

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

The journal is a reflection of the Center's mission to encourage an international perspective that will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. Through *International Higher Education*, a network of distinguished international scholars offers commentary and current information on key issues that shape higher education worldwide. *IHE* is published in English, Chinese, Russian, Portuguese, and Spanish. Links to all editions can be found at www.bc.edu/

International Issues

- 2 Does Higher Education Equalize Income Distribution?
Martin Carnoy
- 3 Branding Universities: Trends and Strategies
Gili S. Drori
- 5 Religion and Higher Education Achievement in Europe
Gaële Goastellec
- 6 Imagining the University
Ronald Barnett

For-Profit Higher Education

- 8 The For-Profit Motive
Andrés Bernasconi
- 10 Squeezing the Nonprofit Sector
Daniel C. Levy
- 12 The Quality-Profit Assumption
Kevin Kinser

Internationalization Themes

- 13 International Student Mobility in the United States
Christine A. Farrugia and Ashley Villarreal
- 15 China's Confucius Institutes—More Academic and Integrative
Qiang Zha
- 17 Finally, an Internationalization Policy for Canada
Roopa Desai Trilokekar and Glen A. Jones
- 19 Branch Campuses Weigh Start-up Options
David A. Stanfield

Latin American Perspectives

- 20 New Dynamics in Latin America
José Joaquín Brunner
- 23 Argentine Public Universities: Inefficient and Ineffective?
Marcelo Rabossi
- 24 Central America: The Value of International Academic Cooperation
Nanette Svenson
- 26 Mexico: Enrollment Competition, Accreditation, and the Public-Private Market
Juan Carlos Silas Casillas

Departments

- 28 New Publications
- 31 News of the Center

be suspect—as an imperfect logic. Simply because low-end, private-sector institutions are frequently seen making profits, from a poor product, this does not make quality and profit incompatible.

WHY THE QUALITY-PROFIT ASSUMPTION FAILS

Other routes to profitability do not require a low-quality product. The most familiar route is reducing costs for delivering an education program, gaining excess resources through improved instructional efficiencies. This could be done through increasing class sizes, standardizing curricula, and teaching practices, or accelerating time to degree through a modified academic calendar. Although efficiency may be a euphemism for cutting corners, it is also a strategy for reducing wasteful practices that can undermine more effective educational activities. A more efficient operation can serve the same number of students less expensively or more students at the same cost. Both are profitable outcomes for the private-sector provider that would not demand quality trade-offs.

A second route would offer programs that are already cheap to teach but priced higher by traditional comprehensive universities cross-subsidizing their own more expensive academic programs. The proliferation of business programs in private-sector institutions, for example, can be seen through this lens. These programs require no special tools or laboratory equipment, and the subject matter is well-established and accessible to nonspecialists. By itself, business is a low-cost program. But many traditional universities use revenue generated by business and other similar low-cost programs, in order to make higher-cost programs more affordable. Simply by not diverting this excess revenue to offset unprofitable programs, the private sector institutions' owners can earn a healthy return on their investments without reducing quality.

A third strategy that avoids the quality-profit connection is to reduce “frills” elsewhere at the university, thus grabbing profit from not having to support elaborate and expensive extracurricular activities. In the United States, the for-profit sector mostly avoids the typical amenities found on traditional campuses—such as athletic facilities, social organizations, and campus housing. Anything outside of the primary instructional mission can be eliminated, leaving all of the focus on the provision of a quality-academic program. Revenue that would go to support nonacademic features can then be converted directly to profit, and the integrity and quality of the program remain inviolate.

In these routes to profit, only in the first case should potential concerns about academic quality come into contention, and even then only if traditional curriculum delivery practices are determined to be essential to quality provision. The other profit strategies are taking advantage of the

pricing strategies common throughout higher education. The quality does not have to suffer, nor do educational expenditures have to be less, in order for excess revenue to be generated. They can provide essentially the same instructional product as the public sector, while earning profit by reducing expenditures for extraneous activities.

QUALITY AND STANDARDS

A key question remains, however. Which aspects of a university education are extraneous and which are intertwined with a quality academic program? For example, to help poorly prepared students to be successful, any institution would need to spend money on nonclassroom activities like academic services, support, advising, extra tutoring, and others. Teaching may be cheap, but the student body is often quite expensive.

To be clear, a robust regulatory regime can still serve a quality-assurance function. As the US case shows, specifically targeting for-profit higher education for regulatory attention may be necessary to arrest egregious violations of academic integrity in the name of profitability. Some activities are certainly illegitimate and should be prohibited. The aim of quality assurance, though, can be more than just the enforcement of minimum standards. It should be possible to discuss “good and better” without disparaging all but “the top.” The profit status of the institution may be one element considered in evaluating educational quality, but it should not be the decisive factor. ■

International Student Mobility in the United States

CHRISTINE A. FARRUGIA AND ASHLEY VILLARREAL

Christine A. Farrugia is senior research officer, Institute of International Education, New York. E-mail: cfarrugia@iie.org. Ashley Villarreal is research coordinator at the Institute of International Education. E-mail: avillarreal@iie.org.

The number of globally mobile students has nearly doubled over the past 10 years, from 2.1 million in 2001 to 4.1 million in 2011. According to *Open Doors 2012: Report on International Educational Exchange*, the United States hosted 764,795 international students in 2011/12, an increase of 3.7 percent from the previous year. International students in the United States now make up 19 percent of the world's

globally mobile students, and as university campus enrollments grow, so does the proportion of students enrolling in them from abroad. The number of US students studying abroad reached 273,996 in 2010/11, an increase of 1.3 percent over the prior year and an increase of 78 percent over the past 10 years.

The data in this article are drawn from *Open Doors 2012*, a statistical survey that reports on international students studying in the United States in 2011/12 and on US students studying abroad in 2010/11.

GROWTH RATES OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

For the fourth year in a row, China is again the top place of origin of international students in the United States, with 194,029 students, and continues to grow at a high rate (23.1%). The number of Saudi students in the United States also continues to increase, growing 50.4 percent over 2010/11, to reach 34,139. The mobility of Saudi students is the result of large-scale scholarship programs for education abroad, provided by the Saudi government. In the coming

International students in the United States now make up 19 percent of the world's globally mobile students.

years the number of Brazilian students in the United States is expected to increase as a result of the Brazil Scientific Mobility Program, which was launched in 2011. Students in this program began entering the United States in January 2012 and will be reflected in the *Open Doors 2013 Report*.

In contrast to government-driven reasons for large increases in students from countries like Saudi Arabia, growth from some countries is largely driven by student demand. One example is Iran, which in recent years, has shown a steady and significant growth in the number of students studying in the United States, despite the obstacles faced by Iranian students in studying abroad. Such restrictions include difficulties obtaining visas and transferring funds out of Iran for tuition and living expenses and US government restrictions on studying in certain scientific and technical fields. In 2011/12, there were 6,982 Iranian students in the United States, a 24 percent increase over the prior year and an increase of 150 percent over the past five years. From 1974/75 through 1982/83, Iran was the top sender of students to the United States, reaching a high of 51,310 students in 1979/80, but dropping to a low of 1,660 in 1998/99.

In 2011/12, modest declines were seen in students from several top places of origin. The number of students from India decreased for the second year in a row. In 2011/12, the number of Indian students decreased by 3.5 percent, following a decrease of 1.0 percent in 2010/11. The decline in the number of Indian students is likely due to the expansion of India's domestic higher education sector, a growing Indian economy that provides job opportunities for graduates, and a significant devaluation of the Indian Rupee. Other declines were seen in numbers of students from Taiwan (6.3%), Japan (6.2%), Canada (2.6%), and South Korea (1.4%).

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' ACADEMIC LEVELS

This year's *Open Doors* data reflect some notable shifts in enrollment patterns of international students by academic level. For the first time since 2000/01, the number of undergraduate students surpassed graduate enrollments, driven by large increases in undergraduates from China. The number of Chinese undergraduates in the United States reached 74,516 in 2011/12, a 30.8 percent increase over the previous year. A striking increase in nondegree study was seen in the number of students from Saudi Arabia, which increased by 95 percent over the previous year, reaching 13,214 students. The majority of these students were enrolled in Intensive English Programs, which portends continued growth in Saudi degree-seeking students, as some current nondegree students are likely to remain in the United States for undergraduate study.

US STUDENTS ABROAD

In 2010/11, 273,996 US students studied abroad for academic credit. The rate of growth of US students studying abroad slowed in 2010/11, increasing 1.3 percent, compared to a 3.9 percent growth reported in the prior year. Events in several host countries resulted in many study-abroad programs being cancelled, contributing to declines in certain key destinations. The tsunami in Japan in March 2011 contributed to a 33 percent decrease in US students, while a US State Department warning on travel to Mexico resulted in a 42 percent drop of US students studying there. The Arab Spring in 2011 likely impacted study abroad to North Africa, most notably Egypt, which experienced a 43 percent decline in US study-abroad students. During the same period, other countries in Asia and Latin America experienced large increases, including Costa Rica (15.5%), Brazil (12.5%), and South Korea (16.4%).

Over the past 20 years there has been increasing diversification in study-abroad destinations. In 1989/90, 76.7 percent of students studied abroad in Europe, while in 2010/11 just over half of students (54.6%) selected European destinations. English-speaking countries received just 21

percent of US students studying abroad in 2010/11, while many non-Anglophone countries experienced increases in US students studying abroad, including China (4.9% increase), India (11.9% increase), and Israel (9.4% increase). These trends suggest that US students are increasingly seeking destinations that offer linguistic and cultural diversity.

GLOBAL STUDENT MOBILITY

The growth of international students in the United States results from both push and pull factors that entice students to select that country as their preferred study destination.

In contrast to government-driven reasons for large increases in students from countries like Saudi Arabia, growth from some countries is largely driven by student demand.

The quality, variety, capacity, and accessibility of American universities are compelling factors that make the United States an attractive destination for international students. This is certainly the case with students from China who, as the result of increasing family incomes and growing demands for higher education, are becoming more and more globally mobile. Likewise, students from Iran are increasingly enrolling in US institutions, despite the visa restrictions and financial barriers they face.

However, market-based explanations for international student flows do not entirely tell what is driving the growth of student mobility into the United States. Government initiatives to send students abroad to strengthen academic skills and expand cultural knowledge can have a significant impact on the flow of international students, as evidenced by the rise in Saudi students—which was precipitated by the launch of the King Abdullah Scholarship Program in 2005.

US study abroad is likewise impacted by a combination of market forces and government initiatives. While the growth in US students selecting nontraditional destinations is in part student driven, the increasing diversity of study destinations is also impacted by US government initiatives—like the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship, which encourages students to select nontraditional destinations, and the “100,000 Strong” Initiative for China, which promotes education abroad in China.

Increasing student demand for education abroad means that international student mobility will continue to

grow, but the impact of recent government programs demonstrates that policy initiatives can also be powerful tools to increase international mobility and to steer students toward countries of interest.

Authors' note: The Institute of International Education has published *Open Doors*, an annual statistical survey of student mobility into and out of the United States since 1919, and has received support from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the US Department of State since the early 1970s. The opinions expressed in this article are entirely those of the authors. More information on *Open Doors* is available at <http://www.iie.org/open-doors>. ■

China's Confucius Institutes—More Academic and Integrative

QIANG ZHA

Qiang Zha is an associate professor at the Faculty of Education, York University, Toronto, Canada. E-mail: qzha@edu.yorku.ca.

Ever since the first Confucius Institute was launched in 2004 in Uzbekistan, this initiative has been seen as an arm of Chinese government for expanding China's soft power. The past 15 years witnessed a phenomenal growth of the Confucius Institutes around the world. By the end of 2011, 358 Confucius Institutes and 500 Confucius Classrooms were established in 108 countries—with 21 percent Confucius Institutes and 60 percent Confucius Classrooms located in a single country, the United States—though they remain controversial in many democratic societies. After all, the organization behind these Confucius Institutes and Classrooms, the Confucius Institute Headquarters or *Hanban*, is affiliated to China's Ministry of Education and operates with government funds. Notably, in 2011 alone, *Hanban* spent US\$164.1 million directly on all kinds of projects and activities in Confucius Institutes across the world. This figure is expected to grow significantly in the years to come. At the recent Global Confucius Institute Conference in Beijing, *Hanban* announced three new major programs applicable to Confucius Institutes worldwide. They include the Confucius China Study Plan—focusing on research aspects of Confucius Institutes, appointments of permanent academic staff at all Confucius Institutes, and the “Chinese



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

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

THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION (CIHE)

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education brings an international consciousness to the analysis of higher education. We believe that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center publishes the International Higher Education quarterly newsletter, a book series, and other publications; sponsors conferences; and welcomes visiting scholars. We have a special concern for academic institutions in the Jesuit tradition worldwide and, more broadly, with Catholic universities.

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

CIHE WEB SITE

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

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

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

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

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

EDITOR

Philip G. Altbach

PUBLICATIONS EDITOR

Edith S. Hoshino

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Salina 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.), and area of interest or expertise. There is no charge for a subscription.

ISSN: 1084-0613
©Center for International
Higher Education