

**PART FOUR**  
**FROM NORTH TO SOUTH:**  
**FLOWS FROM THE POST-**  
**INDUSTRIAL COUNTRIES**

---

- 8 Against the Grain?**  
    **Student Mobility from Britain to Commonwealth  
    Developing Countries** **119**  
    *Hilary Callan and Kate Steele*  
    Introduction  
    The terms of reference  
    Methodology  
    Quality and availability of data  
    Nationally administered and/or monitored activity  
    Transnational perspectives  
    Institutional perspectives and activity: Analysis of questionnaire  
    returns  
    Institutional perspectives  
    Models and opportunities  
    Conclusion and summary of recommendations
- 9 Internationalising Canadian Universities**  
    **Student Mobility to Developing Countries** **157**  
    *Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada*  
    Context  
    AUCC and the internationalisation of Canadian universities  
    A general statistical picture

**Conduct of the survey**

**Canadian universities: Programmes and viewpoints**

**For overseas study: An organisational conspectus**

**The student viewpoint**

**Conclusion**

# 8

## *Against the Grain?*

*Student Mobility from Britain to Commonwealth*

*Developing Countries*

---

Hilary Callan and Kate Steele

### *Introduction*

This chapter reports on a study to make a preliminary assessment of the current scale and pattern of student mobility from Britain to the developing Commonwealth. The purposes were also: to identify preconditions and obstacles to expansion of North-South outward mobility; to stimulate thinking; and to generate proposals for action. Within the wider project of investigating patterns and prospects for diversifying student mobility in the Commonwealth, one principle recognised is that North-South academic linkages may be instrumental in strengthening higher education capacity and excellence within the developing Commonwealth. This principle was enunciated both in the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Student Mobility and Higher Education Co-operation (1989) and at the eleventh Conference of Commonwealth Education Ministers (1991).

Ministers have emphasised the desirability of diversifying Commonwealth student flow. They have noted the willingness of a number of developing countries to receive greater numbers of students from other Commonwealth members, including developed ones, and there is ample evidence of that willingness elsewhere in this book. They have expressed the need for practical steps to encourage student mobility in both North-South and South-South directions, to counterbalance the overwhelming flow from developing to developed countries. Further context to our study is provided by current discussions on the implementation of CHESS and on ways and means of promoting North-South student mobility between EC and OECD countries on the one

hand and the developing world inside and outside the Commonwealth on the other.

The study reported here deals only with facilities and prospects within the UK for enhancing student mobility to the developing Commonwealth. It must be emphasised that time and budget limitations have allowed only a pilot investigation to be conducted; some recommendations are however made at the end of the chapter regarding the further work that would be needed to produce a comprehensive picture.

### *The terms of reference*

As those working in Commonwealth Higher Education will be well aware, this work lies against the grain of both student flow in general and the overwhelming bulk of analysis. The historical factors underlying the pattern of student inflow to Britain and other developed countries need no restating here. Nor do the financial and policy concerns surrounding the issue of access to British education for developing-country Commonwealth nationals (for a recent treatment see Callan & Steele 1991). A number of institutions responding to our survey (see below) declared that promoting outward flow, even to developed countries, was a low priority for them; of those that expressed interest and a theoretical wish to be involved in such activity, several indicated that outward movement would always be a minority pursuit by comparison with the economic imperative to attract fee-paying students from abroad.

This imbalance in both activity and priority seems to be reflected in a number of areas pertinent to the substance of the study. The first and most obvious of these concerns data-gathering practices and availability of information on student outflow from the UK, at both national and institutional levels. The dearth of reliable national statistics on outflow surely reflects the fact that there are few visible incentives for anyone to collect and process them. Institutionally, too, the picture on availability of basic data is very mixed. The limited information that is available suggests, however, that there may be discrepancies between levels of institutional activity and information available on a national scale: specifically, that outward movement may be taking place under informal institutional arrangements without appearing in national data. The implications for national-level policy development towards enhanced outward mobility are briefly considered later in the chapter.

A deeper issue embedded in the policy context of the study is that of

accommodating assumptions based on a 'partnership of equals' as the frame for diversifying student mobility (enshrined for example in the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan), with those based on academic development and institution-building in the South as the desired outcomes. Many institutional respondents were insistent on academic parity between sending and receiving institutions or departments as a precondition for North-South movement. Clearly, a number of further questions flow from this issue and call for further debate. Foremost among them is the *locus of agenda-setting* on disciplines and priorities between Governments and institutions of the 'North' and 'South'. In an unpublished paper (1985), Kenneth King makes a parallel point in the context of agency-funded bilateral research links between developed – and developing country institutions:

... Getting the right mix amongst the agency's, the North's and the South's separate sets of priorities may be rather crucial in a link that is to work well. Quite a lot will depend on whether the North is informally regarded as the senior partner ..., or whether it is a link where both parties genuinely expect to learn from each other ... These sorts of questions take us back to the whole issue of the rationale of links. If the agency priority is really for strengthening local research capacity in the South, then this already implies a relation of senior and junior partner, with staff going North-South and students going South-North. If, on the other hand, the agency also encourages links between scholars and departments of equal academic reputation, then it is likely that the style of research collaboration will be somewhat different.

The inherent tension between discourses of development and institution-building on the one hand, and of transaction among equals on the other, is rendered even more complex by an apparent diversity of view within the UK educational community about the desirability and rationale for developing facilities for North-South student mobility. The national consultation and institutional survey elicited many expressions of positive support for the principle of such development. At the same time, it detected an assumption within some sectors of the same community that (North-North mobility within the developed world aside) South-North flow is the only kind that can carry a developmental or educational advantage, to the mobile student individually or to developing-country educational resources. Enquiries were met, in several quarters, with some version of the blunt question: 'why would British students want to study in developing-country institutions, and why would British institutions want to send them?' There seems to be a

conceptual vicious circle in which low levels of actual North-South mobility discourage both the development of national mechanisms for monitoring and promoting it, and its emergence as an issue warranting full debate and an articulation of the advantages and risks involved.

The relative absence of a national debate directed to educational and developmental issues attending North-South mobility seems to be one of the most serious obstacles in Britain to achieving a greater balance of flow. As will be seen, we *recommend* that measures be taken, under Commonwealth leadership, to stimulate such a debate.

In the light of the above considerations, it seemed right to give greater attention than had been anticipated at the study's inception to the need to articulate the rationales for diversifying student flow within the Commonwealth, and for promoting North-South mobility, in such a manner as to carry conviction and command assent from the perspective of the British student, education institution or supporting body. The study itself has not yielded a comprehensive statement of rationale. Rather, the provisional conclusion is that 'manifesto' statements of faith will carry limited conviction unless the case for North-South movement is also argued concretely and in detail. An attempt to do this for an Australian audience has been made by Elizabeth Dines in Chapter 4.

This partial re-focus of attention to the perceptions of the British HE community implies no departure from the commitment to educational resource-building in the developing Commonwealth as the ultimate objective of the work. It does, however, reflect a need for realistic recognition that whether the prevailing rhetoric be that of 'development' or of 'academic partnership' substantial investment in programmes, models and strategies cannot be expected from the British academic community until its members are persuaded in detail and depth of 'what is in it for them'.

## *Methodology*

At the outset of the study on *North-South mobility*, the following bases or modes were theoretically identified under which British students might spend periods of study or research in a developing Commonwealth country:

- (a) mobility under the provisions of a programme administered at national level and funded by Governments or otherwise, such as CSFP
- (b) mobility under transnational provisions such as might be instituted by the EC

- (c) mobility within the frame of linkages at institutional level or that of institution-based consortia
- (d) mobility of UK-registered students who may spend periods in a developing Commonwealth country for purposes of field research, or non-institutional work attachment, without a local institutional affiliation
- (e) mobility which may bypass altogether the UK education system and its monitoring procedures, such as cases of students not enrolled in a British institution being sponsored by an independent body (or self-sponsored) for study in the developing Commonwealth. This category would include any British students who make direct application for entry to a developing-country institution

This tabulation of theoretical possibilities proved a useful guide to the initial thinking and approach to gathering data. The categories provisionally identified were not, of course, treated as mutually exclusive. It was assumed that, theoretically, possibilities (a) (b) and (c) would apply to both full-course and part-course study outside the UK, while (c) and (d) by definition would include only UK-enrolled students spending part of a course or study period abroad. Mobility under (d) was frequently reported by institutional informants, although it was not given prominence since it seemed to carry no obvious consequences for educational development in the South. (With hindsight, this may have been a misjudgment. Some of the case studies in Part Five of this book seem to suggest that there could be a positive impact.)

As the study progressed, the material itself imposed a loading across the above theoretical categories. With regard to (a), it turns out that the only government-funded nationally administered scheme lying within the brief for which UK students are eligible is the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan administered by the UK Commonwealth Scholarships Commission (see Table 8.3 at the end of the chapter). While the provisions of CSFP do not rule out applications to the Commission for part-course study in other Commonwealth countries, in practice such applications are rarely if ever received. (CSFP is discussed in greater detail below.)

With regard to (b) (transnational provisions), the study's timescale made possible only minimal investigation of any transnationally organised programmes for North-South mobility under which British students could study in the developing Commonwealth. Enquiries made to the British Council's Brussels office and the ACP Secretariat

produced no information on any such facilities within the EC. Educational issues are, however, very much under discussion within the Commission at present (see, for example, the 1991 *Memorandum on Higher Education in the European Community*, Commission of the European Communities). A critical issue at present is that of 'subsidiarity' and, while the picture may change in response to perceptions of urgent global need, the current policy climate seems to favour action on HE mobility and access at national rather than Community level.

The possibilities for promoting North-South mobility under multi-lateral institutional networks such as those proposed under Unesco's 'UNITWIN' project are considered later.

Similarly, with regard to category (c), (direct mobility by 'free movers' into a developing Commonwealth institution), It was not possible to conduct any substantial inquiry. As will become evident, however, from the discussion below of data availability, such investigation could be conducted only by using the *receiving* institution or country as point of departure. The question of funding for such 'free movement' is referred to briefly below.

In the context of mobility under (d), it is worth recording that a feasibility study is said to be currently in progress for a pilot programme under which UK students would be sent on work placements in developing countries for sandwich or intercalation years. The project's objective is the creation of a wider pool of British graduates with direct experience of developing-country conditions and is taking place under the auspices of VSO with funding from the Overseas Development Administration. If the pilot scheme goes ahead in 1992-93 ODA has expressed willingness to underwrite the placement and support costs. While this project strictly relates to work placement rather than study in the developing world, the parallels with the present study are obvious. It is *recommended* that the informal contact which has been established with the VSO project be maintained, and that the possibilities be actively explored for ODA involvement in action resulting from the present Commonwealth initiative.

The realities of the UK situation made it necessary to give more attention than had been planned to the need to carry the argument within Britain for enhancement of North-South flow. Similarly, in the light of the low numbers of students currently moving from Britain to the developing Commonwealth, and of mobility programmes for which British students are eligible, emphasis has had to fall less on actual outward movement than on models, preconditions and rationales that

could be extended or adapted to promote it. It was thought wise to give some attention to provisions allowing students to spend periods of study or research in any developing-country institution, whether inside or outside the Commonwealth. For this reason sample institutions were asked to report on any such arrangements in which they participate. For many institutions, in fact, as for some national bodies, the Commonwealth is not a relevant category when it comes to establishing relationships with developing countries for student recruitment or academic liaison. This means that non-Commonwealth North-South linkages could well provide models for Commonwealth-based activity, and vice versa.

The first consisted of a survey of information available at national level together with consultations with a selection of key individuals and organisations to establish the national picture of outward mobility to the developing Commonwealth and a questionnaire survey of a sample of 31 UK higher education institutions to elicit an institution level perspective. The second involved an analysis of data and follow-up discussions and consultations with selected informants (including institution-based experts) and with the British Council Higher Education Division and the Association of Commonwealth Universities.

The national and international bodies consulted were:

- Commonwealth Secretariat (Education programme; Library and staff)
- Association of Commonwealth Universities
- British Council (Statistics Department, HED and OSSD)
- Dept of Education and Science
- Overseas Development Administration
- Universities Statistical Record
- Commonwealth Youth Exchange Council
- Central Bureau for Educational visits & Exchange
- Rotary International
- Leverhulme Trust
- National Union of Students
- ACP Secretariat, Brussels
- European Commission (DG8), Brussels

The institutional sample was selected following advice received in initial consultations and was not random.

The institutional survey was to complement the national picture by seeking evidence of any relevant arrangements for outward mobility

which might be in place at institutional level and might not appear in national data. It was also considered important, for the reasons given above, to elicit institutional perceptions of the educational and developmental rationale for North-South mobility. The questionnaire was targeted to Registrars/Academic Registrars for redistribution to the appropriate point in each institution. Information on the institutions' record-keeping practices, provisions for outward movement to developing countries that might serve as a model for Commonwealth destinations even if they do not allow such movement in their current form, and respondents' perceptions of the educational and developmental value of promoting North-South flow were asked for.

Levels of uptake of existing outward mobility provisions are a particular concern with regard to strategies for promotion and enhancement. The scale of this study did not, however, allow a full-scale investigation of uptake. From the national figures given in Table 8.1, it is clear that overall numbers are low; with regard to CSFP, possible obstacles to uptake are briefly considered below.

### *Quality and availability of data*

Dearth of clear and reliable statistical information presents a severe difficulty in attempting to locate records of British students studying in the developing Commonwealth. Apart from records kept within the frame of specific programmes such as CSFP, there is in Britain no central monitoring system from which it would be possible to retrieve detail of the outward movement of home students, either from British institutions or independently ('free-movers'). Instead we must rely for national data on existing machinery such as the compilations that form the basis of the Unesco *Yearbooks*. These statistics are based on information elicited directly from receiving countries, whose own data-gathering procedures may not be mutually comparable. Varying definitions, for example, are in use regarding who is a 'foreign student'. National procedures, also, typically rely on a 'count' of foreign students present in their institutions at a qualifying point in the academic year. Thus, for example, the Unesco figures (see below) for outward mobility from Britain will include any British students enrolled on part courses, under exchange arrangements or directly admitted to a developing-country institution in category (e) above – but only if they are present on the day of count.

Unesco statistics, which may under report the true level of North-South activity, are gathered in accordance with a formula which covers the top 50 receiving countries worldwide and accounts for some 95 per

cent of global student mobility. This procedure is clearly adequate for most practical purposes, but may miss fine detail where very small but significant numbers are at issue. Of the 50 top hosts, the only developing countries of the Commonwealth receiving large enough numbers of foreign students from any source to be included are Pakistan, India, Singapore and Cyprus. These cautions notwithstanding, from the outward mobility figures presented below and in Table 8.1, it is evident that, as detected by global recording processes, the numerical level of mobility of British students to the developing Commonwealth is very low.

There is a corresponding lack of comparative statistical information from British sources on outward mobility of UK students. The standard sources of national data on mobility – the British Council, DES and Universities Statistical Record – hold no information on countries of destination for outgoing students and scholars. For obvious reasons, the emphasis is on collation and dissemination of statistics of student flow into Britain. The picture is now changing somewhat in response to new patterns of mobility within Europe and the developed world, and the resulting demand for monitoring of exchange programmes such as ERASMUS. Accordingly, such outward mobility figures as are becoming available are Europe-based and available only from EC agencies. There is little evidence of pressure within the UK for national monitoring of outward flow to developing countries.

A *recommendation* of the present study is therefore that the national data-collecting agencies give consideration to establishing satisfactory procedures for national monitoring of outward flow of British students to all destinations and under all types of programme, or none. Aside from the present specific concern with outward flow to the developing Commonwealth, the increasing ‘globalisation’ of Higher Education as a whole will surely require this adjustment of national monitoring capacity and the priorities that drive it.

### *Nationally administered and/or monitored activity*

The figures presented in Table 8.1 are, as indicated, taken from a variety of sources. Hence comparison is difficult and it would be unsafe to attempt any assimilation of the data. Since the *numbers* are relatively small they are best taken as broadly illustrative of the level and pattern of student mobility from Britain into other countries of the Commonwealth.

The major Commonwealth receivers of students from Britain are the other developed countries: Canada, Australia and New Zealand. This pattern also applies to outgoing British students under CSFP. Of the total number of British students studying abroad, however, the Commonwealth attracts very few. The latest figures available (Unesco: 1991), show that out of a total of 14,475 British students recorded as studying abroad in the assorted years to which the data relate, the USA, France and Germany together received 10,146. Of the remaining 4,329, only 1,185 were recorded as studying in the Commonwealth; 885 in Canada and 223 in Australia. Among developing Commonwealth countries only India (58 students) and Singapore (one student) are mentioned (1983 figures in both cases). These figures should themselves be read with great caution; the years for which data were submitted range from 1983 to 1988, and as noted above unless students are present on the day of data collection it is unlikely that the figures include those attending for only part of the year. They are nonetheless indicative of the general tendency and the historical antecedents it reflects.

These patterns are reiterated in figures taken from the Commonwealth Secretariat (ComSec: Revised 1988 and ComSec 1989) and the Commonwealth Scholarships Commission (CSC: 1990). India appears throughout as the only developing Commonwealth country attracting significant numbers of British students.

There are several national schemes in existence, some government funded and some non-government funded. A summary list of current Government-funded support schemes for international study is given at the end of the chapter (Table 8.3). Of those that may facilitate student mobility throughout the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Programme (CSFP) is the only one whose rules of eligibility would potentially enable British students to study in institutions of the developing Commonwealth. Because of the lack of any central monitoring of outward student mobility from the UK, it is impossible within the scope of this study to provide any information regarding British students studying abroad who may receive support from Government sources outside the UK. It is evident however that very little programme support is available from British Government sources.

A more promising source of potential funds at present may be through the international network of charitable trusts and agencies, bypassing Governments and educational establishments in Britain. Although little statistical information appears to be available, Rotary International, for example, facilitates the movement of 1,205 scholars

from 65 countries of origin into 54 destination countries at the cost of 17.5 million dollars per annum. The Leverhulme Trust in its latest quinquennial report for 1981–85 reports provision of 50 'Study Abroad Studentships', nine of which were held in the Commonwealth. Of these in turn, five were held within the developing Commonwealth: Jamaica, Kenya, Tanzania and Barbados. No further details are available.

*The Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan* has been described as a 'multidimensional scheme of bilateral relations'. Brought into existence in 1959 following a meeting of the Association of Commonwealth Universities, it operates as a series of bilateral agreements between governments of the Commonwealth. Its purpose is to allow Commonwealth students (primarily at postgraduate level) and scholars/researchers of high intellectual calibre the opportunity to study in Commonwealth countries other than their own, on a philosophical basis of parity between partners and equality of educational opportunity. Although a multilateral scheme in the sense that it encompasses all countries of the Commonwealth, it has no central administrative or monitoring agency and not all Commonwealth countries participate. The countries in which awards are tenable may change from year to year, as resources from which to fund scholars are made available or withdrawn. In discussion, it was emphasised that a primary objective of CSFP is to contribute to a two-way traffic of equals, by encouraging and facilitating local funding of awards.

A varying number of awards is offered each year, for which each country is invited to nominate a specific number of candidates. This nomination process is undertaken by the CSFP agency in the student's country of normal residence: in the UK by the Commonwealth Scholarships Commission based at ACU. It would be rare, according to the ACU, for any country to make awards corresponding in number to the nominations invited. The award is then granted by the country in which the award is tenable and in which the proposed institution of study is situated according to rules of eligibility, some of which are more restrictive than others.

In 1991 awards were offered for tenure in the following countries: Australia, Canada, Ghana, Hong Kong, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Malaysia, Malta, New Zealand, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Trinidad & Tobago and the United Kingdom. As may be seen in Table 8.2, in 1990 55 UK candidates were nominated by the UK Commission, 24 awards were offered and all of those accepted were tenable in developed Commonwealth countries. Where nominations were invited and

no awards offered it is likely that students did not meet the criteria or did not wish to study a limited number of disciplines on offer.

While CSFP allows some (limited) provision for UK scholars to study in the developing Commonwealth, the opportunities that do exist are evidently not utilised. The pattern of North-North and South-North flow appears consistent throughout the 31-year history of CSFP and accords with other data. The Commonwealth Secretariat's Tracer Study of CSFP scholars (CS 1989 b, and see Table 8.1) shows that from 371 returns from UK participants (out of a possible 567) only 48 awards were taken up in the developing Commonwealth, all of these in India.

Obstacles to uptake of CSFP may lie at many points in the sequence of information provision, decision, application, nomination, offer and acceptance or otherwise of an award. Further, problems may arise at either end of the system in a geographical sense, that is in either the prospective sending or the receiving country, or both. Resource availability in developing countries offering awards may, for example, force them to impose restrictive criteria of eligibility in the form of a single institution in which the award is tenable, or a narrow range of courses that can be followed. In the home country, again, there may be a lack of information provision at the point of decision that would encourage potential Commonwealth Scholars to consider a developing-country award. In this connection the Tracer Study reveals that, of all former scholars responding, most heard about CSFP within institutions (24 per cent from staff and 16 per cent through notices). The largest single percentage (29 per cent) heard of the scheme through a newspaper or journal advertisement.

Discussion with the ACU identified 3 principal areas of difficulty in enhancing uptake of opportunities under CSFP for developed-country nationals to study in developing-country institutions: finance, infrastructure and information.

- (a) *Finance* At micro-level, it appears that stipends paid to individuals by developing-country authorities are sometimes prohibitively low in relation to real costs. While there is provision for the Commonwealth Scholarships Commission to supplement local stipends to a limited extent, it would clearly go against the entire philosophy of CSFP if this were to foster a 'mendicant' rather than an equal relationship between participating countries. Currency instability, price fluctuations and exchange-control difficulties may exacerbate the problem in some developing countries (as pointed out by Prof Akinpelu in

Chapter 7). At macro-level, it was felt that donor Commonwealth Governments could do more to fund the Programme.

- (b) *Infrastructure* The problem here was thought to be that of enhancing the acceptability of a developing-country qualification to potential developed-country applicants. In many cases, it was felt, this would require the investment of substantial effort and funds into equipment, logistical support and provision for academic recognition and quality assurance.
- (c) *Information* Of the areas of difficulty identified by the ACU, this is perhaps the least intractable. It was suggested that a great deal could be done by developing Commonwealth Governments and institutions to document themselves effectively to potential developed-country applicants. There is often a misleading folklore that needs to be countered, and problems of perception to be overcome, before students and institutions in the North will recognise the real excellence that is to be found in many centres in the South.

A full analysis of obstacles to take-up of CSFP in developing-country institutions lies beyond the present study's scope. It is significant, nonetheless, that the major obstacles of finance, infrastructure and information identified in consultation with ACU resurface in the institutional survey as key issues in the perception of British higher education institutions. Pleas for enhanced funding and infrastructural support may appear Utopian in the present climate; but they must be made, in relation both to CSFP and to the promotion of North-South traffic more broadly. A *recommendation*, on the basis of this study, is that developing Commonwealth institutions and Governments give consideration to ways in which they might raise awareness of what they can offer within the educational communities of the developed Commonwealth countries.

It may also be relevant that while CSFP is based on bilateral relations, it provides for the movement of individuals without stressing the value of having a developed relationship between institutional partners as the frame for such individual movement. No doubt such inter-institutional relationships do develop in consequence of the informal contacts engendered by successful CSFP placements. All the same, the Commonwealth Scholarships Commission may wish to consider whether uptake of CSFP by Northern scholars in Southern institutions could be enhanced by more support for broadly based institution-to-institution liaison and partnership.

## *Transnational perspectives*

A full consideration of transnational approaches to facilitating North-South student mobility in the Commonwealth was outside the scope of this survey, but because the transnational dimension is potentially highly significant, an attempt was made to obtain information about initiatives for North-South student mobility based on transnational bodies, that could offer models for consideration within the Commonwealth. Owing to time limitations these enquiries were not on the whole successful; but the *recommendation* is that they be pursued in the future and the results integrated with Commonwealth-based policies and strategies.

The British Council's EC Directorate in Brussels kindly undertook to make enquiries about any EC-administered facilities for North-South student mobility or exchange. Following consultation at the European Commission, they reported back that no such schemes could be identified; EC-based programmes are designed only for placing EC students in other EC countries. (Access to ERASMUS schemes has now been extended to nationals of EFTA countries; and TEMPUS has an outreach outside the Community but not to developing countries of the South.)

The Commission of the European Communities' *Memorandum on Higher Education in the European Community* (1991) has been received as an agenda-setting document for the future of Higher Education in the Community. Its concentration is on the future education and training needs of Community members and their nationals in the Single Market. The global role of EC educational institutions is considered, in the context of 'the delivery of development assistance and development co-operation and in promoting economic, political and cultural relationships with other major economic regions'. Also acknowledged, under 'Higher Education and External Relations' is an evolving role for education and training in the external relations of the Community since, *inter alia*:

... Education and training, through interactive exchanges at staff and student level and through study abroad schemes, help to cultivate the mutual understanding, respect and knowledge on which successful political and trading relationships can be based (Clause 37).

These references aside, there is little evidence in the document of any explicit concern with promoting North-South mobility as an instrument of development or of academic partnership. This is perhaps not surprising, however, since the thrust of the debate on 'subsidiarity' (see

above) is to identify North-South educational liaison as an activity best conducted at national, rather than Community, level.

The Lomé Conventions encourage student exchange in principle between the EC and African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) nations. Lomé IV makes no explicit provision for North-South movement, but it is understood from the ACP Secretariat that the intent is to support mobility in both directions. A Resolution of the ACP-EC Joint Assembly, adopted on 27 September 1991 and binding on both parties:

... calls for the encouragement, within the framework of the Lomé Convention, of scholarship programmes and exchange schemes for teachers and students from the ACP and EC countries... (para 3; text kindly supplied by the ACP Secretariat).

UNITWIN is an example of imaginative development in multilateral institutional network-building that could provide models for exchange and mobility in the Commonwealth. A Unesco initiative, its aims will be:

- to give fresh impetus to twinning and other linking arrangements between higher education institutions in the industrialised and developing worlds and on the South-South axis; and to develop appropriate criteria and standards
- to reinforce existing networks and establish new ones for co-operation among educational and research institutions, and
- to develop and strengthen 'centres of excellence', especially within developing countries, for specialised studies and advanced research...

While it is too early as yet to assess the effectiveness of UNITWIN and its potential value as a model for student mobility in the Commonwealth, the concentration of resources and effort into building developing-country 'centres of excellence' in specialised fields could do much to overcome the barriers to motivation and uptake that are discussed elsewhere in this paper. There would be risks in taking this route; notably the danger of creating two-tier education systems and 'Cinderella' departments and institutions within developing regions. If these can be foreseen and provided against, UNITWIN could furnish a model or catalyst for Commonwealth-based educational development.

## ***Institutional perspectives and activity: Analysis of questionnaire returns***

As described earlier, a questionnaire was sent to a non-random sample of 31 Higher Education Institutions in the UK. Returns were received from 20 institutions, including four in which respondents found it appropriate to reply by detailed letter rather than complete the form. Two institutions managed to circulate the questionnaire around their academic departments and return individual departmental responses. Several others indicated that they would have liked to do so, but were prevented by the tightness of the timetable. Grateful thanks are due to all who responded. Because the purpose of the survey was to elicit perceptions and gather information rather than to assemble a statistically comprehensive picture, the following analysis treats the completed return (whether departmental or institutional) as the unit of response. This treatment yields a total of 35 returns, including departmental and International Office submissions and returns in letter form.

*Question 1* sought information on *institutions' record-keeping practices* that would enable basic numerical information to be retrieved, now or in the future, relevant to North-South mobility. Not all respondents replied to the question. Of those institutions about which information was received, six kept no records of outgoing students that would include any spending periods of study/research in the developing Commonwealth. Eleven did keep records: six centrally and five departmentally. The last included two institutions in which some departments did, and some did not, keep relevant records. This divergence no doubt reflects departmental differences in the incidence and perceived importance of student movement in different subject areas; and it must be borne in mind that the survey could yield only a very incomplete picture of departmental practice across institutions.

Where records were kept, the type of information recorded was not always specified. Where it was, the clear tendency was to record data by institution of destination, year/level of study, and discipline. Isolated reference was also made to: academic contact in the non-UK institution; curriculum content; text of dissertation or thesis; degree result; subsequent study if any.

Bearing in mind that information was sought on institutions' record-keeping for outgoing part-course students that would cover North-South movement *irrespective* of the actual occurrence of any such movement at present, the survey reveals a remarkable disparity in institutional practice. Institutions may well be adopting much more uniform

record-keeping policies directed to outward movement of students falling outside our brief, such as the fast-growing European mobility programmes (ERASMUS, LINGUA, etc). Nonetheless, if interest is to be stimulated at institutional level in Britain in achieving a more balanced flow of outgoing as against incoming students to and from the developing Commonwealth, the enabling structures need to be in place. In some cases a review of overall record-keeping practice may be called for, institutionally as well as nationally, as a precondition for achieving this.

Academic rationales for promoting North-South outward flow will be discussed in detail below. However, the case for linking academic credit in the British institution to periods of study abroad is a strong one. Such awarding of credit requires, in turn, a minimum level of record-keeping in the home institution with respect not only to basic data but also to the content and outcome of the student's academic activity in some depth. The *recommendation* is that institutions wishing to raise levels of North-South outflow be encouraged to give consideration to these matters.

*Question 2* sought to elicit *institutional perceptions of the academic case, from a British perspective, for promoting greater outward mobility of British students to developing-country institutions*. The rationale behind the question itself was the one given earlier: while the ultimate objective of the present study is to develop instruments for institution-building in the developing Commonwealth, North-South student mobility cannot be harnessed as a means of achieving this unless the academic and institutional advantages at the 'Northern' end of the link can be clearly articulated and command assent. As it turned out, several respondents included developmental benefits to institutions in the 'South'.

Given the invitation to self-selection inherent in the survey design, it is not surprising that *Question 2* yielded 26 positive, five negative and four blank or noncommittal responses. Both positive and negative responses were sometimes given with qualifications, the most frequent of these being with regard to discipline, level of study or the special interests of a responding department.

Asked to specify the nature of the educational advantage, respondents gave a mixture of views, some of which were disappointingly uncritical in their reference to the 'broadening of horizons' through 'experience of a different culture'. While these outcomes are no doubt desirable in themselves, there is a need to make a case for outward mobility which differentiates the benefits of a specifically academic experience abroad from those of enlightened travel or tourism. A

number of focused and specific responses were received, including the following (reproduced or paraphrased from raw returns):

- Britons gain experience necessary to obtain jobs in international aid programmes, or, if obtaining teaching posts in UK, to make their courses more relevant to overseas issues
- Overseas experience can be directly relevant to UK research programmes
- 'The [Kenya] placement is an excellent experience and the results are fed into the National Conservation Strategy for Kenya. The principles of Environmental Management developed in \*\*\* can be applied in tropical environments equally well.'
- Commercial and career benefit from overseas contacts and networks
- Transfer of skills and technology in both directions (North-South and South-North)
- Basis for taking informed career decisions about future work abroad
- Experience of pursuing a discipline in a different cultural frame; possible perspective on 'ethnocentric' elements in the Western academic tradition
- Promoting ability to solve business/organisational problems in widely differing cultural and economic environments
- Establishing/fostering valuable inter-institutional links with comparable institutions abroad
- Specific benefits to *overseas* students enrolled in UK institutions, who may spend part of the study period in the home country and so gain experience of the home-country application of disciplines such as law, politics, economics, psychology and other social sciences.

In addition, many respondents referred to language experience and country – or region-based field research, which may or may not involve attachment to a partner institution in the destination country (category d) of those theoretically identified on page 123). Several also drew a distinction between *undergraduate* and *postgraduate* levels of study, with periods abroad seen as far more beneficial to the latter than the former for the British student.

Parts of *Question 2* attempted to probe respondents' thinking on, respectively, *preconditions*, *obstacles* and *remedies* respecting promotion of North-South student mobility, if they considered the latter to be educationally valuable in principle. Of the 26 'yes' responses, 24 addressed at least one of these questions in explicit or implicit manner. Responses were uniformly detailed, practical and realistic. Since these are, in effect, the crucial issues for this study so far as institutional policies and incentives are concerned, replies are presented in some detail.

*Preconditions* fell under four broad heads: funding, administration, information and academic requirements.

*Funding* Many respondents noted a definitive need for travel funding (for both students and supervisory visits where necessary) and for support funds for institutional underwriting of mobility arrangements. One respondent called for an identified protocol for applying for support funding, for example, from Research Councils, and allocating it within institutions. Surprisingly, no mention was made of appropriate and equitable arrangements for fee-sharing and/or remission, which would seem to be a primary precondition.

*Administration* Nearly all those responding called for formal bilateral agreements between sending and receiving institutions negotiated at an appropriate level of seniority and covering (across the aggregate of respondents) accommodation, administrative support, arrangements for supervision and assessment, compatibility of equipment, academic recognition, quality assurance.

*Information* Several respondents identified a need for information to be made available to prospective sending institutions regarding placement opportunities in developing-country establishments. This could, it was suggested, take the form of a centrally (British Council or ACU?) administered rolling list or 'clearing house' of such opportunities. Such a system, however, would be of an entirely different kind from one based on long-term bilateral links, which a number of respondents also called for. The need was noted for appropriate training/briefing of outgoing students and responsible staff at both ends of the link, for effective communication generally between sending and receiving institutions, and for raising students' awareness of the potential benefits to them of study abroad. It was also suggested that there is much latent interest among British students in study in the South, and that this needs to be harnessed by appropriate schemes.

*Academic requirements* There was clear support for developing means to assure compatibility of academic requirements and standards and for academic recognition of study abroad within the degree structure of the home institution. To this end, provision for formal assessment of work done abroad was emphasised. Several respondents also called for the development of 'structured' schemes that would make study abroad under designated conditions a formal requirement of degrees in appropriate cases.

In addition to the above, respondents mentioned the need for appropriate timing of study abroad to fit the British degree timetable; and for recognition, for example, by Research Councils in respect of completion

deadlines of the time implications of periods spent abroad.

*Obstacles and remedies* These, in respondents' perceptions, echoed many of the preconditions listed above. The single most serious inhibiting factor was, overwhelmingly, that of *cost*. This was seen to include student finance (travel, fees, differential subsistence costs); institutional investment in establishment and maintenance of programmes, and limited departmental capacity to allocate 'ringfenced' resources (money, staff and time) to building up contacts in partner institutions. Not surprisingly, respondents had no blanket solution to offer; but they did severally suggest:

- ... revival of the Inter University Council's former 'Study and Serve' scheme (presumably under a different name and umbrella)
- assimilation of outward student mobility under a larger 'package' including staff exchange, research and consultancy with umbrella funding from Government sources
- a system of bursaries and institutional support grants similar to ERASMUS and directed to North-South flow
- a programme of travel scholarships targeted to North-South movement and financed by ODA, the ACU and/or charitable bodies
- earmarked allocation of Departmental funding for establishing and servicing mobility links with developing-country institutions...

Further potential difficulties were thought to stem from:

- ... incompatibilities of curriculum, standards, educational systems, language of instruction and social conventions between 'senders' and 'receivers', and mutual ignorance generally
- 'bureaucratic difficulties in the developing world'
- limited institutional knowledge of the funding that is available
- limited visible incentives to students to study in a developing country
- implications for completion time
- lack of facilities such as computers and materials, and health/safety worries (including AIDS fears)...

It was also argued that North-South student mobility from the UK, however well-recognised its value and well-developed its enabling provisions, is likely to remain a minority pursuit compared to South-North flow. From the developmental as well as the educational perspective, institutions and Governments of both the North and the South would continue to see improved South-North access as the continuing priority.

Of the above-listed obstacles, the first two, real as they may be, may also reflect institutional thinking that may need to be questioned. Discrepancies of educational system, language, culture and the like between the home country and Britain have never, after all, been regarded as insurmountable barriers when it is a case of recruiting fee-paying students to British institutions; the issue has been the institution's responsibility to provide appropriate support and remedial facilities. Regarding 'bureaucratic difficulties' too, the developing world certainly has no monopoly of these. As regards ways of overcoming the obstacles identified, there was again no consensual view but measures suggested were:

- a clear statement of the rationale, objectives and benefits of outward mobility programmes to developing countries, perhaps in the form of a formal policy document (but see below)
- preparatory visits/meetings by involved staff at both ends of the link, to check academic provision, services and living conditions
- careful vetting, briefing and orientation of potential outward-bound students
- appropriate language training
- adequate provision for exchanging information on academic matters and facilities between partner institutions
- persuading the Research Councils of the case for accommodating the time and completion implications of study/research abroad
- linked research programmes and formal 'twinning' arrangements – but with recognition that these require both the commitment of individuals and the support of institutions

*Formal links* Questions 3 and 4 asked for reports of any *formal arrangements*, whether inter-institutional or part of more broadly-based schemes, which would allow part-course attachment to an institution in any developing country; and if such existed, whether they would allow study in a developing Commonwealth country. No precise definition of what constituted 'formal' as distinct from 'informal' linkages was offered (see question 5); in retrospect, this may have led to some confusion.

Of those responding to questions 3 and 4, 11 indicated the presence and 19 the absence of formal arrangements. Of the latter, one explained that the institution was in the early stages of negotiating link arrangements with institutions in Tanzania, Botswana and Zimbabwe. It must be re-emphasised that, because some responses were institutional and others departmental, and because the responses may reflect different

levels of institutional knowledge, no numerical conclusions can be drawn from these findings.

All but two of those reporting the existence of links enabling developing-country placement believed that these were, or could be, used to send students to institutions somewhere in the developing Commonwealth. Subject areas singled out for mention were Medicine (elective study), Engineering (Appropriate Engineering Technology & Design), Agriculture, Anthropology and Sociology, South Asia Studies, Development Studies, Chemical Science, Education Studies and Law. Several countries of destination within the developing Commonwealth were identified: Cayman Islands, Hong Kong, India, Kenya, Malawi, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Singapore, Tanzania, Western Samoa. For the reasons given above, these lists are unlikely to be comprehensive and should be treated as indicative only.

The question of uptake has been referred to earlier in this report. While a comprehensive national assessment of uptake would require a survey on a much larger scale than budget or time have allowed here, a 'feel' for levels of uptake has been sought by asking a subsample of responding institutions to supply figures for outgoing students to developing-Commonwealth destinations in any academic year. While actual numbers may turn out to be low (as indicated in the national statistics given above and in Table 8.1), the institutional information so far available does suggest that the national data-gathering procedures on outward student flow may be under-recording the true level of North-South movement.

The above, strictly limited, information on formal academic links with provision for student mobility should also be interpreted in the context of the many British Council-administered inter-institutional links under CICHE (staff and scholars only) which are briefly discussed elsewhere in this chapter.

*Informal links* The aim here was to obtain a rough assessment of the extent to which institutions were in a position to support or encourage outward mobility of their students outside the provisions of any formal programme. As stated above, the uncontrolled nature of the sampling process precludes any quantitative interpretation of the responses. The value of the information elicited lies in what it might suggest by way of institutional experience and models that might be adopted or extended.

Of respondents who replied to this question, 13 reported the presence and 12 the absence of informal arrangements. Few details of the actual arrangements were given, but it is clear that several UK higher education institutions (it is impossible to be more precise) have active

academic networks in place that would make possible the placement of students in some subject areas in a developing Commonwealth institution for part of the study or research period. Fieldwork attachments of research students in subjects such as Social Anthropology, Language, Geography and Regional and Development Studies constitute one distinctive pattern; although in some cases, it was pointed out, the student would remain registered in the home institution without any local attachment. Three respondents noted their provision for part-course elective study abroad in Medicine, with students frequently choosing a developing-country placement. These arrangements call for further study as a possible model for larger-scale mobility arrangements. Other subject areas singled out for mention were Engineering, Veterinary Science, Education, Political Science, Social Work and Psychology. The range of developing Commonwealth countries mentioned was wide: Cyprus, India, Kenya, Malaysia, Nigeria, Tanzania, Hong Kong, Malawi, Jamaica, Zimbabwe.

As in the case of 'formal' linkages, the key questions that, from a policy perspective, flow from this rich but evidently *ad hoc* array of networks and opportunities concern *capacity* and *uptake*. The latter issue has already been noted; the former is briefly addressed on the next page and will require careful review on the part of developing-country as well as developed-country institutions.

*Question 6* asked about *academic provision governing recognition for study abroad* under both formal and informal arrangements. Of the 20 respondents who reported the existence of either or both types of arrangement, 14 gave an answer to this.

No clear patterns or models were evident for academic recognition of periods of study in a developing-country institution. This is highly surprising, in the light of the emphasis respondents placed elsewhere on the need for precisely such provision. In some cases, the provisions fall outside the present brief, since students remain attached to the home-country institution and are examined under its ordinances. Other responses indicated case-by-case arrangements for recognition without, evidently, any central policy. In several cases, link arrangements were described as new, with no recognition provisions yet in place. Modularisation of the home course was mentioned as a possible route to academic assimilation of home and away study. One department is currently discussing a four-year undergraduate course including a compulsory year in a developing country; but the method of assessment is not yet determined. Another suggests a 'must pass but not count' rule for study outside, with control against duplication of

courses. A veterinary school allows some periods of work overseas (which could be in a developing country) to count towards compulsory clinical vacation work.

*Question 7* sought to clarify *funding arrangements* that would govern any outward mobility opportunities that had been described. This drew 10 responses out of the 20 possible. The apparent scarcity and piecemeal nature of funding provision is in keeping with the institutions' clear recognition of funding as a prime obstacle to outward mobility. Those answering the question reported:

- no funding arrangements
- each case 'by arrangement'
- funding within LEA grant (undergraduate) or research council, scholarship or ODA support (graduate)
- self-funding with Departmental or small grants toward day-to-day expenses
- home-registered students continue to pay fees to home institution
- internships sponsored by charities/aid agencies

Only one response mentioned the possibility (not actuality) of an arrangement under which tuition fees would be remitted to the *receiving* institution, unless student exchange allowed reciprocal fee remission.

### *Institutional perspectives*

No single, authoritative institutional view on North-South student mobility emerge from our study, partly because of its limited scale and strictly exploratory purpose, but also without doubt because no such consensual view exists. The study indicates the presence of considerable interest and goodwill towards the principle of promoting North-South outward flow on educational grounds; but as stated earlier our enquiries also drew some negative responses. Because of sampling bias at many points in the process, it is impossible to assess the relative weight of these opposed attitudes.

What did emerge clearly was a consistent difference, among those responding, between perceptions of the value of North-South movement (which were, with exceptions, relatively perfunctory and unrefined) and perceptions of the obstacles and preconditions to the promotion of such movement (which were, on the whole, detailed, precise and practical). The latter indicate that as might be expected the key problem areas as seen by British higher education institutions are

*funding* and *quality assurance*; the latter in turn embracing academic recognition, compatibility of curricula and standards, satisfactory supervision/examination arrangements, and infrastructural support.

As in the case of CSFP uptake discussed above, *information provision* was seen as a further problem area. Several respondents evidently felt that more could be done to educate both British students and institutional decision-makers, not to mention grant-awarding bodies such as the Research Councils, of the potential value of study experience in a developing country and the actual opportunities available. The internal dissemination of information within institutions, including record-keeping practices, might repay examination by policy-makers seeking to encourage outward flow. Cross-institutionally, the survey suggests that there is considerable fragmentation of knowledge, and hence isolation of activity, among those engaged in North-South collaboration, particularly under informal arrangements. There could therefore be a case for creating more effective structures for cross-institutional communication and sharing of experience.

Kenneth King (1985) makes a comparable argument in the context of British Council inter-institutional linkages under the Committee for International Co-operation in Higher Education (CICHE). These linkages are at present concerned only with research collaboration and mobility of academic staff and researchers, but it will be suggested below that they might also provide a model for student exchange and mobility. King writes:

'At the moment, there may be as many as a thousand British departments in polytechnics and universities that are involved in academic collaboration with the South ... This is in fact a sizeable constituency, consisting of many of the key figures in the UK concerned with the advancement of the sciences in the Third World. Even though there is a national Committee for International Co-operation in Higher Education, it could be suggested that the constituency of Link Departments are not themselves linked, or often aware of each other's existence. The British constituency is therefore *one which does not know itself*, and is not itself in any sense a network or pressure group. It would be extremely timely for the British Council to encourage a great deal more networking amongst this extraordinarily diverse set of Departments concerned with developing countries.' (1985; our emphasis.)

Calling for the development of interactive networks among institutions and Departments engaged in comparable North-South link activities, King points out that the resulting institutional constituency would form

the basis for concerted national advocacy in support of North-South academic collaboration. He suggests that such interactive networks could be brought into being by such activities as: regional, subject-based and institution-based seminars to share experience, models and plans; the development of a national inventory on links; and the creation of an annual bulletin or newsletter on link activities.

These suggestions were made in 1985; and discussions with CICHE in the course of this study indicate that they have not been taken up or implemented to any significant extent. Nonetheless, they are highly pertinent to inter-institutional information exchange and policy-building with respect to North-South student movement. The *recommendation* is that they be given consideration in the context of the present Commonwealth secretariat project. The question of possible use of the actual CICHE structure of links as a model for student flow will be briefly considered in the section on page 146.

Following the institutional survey, as part of Phase 2 of the study a draft analysis of the results was circulated to a small group of institution-based experts and others for their comments. These confirmed the interpretations given above. One significant observation (from a recently retired Vice-Chancellor) was that a valuable but under-recognised corpus of collective institutional knowledge of higher education in the developing Commonwealth is fast disappearing, with the passing of the last generation of those, who, early in their careers, contributed to the creation of colonial and post-Independence Universities. This knowledge and understanding, he argued, will not be replaced or updated unless positive effort is made to give comparable exposure to future generations of potential scholars.

Reduced to essentials, the question posed by this study as regards institution-level activity and perceptions in Britain is this: What has to happen in order to convince British higher education institutions that student movement to institutions of the developing Commonwealth is of sufficient educational value to justify the investment of resources in supporting it? While an authoritative answer cannot be offered, findings suggest that such an answer would contain the following elements, which are therefore offered for consideration.

- (a) *The academic rationale* for study in a developing country will have to be specified and argued, in much greater depth and detail than is evident in either the responses of the institutional informants or the policy statements emanating from Commonwealth sources studied. A way of achieving this in Britain would be for the

Commonwealth to initiate, and provide a forum for, extensive institutional consultation directed to production of an agreed document stating the case for the educational value of study in the South. If such a document were formally adopted by umbrella bodies such as the CVCP/CDP and by institutions wishing to participate in enhanced North-South flow, it could in turn form the basis for national advocacy and the securing of support funds from Government and elsewhere. General statements of rationale are not enough without detailed documentation of the case at the level of specific academic and developmental objectives.

It may be that in other developed Commonwealth countries there has been more articulation of the academic rationale for study abroad in the South; if so, their experience should be carefully evaluated in the context of the educational climate in Britain.

- (b) *Students* who are potential participants in North-South mobility arrangements will have to be convinced that such mobility is in their interest. This is partly a matter of resources (meeting personal costs), partly of information provision and the overcoming of negative expectations, and partly of providing assurances that academic and other needs will in fact be met. Clearly, both sending and receiving institutions have responsibilities in this regard; the mutual allocation of responsibility will need to be carefully negotiated.
- (c) *Sending institutions* will have to be satisfied that:
- *Financial implications* have been adequately addressed. A strong case can be made for the development of North-South mobility programmes based on reciprocity, which would be fee-neutral with provision of institutional support grants on the ERASMUS model. Periods of study abroad under designated conditions, and integrated into the structure and requirements of the British degree (as already happens under some mobility programmes), would also command support in many British institutions on academic as well as financial grounds. Institutional concerns about the add-on costs of servicing such mobility programmes would however need to be met. Problems of imbalance in demand for incoming and outgoing places may have to be addressed, as would the question of absorptive capacity for both sending and receiving institutions.
  - *Quality assurance* can be built in and sustained throughout the life of programmes. This, as many pointed out in the survey, is

costly in terms of infrastructural support, staff visits and continuing liaison with the developing-country institution. It also raises 'chicken-and-egg' questions, since, while institution-building in the developing Commonwealth is a recognised long-term objective of the project, many British higher education institutions sympathetic to North-South links but concerned about quality assurance and the value of their degree would wish to have dealings only with already 'built' institutions in the South.

## *Models and opportunities*

The sections on the nationally administered and/or monitored activity, and institutional perspectives above yield a 'thumbnail sketch' of activity, perceptions and preconditions for North-South student movement as seen from a UK perspective. While the picture cannot claim to be authoritative, some conclusions can be provisionally drawn with respect to models and policies for the Commonwealth.

- 1 Problems of data reliability notwithstanding, levels of activity are low, as is the perceived priority of encouraging North-South mobility at both national and institutional levels. Outward movement of UK students, especially to developing-country destinations, will remain a minority pursuit by comparison with the promotion of inward flow, despite possible future shifts in the financial imperatives governing the latter.
- 2 Pleas for generalised promotion of North-South movement are unlikely to command support in the present climate of British higher education, unless backed by detailed marshalling of cases. Despite the levels of genuine support revealed by the survey, a realistic assessment of the current climate indicates that the academic rationale for North-South mobility must be spelt out and the case made subject by subject and link by link between institutions and departments of the North and South. Strategies for enhancing North-South flow must be *focused* and *targeted* to specific educational objectives. The Commonwealth could, we believe, play a vital catalysing role by giving political impetus to a debate that would draw in institutions, academic organisations, funding bodies and NGOs to document these detailed educational objectives and to generate statements of rationale. These statements could then be formally adopted by umbrella bodies such as

the CVDP/CDP, enshrined into educational policy at institutional, national and transnational levels; and used as a basis for advocacy and resource seeking.

- 3 Institutionally perceived preconditions regarding resources and quality assurance must be met before significant progress can be made. The question of *fees* is surely a central one here. Student exchange schemes based on reciprocity could be theoretically fee-neutral, but institutional support grants would be needed at both ends of the link to meet the extra costs of providing for students from abroad. As an alternative to the exchange principle or in combination with it, there is evidence of considerable support in Britain for structured periods of study abroad in selected institutions and under designated conditions, with academic recognition 'here' and assessment in accordance with the requirements of the British degree.

If such programmes are to be acceptable to developing-country institutions, they will require concrete incentives to take in part-course students from the North at the possible expense of their own nationals. They will not willingly accept a 'feeder' relationship to British institutions and degrees; nor would such be conducive in the long run to institutional development. Reciprocity again would be one such incentive: either a straight exchange between equivalent departments within a discipline, or receiving students in an area of local strength in return for fee-free places for their own students in disciplines where the Northern institution is stronger. Another incentive would be negotiation of equitable arrangements for fee transfer to the developing-country institution for the period of study in question.

- 4 Provisions for academic recognition of periods of study in the South appear to be relatively undeveloped as yet, at least so far as can be judged from our survey. This is scarcely surprising, given the rapid transformations that are taking place in British higher education itself and the pressure towards harmonisation of academic recognition arrangements within the developed world. As elsewhere, there is need for a wide-ranging debate on the subject; in which the Commonwealth could appropriately play a leading role.
- 5 There will continue to be special academic circumstances where students will, in a sense, find their own way to developing-country destinations and institutions will not need to be persuaded that this is an indispensable component of their studies.

Postgraduate fieldwork, language and area studies are obvious examples. Here, the problems to be overcome are not those of principle but of practicality: travel funds, support and supervision, communication, completion timetables. Departments from which students regularly go to the 'South' on such essential projects will have experience of meeting these practical and logistical needs. Institutions wishing to build facilities for North-South movement in other disciplinary areas may do well to 'tap' the often considerable experience of their own Departments.

- 6 All of the above has to happen within a structure or frame suitable for the purpose intended. No single strategy or model is likely to meet all needs. In the case of outgoing students on specialised research projects, the direction of flow will be one-way and (although there may be exceptions) reciprocity will carry no obvious advantage. In other cases, it is clear from our survey that many in British institutions would favour North-South movement as part of an exchange programme or programmes based on reciprocity.

There has also been much discussion within the EC of the possibility of an ERASMUS-type programme linking institutions of the North and South. While it is too early to predict the outcome of these moves, Commonwealth governments and institutions will clearly want to consider ways in which Commonwealth-based programmes of North-South educational collaboration can be developed in harmony with EC-based ones.

- 7 'Framing' issues of a different kind concern the *structure of inter-institutional relations* within which student movement, whether reciprocal or one-way, is to take place. Policy-makers need to consider what else is happening, or should happen, to give context and add value to the exercise of sending students for study in the South. There is need for a wide-ranging debate on ways in which outward mobility of students could or should be integrated with other forms of liaison: staff exchange, study visits by senior scholars, curriculum development, research collaboration, shared projects for distance learning. (From a Commonwealth perspective, the obvious linked activities are those of the Commonwealth of Learning and CHESS.)
- 8 From the viewpoint of British institutions a strong case could be made for developing a *network of North-South academic linkages* that would embrace student mobility as an integral part of a 'package' of shared activities. Infrastructural support for such links could be

provided from a variety of sources, while their content would differ according to the needs and enthusiasms of participants. One possibility would be a Commonwealth-based inter-institutional mobility programme encompassing both staff and student exchange, in which, in contrast to the conventional pattern of staff moving North-South and students South-North, parity of flow would be encouraged at both Faculty and student levels. King (1985) discusses in detail the rationale of North-South bilateral links from the perspective of both Northern and Southern partners. He notes the tension between the efficiency and academic coherence provided for formal links, and the need to preserve diversity of scholarly communication and the fertility of informal networks. He also stresses the need to assure parity between institutional partners in the collaboration process and in the setting of priorities to govern the links. All these questions require careful consideration.

As has been noted above, there already exists within Britain a structure for North-South links between academic institutions: the British Council's programme of academic linkages under the Committee for International Co-operation in Higher Education (CICHE). Two hundred and ninety-one such links, involving 17 countries, were in place at the time of our study. Supported under a budget provided by the Overseas Development Administration, they underwrite collaboration between British institutions and those in developing countries on projects which have specific objectives relevant to national economic development. Activities supported under CICHE links are varied, but they include institutional and staff development, institutional management, training of technical staff, course and curriculum development, community work, technology transfer and research collaboration. The CICHE scheme does not at present provide for student exchange or transfer between institutions of the North and South. In discussion with the British Council's Higher Education Division it was nonetheless suggested to us that there is no reason in principle why student mobility should not, in appropriate cases, be a relevant activity for CICHE support.

The *recommendation* is that, within Britain, consideration be given to *either* including provision for outward flow and/or exchange of students as a 'bolt-on' to the existing CICHE scheme, *or* using the experience of CICHE as a model for a separate mobility programme as suggested in 3, above. On a pan-Commonwealth scale, it will clearly be

necessary to consider and learn from any alternative models emerging from activities in the other developed countries that are outside the scope of this study.

## ***Conclusion and summary of recommendations***

In an exploratory and time-limited, though wide-ranging national study, a broad picture has emerged and provisional recommendations can be made as to the next steps. These are summarised with headings corresponding to those of the study's original brief.

- 1 *Information base* National information on student outflow to all destinations is inadequate. Without a reliable information base, there can be no possibility of a national policy to encourage or support outward movement to developing-country destinations, whether inside or outside the Commonwealth. National data-collecting agencies should give serious consideration to establishing satisfactory procedures for monitoring outward flow of British students to all destinations. Such data availability will be needed in the future for national policy purposes going beyond those of this study.

At institutional level, record-keeping policies seem to be highly variable and information on outward movement of students is not always easily accessible, even to institutional staff. Institutions should be encouraged to examine what can be done to collect basic information relevant to policy-building on student outflow and exchange, and to disseminate it internally in the most effective manner.

Institutions should also play from their strengths. They should audit the collective wisdom of their own departments with long experience of sending students Southwards in subject areas such as anthropology, geography, regional studies and medical/veterinary electives, and consider what can be learnt and applied in other subjects.

Developing-country institutions in the Commonwealth wishing to receive students from the North, under CSFP for example, should consider what they can do to 'document' themselves and their areas of strength in the academic and student circuits of the developed world.

- 2 *Provisional assessment* The results of the study indicate that:

- Numbers of outgoing students to developing-country destinations from the UK are very low, although activity under informal institutional arrangements may be under-recorded.
- Promotion of North-South student movement is likely to remain a minority pursuit by comparison with overseas recruitment, although much can be done to encourage a greater balance of inward and outward flow.
- There is considerable support within institutions for the principle of encouraging North-South student movement, although this enthusiasm tends to be concentrated among individual staff establishing and working within personal networks.
- If this individual enthusiasm is to be translated into formal policy backed by resources at institutional level, certain very clearly perceived preconditions will have to be met, particularly with regard to funding and quality assurance.
- Receiving institutions in the developing Commonwealth will also have to be provided with proper incentives to take in developed-country nationals. These incentives could take several possible forms; such as fee transfer to the receiving institution or student exchange with fee remission.
- UK institutions asked to dedicate resources in the present climate to promoting North-South movement will have to be convinced of its educational value. General 'manifesto' statements of academic rationale need to be developed, but will not carry conviction unless backed by detailed documentation of educational benefits to be pursued in specific academic areas.
- Possibly the most serious impediment to policy development for North-South mobility is the *lack of a national debate* on rationales, issues, preconditions, obstacles and remedies. Institutional interest is, as indicated, substantial but scattered and isolated. There is, as King observed (1985), no connected constituency within which advocacy and policy development could take place. A number of our respondents and those consulted observed that our study opened up a new area of discussion, and one which they greatly wished to see developed.

In the light of the above, the following *recommendations* for action on the part of the Commonwealth are made.

- 3 *Action through the Commonwealth* In response to the present position regarding North-South student mobility within the UK, the Commonwealth should:

- (a) Take a political lead in stimulating a national dialogue on North-South mobility which would draw in all sectors of the Higher Education community in Britain: institutions, academic and professional associations, the British Council, Government Departments and NGOs. Two results can be anticipated. First, a general case could be articulated of the educational value of study in a developing country; a 'mission' document could be adopted into institutional policies and those of umbrella bodies such as the CVCP/CDP, and used as the basis for national advocacy and resource-seeking. As stated earlier, this global statement of rationale would need to be backed by case-by-case documentation of academic rationales. Second, an enduring national network could come into being – a 'constituency aware of itself' – which would in turn become a locus for the sharing of experience and the testing and refinement of aims, policies and strategies.
- (b) Consider the establishment of a Commonwealth-based inter-institutional mobility programme on the North-South axis, in which student flow would be integrated with other dimensions of academic activity such as staff exchange, research collaboration, technology transfer and distance learning. A substantial feasibility study would be needed to develop this proposal. Close co-ordination would obviously be necessary with the Commonwealth of Learning and with the CHES implementation process. Consultation should also take place with the British Council regarding the use of CICHE bilateral links as a part-model for the proposed programme; or, alternatively, incorporating provision for student movement into the CICHE scheme itself.
- (c) Monitor the progress of transnational initiatives outside the Commonwealth, such as action by the EC and Unesco, and ensure harmony of effort to maximise educational opportunity on a global scale. Liaison and harmony of effort should also be maintained with other national developments in Britain, such as the VSO/ODA work-placement initiative.

**TABLE 8.1 UK students studying in other countries**  
Data from several sources

SOURCE OF STATISTICS				
Host Country	(1) UNESCO 1988	(2) ComSec 86-87	(3) CSFP 1990	(4) CSFP 1960-80 onwards
Australia	223	184	5	80
Canada	885	1070	11	164
Hong Kong	-	-	-	-
India	58*	74	-	48
Jamaica	-	-	-	-
Malaysia	-	-	-	-
New Zealand	0	23	2	36
Nigeria	-	-	-	-
Singapore	1*	-	-	-
Trinidad & Tobago	1	-	-	-

\* Figures are for 1983

Sources:

- 1 Unesco Yearbook 1991
- 2 Commonwealth Student Flows in an International Perspective: Update and Model for Future Monitoring. ComSec, Revised Sept 1988
- 3 31st Annual Report of the Commonwealth Scholarship Commission
- 4 CSFP Tracer Study 1989

**TABLE 8.2 CSFP Scholarships available to UK students 1990**

<i>Awarding Country</i>	<i>Number of Nominations by the Commission</i>	<i>Number of Awards Notified to the Commission</i>	<i>Awards Accepted</i>
Australia	16	5	5
Canada	27	14	11
Hong Kong	–	–	–
India	2	2	–
Jamaica	1	–	–
Malaysia	2	–	–
New Zealand	5	2	2
Nigeria	2	1	–
Trinidad & Tobago	–	–	–

Source: 31st Report of the Commonwealth Scholarship Commission

**TABLE 8.3 List of Government-funded support schemes**

KEY	
F	British source of funds
Y	Year in which scheme as currently constituted was established
A	Body of administration in Britain
E	National eligibility for awards
T	Country in which award is tenable

**1 Technical Co-operation Training Programme**

- F ODA
- Y 1960
- A British Council
- E nationals of a developing country participating in TCTP
- T UK

**2 ODA Shared Scholarship Scheme**

- F ODA
- Y 1986
- A ODA/colleges and universities

- E open only to students from the developing Commonwealth
- T UK
- 3 Sino-British Friendship Scheme**
  - F ODA
  - Y 1987
  - A British Council
  - E Students from the People's Republic of China
  - T UK
- 4 Nassau Fellowship**
  - F ODA
  - Y 1986
  - A British Government and in some cases the Commonwealth Secretariat
  - E Black South African students
  - T -
- 5 British Undergraduate Fellowship Scheme**
  - F ODA
  - Y 1987
  - A -
  - E Black South Africans
  - T -
- 6 Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan**
  - F FCO/ODA
  - Y 1959
  - A Association of Commonwealth Universities
  - E Commonwealth students and scholars
  - T Tenable in countries participating in the scheme
- 7 FCO Scholarships and Awards Schemes**
  - F FCO/ODA
  - Y 1983
  - A FCO/British Council
  - E Commonwealth nationals, excluding Britain
  - T UK
- 8 Marshal Aid Commemoration Scholarships**
  - F FCO
  - Y 1953
  - A Secretariat provided by ACU
  - E US citizens
  - T Britain
- 9 British Council Fellowship Programme**
  - F British Council

- Y 1937
  - A British Council
  - E No restrictions
  - T UK
- 10 Overseas Research Students Awards Schemes**
- F Department of Education and Science
  - Y 1980
  - A Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals
  - E Overseas graduates
  - T UK
- 11 Fulbright Commission Scholarships**
- F Department of Education and Science
  - Y 1948
  - A -
  - E British and American citizens
  - T Britain and the USA
- 12 CBI Scholarships**
- F DTI/CBI
  - Y 1950
  - A -
  - E Overseas engineers
  - T UK
- 13 Hands on Training Scheme**
- F DTI/British Industry
  - Y 1989
  - A -
  - E Candidates from countries considered to be key trading partners
  - T UK

*Sources:* The ACU, 1990 Awards for Postgraduate Study: at Commonwealth Universities 1991-93, London  
 The ACU, Lynn Williams, 1990, Country Studies on Mobility: Britain, London, The Commonwealth