials and of quantity over quality. Can these private-public providers, essentially driven by overpowering political and economic motives, generate the right mix of high-quality human capital to meet the needs of a technology savvy and knowledge-driven economy?

SUPPLY-DEMAND MISMATCH AND GROWING UNEMPLOYMENT

The outcry from both the public and private sectors is that the country's universities are educating graduates with insufficient English language skills and mental building blocks to think constructively—capabilities that Malaysian industrial and service sector employers are in dire need of. As the demand for skilled workers with a global awareness increases, many top companies recruit almost exclusively Malaysian graduates returning from selective overseas English-medium universities, rather than from the country's more insular institutions.

Recently, a lawmaker pointed out that apart from their communication, interpersonal, and leadership skills, thousands of public university graduates were unemployable by the private sector primarily because of their poor command of English. The government had to recruit them into

the highly bloated public service. The failure of thousands of local university graduates to secure employment due to their poor command of English—their inability to “string a sentence together in English”—was reiterated by the former chief minister of the East Malaysian State of Sarawak, the late Adenan Satem. To mitigate the problem of “graduates without a future,” the chief minister made English Sarawak's second official language.

The National Graduate Employability Blueprint highlights the mismatch between the supply and demand of graduates in the labor market and emphasizes that employability rates “remain poor and unimproved.” The Malaysian Employers Federation too points out that graduate unemployment is a serious problem. Poor command of English is singled out as the primary reason for employability decline.

The outcry from both the public and private sectors is that the country's universities are educating graduates with insufficient English language skills and mental building blocks to think constructively.

To boost employment, the former Barisan national government instituted the 1 Malaysia Training Scheme and the Graduate Employability Management Scheme. It is perplexing how public university graduates have to be retrained, at taxpayers' expense, while the education system is not able to correct the deficiencies, despite nearly 6 percent of the country's GDP being spent on education.

DECLINE IN TEACHING AND USAGE OF ENGLISH

Singapore has retained English as medium of instruction at all levels of its education provision with the aim of keeping pace with the fast evolving global knowledge and market systems. Malaysia, inversely, made Bahasa Malaysia the main medium of instruction to counterbalance the linguistic imperialism of the English language. However, unlike South Korea, it has failed to turn Bahasa Malaysia into a main vehicle of scientific scholarship.

Although English has been a compulsory second language since independence, patriotic sentiments combined with national political exigencies and teaching incompetency have progressively resulted in a greater usage of Bahasa Malaysia, while English, these past forty years, has been allowed to decline drastically among school leavers, tertiary education students, and the academic community.

Most non-English-speaking countries aspiring to keep abreast with a rapidly globalizing world have made English the first foreign language in their schools. For instance, English is taught from primary level upward at Dutch, Chinese, and Indian schools. In China, the demand for English competency is surging, particularly among upper tier higher education institutions. Malaysia's ASEAN neighbor and competitor, Vietnam, has identified English-medium education as key to improving the quality of its rapidly expanding tertiary institutions. In addition, Vietnam states that English is crucial to its larger aim of modernizing and internationalizing the economy. The Indian National Knowledge Commission of 2009 emphasized that "an understanding and command over the English language is the most important determinant of access to higher education, employment possibilities, and social opportunities. School leavers who are not adequately trained in English as a language are always at a handicap in the world of higher education." English is a key requirement to secure social mobility and high-wage employment in highly competitive areas such as commerce, finance, trade, technology, and science, among others. The British Council reckons that English is spoken at a working level by some 1.75 billion people, a quarter of the world's population.

Malaysia's effort to develop into a modern, technological savvy, and export-driven nation depends on strengthening its human capital. Competency in the English language guarantees access to the latest scientific discoveries and developments. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10776>

International Faculty in Japan

FUTAO HUANG

Futao Huang is professor at the Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University, Japan. E-mail: futao@hiroshima-u.ac.jp.

Since the 1980s, hiring international faculty has been used by national higher education systems across the world as an effective strategy to improve their universities' standing in global rankings and their international competitiveness. Accordingly, and as a result of new global and national contextual factors, the profile of international faculty has undergone tremendous changes in terms of work roles as well as perceptions of internationalization of higher

education in their host countries. Japan is no exception.

Unlike in other East Asian countries, international faculty have a historic role in Japanese higher education. As early as the late nineteenth century, Japan invited a large number of foreign experts, scholars, and professionals from the United Kingdom, the United States, Germany, and France in an effort to establish a modern society and higher education system based on Western models. Post-WWII, the introduction of the US general education ideal to Japanese universities required them to hire international faculty, especially from English-speaking countries, to provide foreign language programs to Japanese students. Subsequently, the implementation of the 1982 act for "Employing Foreign Full-time Faculty at National and Local Public Universities" made it possible for public sector institutions to employ international faculty full-time and with tenure, and allowed them to be involved in administrative matters at their institutions. In recent years, recruiting international faculty has also been used as an effective way to enhance the quality and international competitiveness of Japanese higher education. These factors have contributed to a rise in the number of international faculty at Japanese universities: national statistics show that the number of full-time international faculty increased from 940 (0.9 percent of all faculty) in 1979 to 8,262 (4.5 percent of all faculty) in 2017. In light of this significant increase, this article analyzes the changes that occurred in their personal and professional profiles, in their motivations for coming to work to Japan, and in their perceptions of the labor market, based on a comparison of findings from national surveys conducted in 1979 by Professor Kazuhiro Kitamura and in 2017 by the author.

MORE ASIANS AND MORE WOMEN IN THE HARD SCIENCES

In terms of country of origin, the first survey shows that in 1979, international faculty came predominantly from the United States (39.1 percent), followed by the United Kingdom (17.1 percent), Germany (15 percent), Spain (7.7 percent), France (6.6 percent), China (4.4 percent), and South Korea (2.7 percent). By contrast, the second survey shows that in 2017, the largest groups came from China (22.2 percent), followed by the United States (18.8 percent), South Korea (13.2 percent), the United Kingdom (8.2 percent), Canada (4.8 percent), Germany (3.8 percent), Australia (2.8 percent), France (1.8 percent), and Taiwan (1.7 percent). In terms of gender, the number of female faculty increased from 20.7 percent in 1979 to 26.4 percent in 2017. In terms of disciplines, in 1979, the subject areas of international faculty in Japan were mostly languages (33.4 percent), followed language and literature (26.1 percent), and literature (17.4 percent). In 2017, while the humanities were still the most

common discipline areas of foreign faculty (39.4 percent), the natural sciences constituted the second largest group (25.5 percent), followed by the social sciences (18.2 percent) and life sciences (7.3 percent). As for academic rank, in 1979, foreign lecturers who solely taught language teaching programs were the most numerous (34.9 percent), followed by professors (23.7 percent), lecturers (15.8 percent), associate professors (14.7 percent), guest professors (9 percent), and assistant professors (0.8 percent). Because of a rapid decline in the numbers of foreign lecturers, in 2017 the largest proportion of international faculty were professors (35.6 percent), followed by associate professors (29.6 percent), assistant professors (18.1 percent), and lecturers (13.6 percent).

As early as the late nineteenth century, Japan invited a large number of foreign experts, scholars, and professionals.

MOTIVATIONS AND RECRUITMENT

As for their motivations for coming to Japan, in both surveys the largest numbers of respondents stated that they were attracted to Japanese universities for academic or professional reasons (64.9 percent in 1979 and 78.9 percent in 2017), while a significant and growing proportion expressed having an affinity with Japanese life and culture (31 percent in 1979 and 64.8 percent in 2017). In 2017, the majority stated that they had decided to teach or do research in Japan due to better living conditions there than in their home country (37.7 percent, against only 1.9 percent in 1979), as a result of fortuitous circumstances (29.3 percent, against 14.9 percent in 1979), or because of difficulties finding employment in their home country (21.2 percent against 4.6 percent in 1979).

Significant differences could be identified in terms of how these faculty had been recruited. According to the 1979 survey, the majority were hired through personal contacts (58.7 percent), through an intermediate agency (16.1 percent), or by applying directly to the institution through the public or international advertisement of a position (8.5 percent). In contrast, the 2017 data indicates that as many as 64.7 percent applied directly to the institution, followed by hiring through personal contacts (30.5 percent), and through an intermediate agency (0.8 percent). On the one hand, international faculty have become more successful in applying through public or international advertisements.

On the other hand, there is evidence that the Japanese academic market has become increasingly open to international faculty, accepting direct applications from international faculty without relying on personal networking.

This is also supported by the respondents. For example, as many as 71.7 percent of international faculty in 1979 believed that the Japanese academic market was closed to international candidates, while in the 2017 survey only 37.4 percent held such views. Further, they seem to “matter more” in their academic environment. In the 1979 survey, nearly half of the respondents (47.5 percent) answered that in general, Japanese faculty were indifferent to their international colleagues, compared to 36 percent in 2017.

CONCLUSION

The two surveys demonstrate that considerable changes have occurred in the profiles, recruitment pathways, and perceptions of international faculty in Japan. Japanese universities are attracting significantly more international faculty from neighboring countries than 30 years ago, and have become more of a regional hub. In addition, it appears that international faculty are now playing work roles that are similar to local faculty, rather than predominantly engaging in language teaching as the majority did in the late 1970s. However, there are no significant changes in their motivations for coming to Japan. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10777>

The International Baccalaureate in Japan

YUKIKO ISHIKURA

Yukiko Ishikura is lecturer at the Center for the Study of Higher Education and Global Admissions (CHEGA), Osaka University, Japan. E-mail: ishikura@chega.osaka-u.ac.jp.

The research work leading to this article was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP40762414.

The International Baccalaureate (IB) offers internationally recognized programs that prepare students to think and act critically and independently as internationally competent individuals. In recent years, the IB has undergone a rapid expansion worldwide. According to the IB Organization, the number of IB programs across the globe increased by 39.3 percent between 2012 and 2017, as more educational systems have recognized the value of nurturing globally prepared citizens. This trend is manifest in Japan, which

has recently witnessed an expansion of IB schools as a result of a range of government initiatives. This article sheds light on the global trend of IB expansion seen through the lens of the Japanese experience and addresses challenges and opportunities that this shift has brought to Japanese higher education.

In 2011, the Japanese government announced an ambitious initiative called the “IB 200 Schools Project” aimed at increasing the number of IB Diploma Programmes (IBDP) to 200 over the next five years. IB curricula that value inquiry-based learning and critical thinking fit with the government’s longstanding goal for secondary and tertiary education: transforming the country’s teaching and learning approaches from knowledge-based to inquiry-based learning and fostering internationally competent citizens.

Although universities may open a special IB admissions track, there is increasing concern as to whether IB students can fit in the Japanese college education context.

The first IB school in Japan was established in 1979. Subsequently, the number of IB schools in the country increased only slowly. Before the announcement of the new government initiative in 2011, there were only 11 IBDP schools; these were mainly international schools (nine were international and two were One Article secondary schools, which follow national curriculum requirements). Because of the limited number of international schools in Japan, there was a significant need to involve more Article One schools to reach the goal of 200 IB schools. However, the IB language of instruction, English, was a major hindering factor.

In order to lessen the language burden, the Dual Language IBDP was introduced via joint initiatives by the Japanese government and the IB Organization, with a slight revision of postponing the project’s initial target year to 2018. Although the introduction of the Dual Language IBDP has supported the IB 200 Schools Project, a further revision of the targeted goal was made in 2016; the new goal seeks to establish 200 IB schools, including Primary Year Programme (PYP) and Middle Year Programme (MYP), by 2020. As of 2018, there are a total of 58 IB schools (including PYP, MYP, and DP) in Japan, compared to just 17 IB schools before 2011. Japan needs more time and effort

to reach the target goal, but it has demonstrated remarkable progress in dramatically increasing the number of IB schools in a short period.

While the current initiatives are undoubtedly pushing Japan toward change, challenges have arisen regarding the transition from IB to Japanese colleges. IBDP has been formally recognized by the Japanese government as a college qualification since 1979, yet many in the educational system do not embrace it fully. A key problem in Japan was that IBDP credentials were recognized differently depending on students’ backgrounds. However, this situation has recently changed due to the impact of the spread of IB in Japan.

ALIGNMENT BETWEEN IB AND JAPANESE COLLEGES

Private universities have led the trend toward recognizing the IB Diploma for college admission in Japan, while national and public universities have lagged behind. As a result, there is a significant flow of local IB students applying to and entering local private universities or even overseas universities. National and public universities have offered local IB students limited admission pathways: admissions for returnee students and regular admissions. The former pathway is for Japanese expatriates who are educated outside Japan and then return. The latter is for those who are Japanese nationals without any overseas experience. This regular admission pathway requires all students to take a national examination. Thus, IB students need to take both the IB final examination and the Japanese national examination. This dual testing has been a major reason why local IB students choose either local private universities or overseas universities.

For IB students to succeed at the national examination, they need to prepare completely differently than for the IB final examination. There is a gap between ways of teaching and learning favored in Japanese general schools and those preferred in the IB curriculum. The general Japanese curriculum accentuates knowledge-based learning, whereas IB emphasizes inquiry-based learning and critical thinking.

In order to solve the issue, national universities are beginning to offer IB graduates special admissions pathways that do not require dual testing. The IB special admission pathway is usually reserved for those who complete the IBDP with a high level of Japanese proficiency—students are required to complete Japanese A or B in order to study in a Japanese-medium university program. Moreover, most universities set a quota on the IB admissions track, specified as *Jyakkan mei* in Japanese, which means “a few” or “a small number.” This expression does not indicate a specific number but includes a signal that only limited numbers of students shall be admitted.

Universities are usually very careful when launching new admission pathways that may attract a student population they never previously accepted. College admissions play an important role in Japan, as the culture dictates that colleges have the responsibility to take good care of students and ensure that they complete their studies in four years. Indeed, the college attrition rate is low in Japan—just 2.65% according to a 2012 government survey. To ensure that they are able to fulfill this social compact, universities select students with great sensitivity and care.

Although universities may open a special IB admissions track, there is increasing concern as to whether IB students can fit in the Japanese college education context. This has become a major motivation in the government's push to reexamine teaching and learning approaches in secondary and tertiary education, using IB as a tool to promote change.

MOVING FORWARD

The government has been a key driver for educational reform in Japan, attempting to bring about a variety of changes in Japanese secondary and tertiary education via various projects. The IB 200 Schools Project has brought many challenges to the current Japanese educational culture. However, depending on how those challenges are dealt with, they could turn into opportunities for Japan to transform.

IBDP is known as a program for college readiness. There have been many discussions on how students can be prepared for college education, but only rarely have educators discussed how colleges could be made ready for students. The student population is becoming more diverse; as they enter college, these students bring with them different expectations of teaching and learning. It is time for colleges to consider how their educational patterns should be changed in response to the changing student population.

Though this article has focused on IB students in particular, the argument could easily be applied to the overall college student population. By attempting to better meet the needs of IBDP students, universities could enhance the satisfaction of not only international students but also Japanese students, improving the educational experience and outcomes of all. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10778>

Japan: World-Class Universities for Social Innovation Ask Not What Your Country Can Do for You...

AKIYOSHI YONEZAWA

Akiyoshi Yonezawa is professor and vice-director of the International Strategy Office at Tohoku University, Japan. E-mail: akiyoshi.yonezawa.a4@tohoku.ac.jp.

A new world-class university policy was introduced in Japan in 2017. The government selected six out of 86 national universities to be Designated National Universities, all with long research traditions—this list includes the University of Tokyo, Kyoto University, Tohoku University, the Tokyo Institute of Technology, Nagoya University, and Osaka University. These chosen institutions have been given a “distinguished” legal status, different from all other national universities that already experience significant advantages in national government funding—they are quite distinct from the 90 local public universities and 604 private universities in Japan. Designated National Universities are expected to be competitive with leading universities worldwide. What then can the national government do for them and what are these selected universities expected to do?

NOT THE FIRST ATTEMPT

This is not the first attempt at creating world-class universities in Japan. In fact, Japan is recognized for having been actively engaged in world-class university policy through a series of governmental projects and excellence initiatives: for example, 21st Century Centers of Excellence (2002–2009), Global Centers of Excellence (2007–2014), Global 30 (2009–2015), and Top Global Universities (2014 onward).

In contrast with emerging institutions in neighboring China, Singapore, and South Korea, Japan's flagship universities have gradually slipped down in the rankings over the last two decades. Two reasons are always highlighted: the slow pace of internationalization of universities and society as a whole and the shortage of financial investment. While the two first Centers of Excellence projects mentioned above were funded by direct investment to research clusters, impact was not significant, partly because the basic infrastructure of science and technology at Japanese universities had already been established before the launch of these projects, namely, in the 1990s after the economic

culmination of the country. From 2007, the World Premier International Research Centre Initiatives targeted only a few research institutes with much more concentrated investments. It is still too early to measure the exact impact of these initiatives on research and universities and on the country as a whole.

The Global 30 project ultimately supported 13 universities because of policy changes after the financial crisis of 2008. The Top Global University project now supports 13 universities in their efforts to be globally competitive, and another 24 universities as leading examples of internationalization. These projects are not funding research excellence but are enhancing the internationalization of universities through key performance indicators such as employing international researchers and enhancing the English language proficiency of students and staff.

Designated National Universities are expected to be competitive with leading universities worldwide.

When the Top Global University project was launched in 2014, the government declared that the policy's goal was to propel 10 Japanese universities among the top 100 in world rankings. Indeed, the profiles of flagship universities in Japan, for example in terms of the proportion of international students and staff, appeared low in global university rankings, and remain poor even now. The slow internationalization of Japanese universities largely reflects the slow internationalization of the whole education system and of the labor market within this country.

AT THE CORE OF NATIONAL INNOVATION POLICY

The Japanese government is now trying to use research universities as a key driver of national economic development and promotes an integrated economic and financial policy linked with industrial innovation. Top research universities are now attracting attention not only from the ministry of education, culture, science, and technology, but also from cabinet office departments such as the Council for Science, Technology, and Innovation and the Council on Economic and Fiscal Policy.

Compared with previous excellence initiatives and internationalization schemes, the selection of Designated National Universities focuses much more on an institution's capacity to set a vision and plan and implement changes

that will enable it to achieve world-leading status. Applicant universities were asked to present a self-assessment of their strengths and weaknesses; of their achievement of goals based on benchmarks within good practice and performance measurement; of their strategies to implement leading research and human resource development; and of their contributions to the economy and to society by addressing global and national challenges. The guidelines stipulated that the universities cover topics such as human resource acquisition and development, improvements to research capacity and university governance, strengthening financial foundations, international collaboration, and links to the wider society.

...ASK WHAT YOU CAN DO FOR YOUR COUNTRY

Takeshi Sasaki, chair of the Designated National University project review committee, has expressed concern about the vulnerable financial foundation of even top research universities in Japan. His wish is to see public support expanded and assistance from society significantly increased, in particular through donations from the business community and individuals, with backing from the government.

However, in reality, the new "designated" status does not automatically guarantee drastic financial advantages. The amount of public funding directly linked to the scheme constitutes only a small portion of the universities' running costs, at around 0.2 percent of their annual income. Rather, the government expects the selected universities to engage more actively in income generation from nongovernmental sources, for instance from philanthropic donations and university–industry cooperation. The underlying message is that developing management capacity within universities is the only sustainable pathway for them to achieve world-class status, and that institutions are required to contribute directly to the development of the national knowledge economy. Here, the government's message to the universities seems to be, "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country," as stated by US President John F. Kennedy in his 1961 inaugural address. In that respect, the proposal and implementation of this particular scheme has stimulated a systemic discussion about how a university can establish, and contribute to, a virtuous circle between its development and its socioeconomic impact.

In contrast to the officially expressed vision, cabinet level support for the policy appears to strengthen governmental intervention in university governance and management—adding contribution to economic development through industry relations and innovation to education and research as a core function of a university. This new challenge for aspiring world-class universities—the expectation of generating their own income—appears to be a risk-taking

policy, in light of the uncertainty surrounding the complex mechanism linking long-term knowledge activities at the universities and industrial commercialization. Of particular note: the Japanese business environment is largely under the dominance of global enterprises typically based in the United States. It is becoming apparent that universities will have to struggle and fight to gain their financial autonomy and, ultimately, define their new identity. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10779>

The Recent Crisis in South African Universities

JONATHAN JANSEN AND CYRILL WALTERS

Jonathan Jansen is Distinguished Professor of education at Stellenbosch University in the Western Cape, South Africa. E-mail: jonathan-jansen@sun.ac.za. Cyrill Walters is postdoctoral fellow at Stellenbosch University. E-mail: cyrillwalters@sun.ac.za.

In 2015–2016, South African universities experienced the most intense and violent student protests in a century of higher education. Most analysts attribute the widespread campus protests to two factors: the alienating cultures of historically white universities, associated with the movement labelled #RhodesMustFall (#RMF); and the discriminatory cost of higher education, which gave rise to a movement known as #FeesMustFall (#FMF).

The #RMF protests started in March 2015 at South Africa's premier institution of higher education, the University of Cape Town (UCT), when undergraduate student Chumani Maxwele set off a wave of protest by throwing human excrement on a statue of the nineteenth-century British colonialist Cecil John Rhodes—a statue that paid tribute to a man who came to embody the dreams, aspirations, and superiority complex of imperial Britain, leading to the colonial dispossession and oppression of Africans. Rhodes was a British imperialist who acquired vast mineral wealth and created the colony of Rhodesia. It was the same Rhodes who provided funding for the creation of UCT as well as Rhodes University in the Eastern Cape. After the #RMF protesters succeeded in having the statue of Rhodes removed from campus, the movement's demands expanded further to the transformation of institutional symbolism (such as artworks), the hiring of more black professors, and what was called “the decolonization of curriculum.”

The #FMF revolt against high tuition fees started in October 2015 at another major research institution, the University of the Witwatersrand, in Johannesburg. Students protested against the growing costs of tuition, which limited access to higher education and left graduates with considerable debt. The students eventually “won” their case as the besieged, corrupt, and populist President of South Africa unexpectedly declared—against the advice of two official commissions—that higher education would be free for poor students.

THE COSTS OF THE STUDENT REVOLT

These two streams of “fallist” protests (Rhodes and fees) merged into a powerful student movement that gave a sense of urgency to the transformation of the seven historically white universities and to the opening up of access to higher education for poor students, especially in the eight historically black universities. But the protests came at a huge cost to South African institutions. Fires raged across campuses as buildings were set alight, including libraries, computer centers, student residences, and administration buildings. Estimates of the damage run from R 800 million to R 2 billion (\$55 million to \$137 million). Weeks of lecturing time were lost at several universities, leading to emergency arrangements for teaching and tight security for examinations. Staff and students were traumatized by the intensity of the protests, which included constant disruptions of classes and much physical intimidation, as well as by the actions of the police and security forces called in to contain the disturbances.

There were many personal tragedies. A petrol bomb was lobbed through the window of a vice-chancellor's office. A tragic suicide of a leading medical scientist grabbed national attention. This professor was also the first black dean of his faculty of health sciences and his death was attributed by his family to the personal trauma he suffered at the hands of protesting students, who occupied his office and insulted him. At another university, a worker died as a result of an asthma attack after students discharged a fire extinguisher in an enclosed space. A policeman and security guard were trapped inside a booth when it was set alight by students. At UCT, one security guard was severely beaten with an iron rod, and another's skull was fractured when a protester dropped a brick on his head from four floors above.

At the major universities, international contracts and much-needed revenue were lost as students from universities abroad cancelled their study visits to South African campuses. Leading academics, including vice-chancellors, went into retirement or took jobs at universities abroad. And relationships among academics; between academics

and management; and between students, academic staff, and the university leadership, were fundamentally changed in the wake of these violent and prolonged protests.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROTESTS FOR ACADEMIC CULTURE(S)

There is no doubt that the protests raised crucial issues of financial access and racial inclusion in post-apartheid universities. In this context, the protests should be seen as a gift to society and a much-needed push toward transforming hard-to-change institutions. But what else was lost in the fire? The Academy of Science of South Africa launched a seminar forum to deliberate on the way in which campus cultures changed after the 2015–2016 protests. From these deliberations, it became clear that all of the public universities were much changed. At historically black campuses, violence and disruptions continued from one week to the next. At some historically white campuses, there were reported incidents of whites being excluded from public events or being asked to leave certain lectures. Works of art have been vandalized and covered up in some cases, including the

The #FMF revolt against high tuition fees started in October 2015 at another major research institution, the University of the Witwatersrand.

works of progressive and black artists; such acts have raised the alarm of creeping censorship on university campuses. The Danish journalist Flemming Rose was disinvited from, ironically, the Academic Freedom Lecture at the University of Cape Town; Rose drew controversy by having published cartoons of the Prophet Mohammed in Denmark some 10 years ago. And at one Johannesburg university, academic teaching staff have to report on how much they have done to “decolonize” their curricula.

The physical damage to university buildings will be repaired and rebuilt over time. Much harder will be dealing with the psychological and emotional trauma that the protests left in their wake. But the more serious consequences of the 2015–2016 student protest movement include the long-term threat to the very idea of a university as a place for the free expression of ideas; a space in which academic functions like teaching, learning, research, and public commitments can proceed without frequent and violent interruptions; and a forum in which knowledge transaction remains open ended and inclusive rather than subject to the

ideological dictates of any political movement or passing fad.

BROADER IMPLICATIONS OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN UNIVERSITY CRISIS

South Africa is not exceptional. Recent research identifies the key reasons for the demise of once great African universities as being political interference, financial crises, and chronic disruption to the academic project of the university. While most South African institutions seem to have entered a period of uneasy stability since the 2015–2016 protests, it is not at all clear whether the country’s 26 public universities will be able to rebuild the social, intellectual, and cultural capabilities that distinguished them from other kinds of public entities.

These wide-scale student protests also have direct implications for the Southern African region and the continent as a whole. Middle-class African students from outside South Africa see post-apartheid tertiary institutions as relatively stable and offering, through the local elite research universities, a nearby and more affordable option for quality higher education than Western Europe or the United States. In the same way, African scholars consider South Africa’s top universities as places where they may pursue their own academic careers. It is quite likely that this inflow of academic talent from the continent has also been threatened as a consequence of the 2015–2016 protest movement. Time will tell. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10780>

Student Pathways in South Africa

REBECCA SCHENDEL

Rebecca Schendel is lecturer in education and international development at the Institute of Education, University College London, UK. E-mail: r.schendel@ucl.ac.uk.

The content of this article represents the work of the Pathways project, a collaborative effort that will soon be published as Higher Education Pathways: South African Undergraduate Education and the Public Good (an African Minds publication).

Much is expected of higher education systems around the world; individual families pin their hopes on the

promise of social mobility, enabled by a university degree, while governments expect that economic and social returns will flow from an increase in the population of university graduates. The South African higher education system, however, shoulders an additional burden. After decades of being directly implicated in the apartheid system, higher education institutions across South Africa are now expected to play an active role in that society's "transformation." In the nearly 25 years since the end of apartheid, South African universities have played a central role in the transformation agenda. Institutions are now required to accept students from all backgrounds, and new hiring and funding policies have been introduced in an effort to transform the system's historical injustices.

A DISCONNECT BETWEEN RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

The dramatic student protests of the last few years, however, have highlighted the limitations of this transformation agenda. The South African higher education system remains highly unequal, with white students disproportionately represented in terms of both access to and success within higher education. The protests reflect the deep-seated frustration of students who feel that, despite years of inclusive rhetoric, it remains much more difficult for young black people to gain a university place, to complete a university degree, and to gain fulfilling employment following graduation—due both to financial barriers and to more symbolic issues, such as a curriculum that alienates students by continuing to privilege European ideas at the expense of local knowledge.

The frustration of many higher education researchers in South Africa is that none of the issues raised by the student protesters is new. In fact, all of them have been frequent topics of academic analysis throughout the past two decades. The fact that extensive research has not yet influenced policy in such a way as to satisfactorily address these issues raises alarm bells for all who believe that higher education research is important to illuminate challenges and help to formulate better ways forward.

EXPLORING RESEARCH GAPS THROUGH COLLABORATION

In 2015, a group of UK-based and South Africa-based researchers launched a collaborative project, which aimed to address this impasse by taking stock of what is currently known about higher education in South Africa. The project rested on three fundamental premises: 1) that higher education in South Africa should be contributing to the "public good" and that it should do so by enabling its students to have a positive impact on society; 2) that, despite the fact that students' individual experiences form a "pathway" through higher education, higher education research is lim-

ited by the tendency of individual studies to focus only on one stage within that pathway (i.e., on access to higher education, experiences within higher education, or outcomes of higher education); and 3) that there is value in bringing these largely independent strands of literature together, in order to better understand how pathways through higher education work for different students studying in different institutions. As a result of these orienting concepts, the project team chose not to undertake new empirical research but, instead, used project funding to bring participating researchers together at regular intervals over a three-year period to study what we currently know about higher education "for the public good" in South Africa.

When taken together, our analysis of the existing literature illuminated three main conclusions, two of which relate to the project's focus on student pathways and one that emerged from our final synthesis of existing research on South African higher education.

The project highlighted the significant lack of information about the more disadvantaged corners of South Africa's higher education system.

THINKING IN TERMS OF STUDENT "PATHWAYS"

First, thinking about existing research in terms of student "pathways" illuminated the multiple "moments" (aside from the oft-discussed moment of access) when students encounter damaging barriers that prevent them from achieving success and/or push them toward the kind of future that might be better understood as a public "bad" than a public good. Second, bringing access, experiences, and outcomes research together helped to highlight the ways in which institutional structures affect student pathways throughout higher education. Although each student's ability to access higher education (and to succeed within it) is affected by his or her material and family circumstances, the highly differentiated nature of South Africa's higher education system also plays a crucial role. South African universities remain deeply affected by their historical legacies and differ dramatically in terms of both mission and funding/resources, and these institutional differences profoundly affect student pathways, as they can either further exacerbate, or help students to overcome, the barriers presented by their personal circumstances.

A BIAS TOWARD BETTER-RESOURCED INSTITUTIONS

In addition, the project highlighted the significant lack of information about the more disadvantaged corners of South Africa's higher education system. The literature reviewed as part of the project was overwhelmingly focused on more advantaged institutions, most of which are historically white. This is, in some ways, not surprising, given that researchers in better-resourced institutions have more access to research funding and have stronger networks that enable them to publish their work, but it does have important implications for our ability to understand the system as a whole. If we know very little about the institutional culture of historically disadvantaged universities, for example, what can we really say about the ways in which institutional culture might disadvantage black students studying at different types of institutions?

CONCLUSION

These messages are not revolutionary in their own right, but they are strikingly absent from the current discourse, likely because they can only be drawn from a review of the field as a whole. Yet, such reviews are rare, given that faculty incentive structures prioritize individual empirical research over collaborative attempts to synthesize existing work. This tendency limits our ability to advise institutions as to how best to support students throughout their higher education careers.

Taken as a whole, these conclusions carry important implications for those interested in using research to strengthen future higher education policy and practice in South Africa, but they also invite reflection from higher education researchers outside the country. South Africa is certainly not alone in suffering from an exclusionary history of higher education, nor in struggling with highly unequal access to, experiences within, and outcomes of higher education. What is unusual is the particular emphasis on higher education within the national reconciliation and transformation agenda—and, as a result, the particular focus within the literature on higher education as a potentially transformative space. This focus offers an unusual perspective on issues that plague all unequal higher education systems. The rest of the world could learn much from the South African experience.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10781> ■

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

International Higher Education has an advisory board of distinguished higher education experts to provide insights, suggest topics, and increase the visibility of the publication. The Editorial Advisory Board is comprised of the following members:

Andres Bernasconi, Pontifical Catholic University of Chile, Chile

Eva Egron-Pollack, Former Secretary General, International Association of Universities, France

Ellen Hazelkorn, BH Consulting Associates, Ireland

Jane Knight, University of Toronto, Canada

Marcelo Knobel, University of Campinas, Brazil

Betty Leask, La Trobe University, Australia

Nian Cai Liu, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

Laura Rumbley, European Association for International Education, the Netherlands

Jamil Salmi, Global Tertiary Expert, Colombia

Damtew Teferra, University of Kwazulu-Natal, South Africa

Akiyoshi Yonezawa, Tohoku University, Japan

Maria Yudkevich, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Russia

NEW PUBLICATIONS

(Editor's note: We welcome suggestions from readers for books on higher education published especially outside of the United States and United Kingdom. This list was compiled by Jean Baptiste Diatta, graduate assistant at CIHE.)

Carnoy, Martin, Isak Froumin, Oleg Leshukov, and Simon Marginson, eds. *Higher Education in Federal Countries: A Comparative Study*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2018. pp. 478, \$114.75 (hb). Website: us.sagepub.com

Cupples, Julie, and Ramón Grosfoguel, eds. *Unsettling Eurocentrism in the Westernized University*. London, UK: Routledge, 2018. pp. 284, \$132.28 (hb). Website: <https://www.routledge.com>

Deardorff, Darla K., and Harvey Charles, eds. *Leading Internationalization: A Handbook for International Education Leaders*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2018. pp. 200, \$95.00 (hb). Website: <https://styluspub.presswarehouse.com>

Dikli, Semire, Brian Etheridge, and Richard Rawls, eds. *Curriculum Internationalization and the Future of Education*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2018. pp. 360, \$129.35 (hb). Website: <https://www.igi-global.com>

Ferreira, João J., Alain Fayolle, Vanessa Ratten, and Mario Raposo, eds. *Entrepreneurial Universities: Collaboration, education and policies*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2018. pp. 280, \$135 (hb). Website: <https://www.e-elgar.com>

Garcia, Manuel P., and Lucio De Sousa, eds. *Global History and New Polycentric Approaches – Europe, Asia and the Americas in a World Networking System*. Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018. pp. 352, \$25 (hb). Website: <https://www.palgrave.com/us>

German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). *Facts and Figures on the International Nature of Studies and Research in Germany*. Bonn: DAAD, 2018. pp. 169. Website: http://www.wissenschaftswelt.de/publikation/wiwe_2018_verlinkt.pdf

Hicks, Martin, Amy Kaufman, and Harvey P. Weingarten. *Assessing Quality in Postsecondary Education: International Perspectives*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2018. pp. 216, \$35.96 (pb). Website: <http://www.mqup.ca/>

Johnstone, Christopher J., and Li Li Ji, eds. *The Rise of China – U.S. International Cooperation in Higher Education – Views from the Field*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill Sense, 2018. pp. 224, \$45.00 (pb). Website: brill.com.

Lee, Susan, Robert A. Cole, Michael J Tyson, and Hilary Landorf. *Passport to Change: Designing Academically Sound, Culturally Relevant, Short-Term, Faculty-Led Study Abroad Programs*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2018. pp. 364, \$25.59 (pb). Website: <https://styluspub.presswarehouse.com>

Otieno, Iddah Aoko. *Kenyan Public Universities in the Age of Internationalization – Challenges and Prospects*. Lanham, MD: Lexington

Books, 2018. pp. 156, \$85.00 (hb). Website: rowman.com

Perna, Laura W., ed. *Taking It to the Streets: The Role of Scholarship in Advocacy and Advocacy in Scholarship*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 2018. pp. 160, \$27.95 (pb). Website: jhupbooks.press.jhu.edu

Phillips, Susan D., and Kevin Kinser, eds. *Accreditation on the Edge – Challenging Quality Assurance in Higher Education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 2018. pp. 216, \$35.96 (pb). Website: jhupbooks.press.jhu.edu

Rose, Shirley K., and Irwin Weiser, eds. *The Internationalization of US Writing Programs*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press, 2018. pp. 277, \$90 (hb). Website: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu>

Shin, Jung Cheol, Kehm, Barbara M., Jones, Glen A., eds. *Doctoral Education for the Knowledge Society – Convergence or Divergence in National Approaches?* Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 2018. pp. 255, \$159.99 (hb). Website: springer.com

Tran, Ly Thi, and Simon Marginson, eds. *Internationalisation in Vietnamese Higher Education*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 2018. pp. 261, \$99.99 (hb). Website: springer.com

Zajda, Joseph I., ed. *Globalization and Education Reforms – Paradigms and Ideologies*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2018. pp. 247, \$73.97 (hb). Website: springer.com

Zapp, Mike, Marcelo Marques, Justin J.W. Powell, Gert Biesta, and Jo B. Helgetun. *European Educational Research (Re)Constructed*. Oxford, UK: Symposium Books, 2018. pp. 254, £ 42.00 (pb). Website: <http://www.symposium-books.co.uk>



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

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

NEWS FROM CIHE



The fourth WES-CIHE Summer Institute on Innovative and Inclusive Internationalization will take place at Boston College on June 19–21, 2019.

This event will provide master's students, PhD students, and young professionals from around the world with opportunities to present their research and interact with experts on new developments in internationalization. A small number of scholarships for travel and accommodation will be available thanks to a grant from World Education Services. For further information, please contact ihe@bc.edu.

WES-CIHE Summer Institute: Innovative and Inclusive Internationalization

June 19-21, 2019



The Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE)

At the forefront of international higher education.

Subscribe

International Higher Education

<https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe>

Explore

Master of Arts in International Higher Education

<https://www.bc.edu/IHEMA>

Evolve

Graduate Certificate in International Higher Education

<https://www.bc.edu/IHECert>

Participate

Consider writing for one of our publications:

International Higher Education

<https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe>

The World View

<https://insidehighered.com/blogs/world-view>

Educación Superior en América Latina

<http://rcientificas.uninorte.edu.co/index.php/esal/>