

# Towards a Commonwealth of Scholars

*A New Vision for the Nineties*



*Edited by Lalage Bown*

Commonwealth Secretariat

# Towards a Commonwealth of Scholars

*A New Vision for the Nineties*

Edited by Lalage Bown

*Professor Emeritus, University of Glasgow  
Honorary Professor, University of Warwick*

Commonwealth Secretariat 1994

Published 1994

Commonwealth Secretariat  
Marlborough House  
Pall Mall  
London SW1Y 5HX  
United Kingdom

Governments of developing Commonwealth countries wishing to reproduce the material in this publication in whole or in part in any language should inform the Commonwealth Secretariat which may be able to offer them some assistance.

© Copyright Commonwealth Secretariat 1994

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

ISBN 0 85092 402 2

Prepared for publication by Paren & Stacey Editorial Consultants  
Designed and formatted by Geoffrey Wadsley  
Edited by Pauline Tait

May be purchased from

Education Department  
Human Resource Development Division  
Commonwealth Secretariat  
Marlborough House  
Pall Mall  
London SW1Y 5HX  
United Kingdom

# Contents

---

LIST OF TABLES	v
PREFACE	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	ix
<b>PART ONE: Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1 Active, not Passive	3
A Commonwealth Agenda for Redirecting Student Flows	
<i>Lalage Bown</i>	
2 Towards a Commonwealth of Scholars	10
Developing Foreign Student Flows into Universities of the South	
<i>Lalage Bown</i>	
<b>PART TWO: Academic Interchange and Institution Building in the Commonwealth</b>	<b>33</b>
3 Trends, Problems and a Commonwealth Project	35
<i>Jasbir Singh</i>	
4 Student Mobility Networks	43
The Case for a Commonwealth Scheme	
<i>Elizabeth Dines</i>	
<b>PART THREE: Perspectives From the South: Some Viewpoints</b>	<b>59</b>
5 Student Mobility and Internationalisation	61
A Perspective from the English-speaking Caribbean	
<i>Ancilla Armstrong and J E Greene</i>	

6	Academic Exchange Student Flows, Exchange Schemes and Capacity Building in India <i>Karuna Chanana Ahmad and Aparna Basu</i>	78
7	Policy, Expectations and Shortfalls Nigerian Views and Experiences <i>A Jones Akinpelu</i>	108
<b>PART FOUR: From North to South: Flows from the Post- Industrial Countries</b>		<b>117</b>
8	Against the Grain? Student Mobility from Britain to Commonwealth Developing Countries <i>Hilary Callan and Kate Steele</i>	119
9	Internationalising Canadian Universities Student Mobility to Developing Countries <i>Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada</i>	157
<b>PART FIVE: Mobility in Practice: Case Studies and Experiments</b>		<b>173</b>
10	Academic Exchange Schemes in Malaysia <i>Leong Yin Ching</i>	175
11	Two Contrasting African Cases Kenya and Zimbabwe <i>Parvin Walji and Peter Dzvimbo</i>	190
12	World Class Institutions and Student Mobility The Indian Institutes of Technology <i>Jayalakshmi Indiresan</i>	207
13	Open to Talent Higher Education in Singapore <i>G Gopinathan</i>	218
<b>Appendices</b>		<b>229</b>
1	Summary Statistical Tables on Student Mobility	231
2	Commonwealth Universities Study Abroad Consortium	236
REFERENCES		241
LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS		244

## *List of Tables*

---

5.1	University enrolment growth: University of the West Indies, 1960/61–1988/89	77
5.2	Higher education enrolment of English-speaking Caribbean students: Caribbean and United States, 1983	77
6.1	Foreign students enrolled at Indian universities 1989-90, numbers and countries of origin	
	A Commonwealth	103
	B Non-Commonwealth	104
6.2	Indian universities with more than 100 foreign students, 1989-90	105
6.3	Annual enrolment of foreign students, Delhi University, 1961-62 to 1991-92	106
6.4	Countries of origin of foreign students enrolled at Delhi University, 1991-92	107
7.1	Estimates of foreign student enrolment in nine Nigerian universities, 1985/86 to 1989/90	115
7.2	Foreign applicants for Commonwealth awards tenable in Nigeria, 1988 to 1991	115

8.1	UK students studying in other countries	153
8.2	CSFP Scholarships available to UK students, 1990	154
8.3	List of Government-funded support schemes	154
11.1	Exchange programme students at the University of Nairobi by country, institution and discipline, 1988-91	205
11.2	Exchange programme students at Kenyatta University by institution, 1988-91	206
Appendix 1		
1	All international students abroad, 1989	231
2	Main Commonwealth senders of students to US 1990, with student numbers	232
3	Intra-Commonwealth student mobility flows to four main countries	233
4	Percentage change in numbers of students from abroad by Australia, Britain, Canada and New Zealand, 1980 to 1990 and 1988 to 1990	234
5	Number of postgraduate and undergraduate overseas students in higher education in UK, 1990	234
6	Increase in Commonwealth students in Australia, Britain and Canada, 1988-1990	235

## *Preface*

---

In April 1992, a group of university academics and administrators from all parts of the Commonwealth met in Singapore to consider how best to promote the flow of students into the universities of developing countries from other Commonwealth universities, against the grain of a long history of outward movement. It was a notably well-prepared meeting, with papers specially commissioned from ten countries to describe and analyse the current situation and the obstacles to improvement. The meeting was charged with the task of proposing ways of overcoming those obstacles.

In this book, Professor Lalage Bown has spun together the results of that meeting, including the background documentation, into a rich and informative narrative. It provides, from many different national perspectives, a thorough analysis of the policy issues and preoccupations which concern governments and universities alike; it gets behind the rhetoric into the facts. The data it assembles, and its challenging case studies of particular countries and universities, are important references for anyone working in the field of international education in Commonwealth countries and elsewhere.

But the book is more than a collection of information and opinions: it is a call for action, and specifically for leadership from the Commonwealth, which stands for so many of the values which the writers uphold. For the most part that leadership must come from within institutions and governments, and this volume contains many examples of where it could be most effective.

The Commonwealth Secretariat recognises that it too has a catalytic role to play, to the extent that its resources permit. One Secretariat

response is described in Appendix 2 of this book, which details how the Secretariat has taken the lead in assembling the Commonwealth Universities Study Abroad Consortium comprising twenty-eight institutions from all parts of the Commonwealth. In August 1993 these universities committed themselves formally to take action to provide opportunities for their students to study in other universities in the developing world as a part of their course, and to give full academic credit for this.

Alongside co-operative endeavours like the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan and the Commonwealth of Learning, this initiative, and the student movements which will flow from it, will demonstrate that the countries of the Commonwealth continue to take a lead in the internationalisation of education from which they all, both industrialised and developing, will gain.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading 'Emeka Anyaoku'. The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letter 'E' being particularly large and stylized.

Emeka Anyaoku  
Commonwealth Secretary-General

## *List of Abbreviations*

---

AARA	Australia Awards for Research in Asia
ABU	Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria
ACE	American Council on Education
ACFAS	Association Canadienne-française pour l'avancement des sciences (French Canadian association for the advancement of science)
ACP	African, Caribbean and Pacific nations, in the context of their relations with the European Community, under the Lomé Conventions
ACU	Association of Commonwealth Universities
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AICTE	All India Council of Technical Education
AIS	American Institute of Indian Studies
AIU	Association of Indian Universities
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
AUCC	Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada
BACAA	Bilateral Agreements, Commonwealth and African Affairs (in Federal Ministry of Education, Nigeria)
BPSP	Berkeley Professional Studies Programme
CAFLIS	Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Study, USA
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CAST	College of Arts, Science and Technology, Jamaica
CBIE	Canadian Bureau for International Education
CEP	Cultural Exchange Programme
CFTC	Commonwealth Fund for Technical Cooperation

CHES	Commonwealth Higher Education Support Scheme
CICHE	Committee for International Co-operation in Higher Education (a committee of the British Council)
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
COL	The Commonwealth of Learning
CPA	Commonwealth Professional Association
CS	Commonwealth Secretariat
CSFP	Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan
CUSAC	Commonwealth Universities Students Abroad Consortium
CUSO	Canadian University Service Overseas
CVCP	Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals
DAAD	German Academic Exchange Service
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DES	Department of Education and Science, UK (name now changed to DFE, Department for Education)
DU	University of Delhi, Delhi, India
EAP	Education Abroad Programme (of the University of California, USA)
EC	European Community
ECCCTS	European Community Course Credit Transfer System
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
Ed-CIL	Educational Consultants India Ltd
EFTA	European Free Trade Area
ERASMUS	European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students
ESAP	Economic Structural Adjustment Programme, Zimbabwe
FSA	Foreign Student Advisor
GCSS	General Cultural Scholarship Scheme (India)
GTZ	Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (German Agency for Technical Co-operation)
ICCR	Indian Council for Cultural Relations
IDPAUC	International Development Programme of Australian Universities and Colleges
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IIE	Institute of International Education, USA
IIT	Indian Institute of Technology
IMA	Indian Missions Abroad
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IRDAC	Industrial Research and Development Advisory Committee

ISEP	International Student Exchange Programme, Washington, USA
JAMB	Joint Admissions and Matriculation Board (Nigeria)
JEE	Joint Entrance Examination, India
JMI	Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, India
JNU	Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India
JSPS	Japan Society for the Promotion of Science
MHRD	Ministry of Human Resource Development
MIS	Management Information System
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTCP	Malaysian Technical Co-operation Programme
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NUC	Nigerian Universities Commission
OAU	Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria
ODA	Overseas Development Administration (UK)
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OIC	Organisation of Islamic Conference
SADCC	Southern African Co-ordinating Conference
SARF	South African Relief Fund
SERU	Socio Economic and Research Unit, Prime Minister's Department, Malaysia
SICI	Shastri Indo-Canadian Institute
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SPM	Sijil Pelajarau Malaysia (Malaysian Certificate of Education)
SPVM	Sijil Pelajarau Vokasional Malaysia (Malaysian Certificate of Vocational Education)
STPM	Sijil Tinggi Persekolahan Malaysia (Malaysian Higher School Certificate)
TEMPUS	Trans-European Mobility Scheme for University Studies
TIL	Targeted International Links Programme, Australia
UDU	Uthman Dan Fodio University, Sokoto, Nigeria
UG	University of Guyana
UGC	University Grants Commission
UI	University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria
UKCOSA	United Kingdom Council for Overseas Student Affairs
UMAP	University Mobility in the Asia Pacific
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNB	University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria (commonly called UNIBEN)

UNC	University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria (commonly called UNICAL)
UNL	University of Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria (commonly called UNILAG)
UNM	University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri, Nigeria
UNN	University of Nigeria, Nsukka
UOR	University of Roorkee, India
USAID	United States Agency of International Development
USEFI	United States Educational Foundation in India
USIS	United States Information Service
USIU	United States International University – Africa, based in Nairobi, Kenya
UWI	University of the West Indies
VSO	Voluntary Service Overseas
WUSC	World University Service Canada

# **PART ONE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

---

- 1 Active, not Passive**
- A Commonwealth Agenda for Redirecting Student Flows** 3
- Lalage Bown*
- Scholarship in the North and South
- The Singapore Workshop on Academic Interchange and  
Institution Building
- Purpose and structure of this book
- 2 Towards a Commonwealth of Scholars**
- Developing Foreign Student Flows into Universities  
of the South** 10
- Lalage Bown*
- First principles: the nature of universities
- The present picture
- Facets of student mobility
- Lessons for strategy: Factors favouring student mobility
- Lessons for strategy: Inhibitions on student mobility
- Mechanisms for progress: Types of support structure
- The way forward: Some models of good practice
- The way forward: A Commonwealth strategy
- Afterword: The benefits of greater student mobility in the South

# 1

## *Active not Passive*

*A Commonwealth Agenda for Redirecting Student Flows*

---

Lalage Bown

### *Scholarship in the North and South*

Scholarship is common wealth, in several senses. The knowledge and understanding which derives from scholarship both helps in the conservation of values held in common and is the basis of economic change or development. It is therefore quite literally the wealth of any community, small or large.

It is common also in the sense that it can be shared across frontiers. It is a fundamental tenet of academia that it should be so shared. Hence the imperative to publish research results and disseminate them. Hence also the physical movement of academics, and often of their students, from one institution to another, from one country to another.

The fact that much academic behaviour is about sharing, and the fact that the scholarly tradition is premised on sharing does not, however, mean that the division of the world's wealth of knowledge is equal. Paradoxically, modern improvements in information technology have heightened inequality in access to knowledge, since the poorer countries do not command the skills, the equipment or the resources to benefit from them. A recent Human Development Report (UNDP, 1992) points out:

Some of the current gaps between North and South in technical education, informatics and technological research are particularly disturbing:

- The tertiary enrolment ratio is only eight per cent in the South compared with 37 per cent in the North. In the least developed countries it is two per cent.

- Scientific and technical personnel number only nine per 1,000 people, compared with 81 in the North.
- Communications – the informatics and communications revolution seems to have bypassed most developing countries. Per capita, they have only one-eighteenth as many telephone connections, one-eighth as many newspapers and one-sixth as many radios.
- Computerisation – only a twentieth of the world's computers are in the South.
- Research and development (R & D) – despite having 80 per cent of the world's population, developing countries are responsible for only four per cent of global R & D expenditure.

Such drastic inequalities are of major concern to the Commonwealth, since it is a partnership of rich and poor countries, a coalition of North and South which will experience increasing tension if these gaps are not bridged.

Within the Commonwealth, much of its partnership activity is higher education-related. Almost all of the Commonwealth Professional Associations (CPAs) bring together professional people trained in higher education institutions and whose capacity to understand each other stems from a comparability in their training. Within universities themselves, there has been a sense of common heritage in system, standards and, generally, language. It is therefore a matter of great sensitivity that higher education across the Commonwealth is seen to be genuinely open to exchange and interchange. In the eyes of many of the countries of the South, the association might stand or fall by its success in keeping up a fairer flow of knowledge physically symbolised by a flow of people, both students and academics.

The movement of students has a very high priority for the many small Commonwealth nations in any case, since they may have no university within their borders, as is the case with The Gambia, or their higher education institution may not have the resources to cater for more than a few disciplines or for any postgraduate work.

It is not, therefore, surprising that higher education exchange, linked to student flows, has loomed large in recent Commonwealth discussions. The Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) in Harare in November 1991 'affirmed the fundamental importance of enhanced student mobility for Commonwealth cohesion and for the future of the Commonwealth itself'.

The tensions were heightened in the 1980s by the action of the countries of the Commonwealth North in charging full-cost fees, which was seen as tantamount to slamming the doors on students from the poorer

countries. This was not passively accepted, and there was a protracted attempt to palliate, if not reverse, the various rich countries' decisions. That struggle is referred to elsewhere in this book, but here we are concerned with the drive for alternative action to continue student mobility without being hobbled by the high fee regimes in Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United Kingdom.

The move to alternative action has included such initiatives as the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) and the Commonwealth Higher Education Support Scheme (CHESS). But recently it has focused on a redirection of some student flows. Two questions have been posed. The first is: can there be more exchanges between institutions of the South? This might seem problematic if we were simply seeing the spectacle of the poor sharing their poverty, but in the Commonwealth South there are countries with very highly reputed institutions, such as India with its great Institutes of Technology, and countries with extensive and complex higher education systems, such as Nigeria. In addition, there are federal institutions such as the University of the West Indies and the University of the South Pacific, which have a rich and sophisticated experience of catering to students from diverse backgrounds within their own far-flung regions. All these would make credible hosts for students from other parts of the South. The advantages of South-South student migration will emerge in several chapters: the environment in another developing country should not be so alienating as that of urbanised post-industrial societies; the problems posed in curricula should be more directly relevant to students' own backgrounds, and they may form friendships and make contacts which will make the Commonwealth more multi-dimensional and less magnetised towards the metropolises.

The second question is: can more students from the North be encouraged to pursue part of their higher education in the South? While their numbers would always be comparatively few, an increasing Northern presence in Southern campuses is seen as likely to contribute to building the capacity of those campuses and also as a logical development of the globalisation of business and markets, with trans-nationals needing employees who understand the languages, cultures and environments of the countries where they operate.

## ***The Singapore Workshop on Academic Interchange and Institution Building***

It was as a result of the new thinking and the urge to new action that the Commonwealth Secretariat decided to commission research from a group of consultants from ten different member countries on the feasibility of redirecting student flows. Each consultant worked to a common brief so that substantial parallel information was collected on: student flows; major exchange schemes; national and institutional attitudes towards enhanced student intake from abroad; factors affecting student mobility. Additionally, assessments were given of national and institutional policies and opinions on what, if any, institutional support structures and academic resources needed strengthening.

The purpose was to stimulate creative thinking on patterns of student flow and the consultants were brought together in a workshop in Singapore to discuss the implications of their research and make some recommendations to promote activity designed to enhance student flows into the South. The workshop took place in April 1992 in Singapore, which was regarded as a particularly appropriate venue, since Singapore has always taken a positive view of the value of welcoming foreign students. Its policy and experience of being 'open to talent' are described in the final chapter of this book.

As a result of the Singapore meeting, the Secretariat was able to build up a new agenda and in particular to move to the launching of CUSAC, the Commonwealth Universities Study Abroad Consortium.

### ***Purpose and structure of this book***

Events have moved so fast since the Singapore meeting that some of the papers and discussions there may seem to have become dated already. To the Secretariat and to some academics, the value of the papers will continue to lie in their rich seam of comparative data and in statistical material which is likely to continue to be indicative. For a more general audience, it is hoped that certain dominant themes in relation to student mobility will be of abiding interest and that there will also be a welcome for insights, deriving from first-hand specialist knowledge, into certain specific cases of successful schemes and policies.

Material from the Singapore papers has been used in this book with the purpose of providing in readable form:

- 1 A historical background to the new initiatives in student exchange

- 2 A thorough analysis of the major policy issues and preoccupations from the point of view of South and North
- 3 A set of case studies from which lessons may be learned from other institutions and governments

The papers have been edited to provide continuity between chapters and although in most cases the major part of each author's text has been used, only a few of the statistics have been included and in each case the extracts are focused on a given theme. Inevitably, there was some repetition in the originals since, for instance, the barriers to mobility are very similar in most countries. These have been cut out to make a developing story, but I should emphasise to the reader that every paper was a substantial piece of social research done according to the proper canons. As with all social research, all the authors were aware of their responsibility in providing evidence and information which could be used to shape policy.

What follows provides evidence and information and also has a deliberate pattern or 'story-line'.

**Part One** is explanatory, with this chapter introducing the book and the second one providing a digest (with some personal opinions) of knowledge and ideas on student mobility as at April 1992 when the original papers were compiled.

**Part Two** gives a perspective by Jasbir Singh from the Commonwealth Secretariat on recent thinking and developments. She gives a context to the whole project which evolved from the Singapore workshop. One of the main preoccupations at Singapore was the question of a rationale for new forms of student exchange and after the meeting Elizabeth Dines went away and wrote a paper aiming to produce a rationale for her Australian colleagues. It is placed next to Dr Singh's paper, since Dr Dines' attempt to articulate the advantages of student mobility to an Australian audience contains much of the argument which would need to be presented to a Commonwealth-wide audience.

**Part Three** moves to three general papers giving perspectives from the South, in which the general issues are clearly presented, but from different angles. *Chapter 5* represents a description of the issues from the angle of a single university institution rather than a government. Ancilla Armstrong and J E Greene give a very clear and comprehensive study from the standpoint of the University of the West Indies. *Chapters 6 and 7* cover both national perspectives and those of university systems. Karuna Ahmad and Aparna Basu show the way in which the Indian government and institutions act as hosts to significant numbers

of foreign students – India being the only country of the South which is a major host to foreign students. The two authors, however, explain that India has no overt explicit policy, although there are obvious foreign policy interests and other policy pressures which affect student mobility in India. By contrast, the Federal Government of Nigeria has an expressed policy on the reception of foreign students and Jones Akinpelu calls attention to the shortfall between policy and practice. Throughout, it was found that in most countries of the South, not all opportunities offered, even through the Commonwealth Scholarships and Fellowships Programme, were taken up by foreign students, so that Nigeria was not peculiar in this. The barriers seemed to be the same as elsewhere, in spite of a favouring policy – and, as elsewhere, have to do with institutional constraints as well as lack of finance and lack of communication.

Lack of communication seems to be a serious inhibitor to increased North-South flows, and after the three perspectives from the South, **Part Four** goes on to look at why it is that students from the North do not present themselves in the South. Hilary Callan and Kate Steele in *Chapter 8* look at what happens when British students go to the South and Eva Egron-Polak in *Chapter 9* looks at Canadian students going South. Both chapters include information on institutional attitudes and on schemes in place to encourage North-South student interchange.

**Part Five** moves on to case studies. Malaysia is known for its very successful schemes to bring in foreign students and even though they are on a very small scale, they provide useful pointers to the ingredients of success. Leong Yin Ching describes them in *Chapter 10*. Some similar small-scale successful programmes have been mounted in Kenya and *Chapter 11* by Parvin Walji and Peter Dzvimbo provides a powerful contrast in approaches by two African countries – Kenya anxious to welcome foreign students from North and South, Zimbabwe much more cautious. Perhaps the difference is explained in part by the fact that Zimbabwe has come to independence very recently and is still very conscious of the role of its higher education institutions in nation-building, whereas in Kenya that role is taken for granted and not seen as threatened by the presence of foreign students.

*Chapter 12* takes us back to India. Besides being notable as the only country of the Commonwealth South to be a major host, India is also a major player because of its small group of world class institutions. Jayalakshmi Indiresan explains the interest of these institutions in attracting appropriately able foreign candidates, but explains that they have not always been able to do so.

Finally, in *Chapter 13* Dr Gopinathan depicts the special national case of Singapore, which is consciously and actively 'open to talent'.

Through all these chapters, there are certain common themes: about the internationalisation of universities; about the stresses placed on politicians and university heads by the application of an internationalisation policy when university places are short; about the great difficulty in obtaining adequate data on which policies could be based; about other factors favouring and inhibiting student mobility; and about the gap between opportunities for student mobility and actual take-up. In the next chapter, an overview is attempted of the various authors' insights into all these themes.

## 2

# *Towards a Commonwealth of Scholars*

## *Developing Foreign Student Flows into Universities of the South*

---

Lalage Bown

### *First principles: The nature of universities*

Universities do not flourish in isolation. As Armstrong and Greene state in Chapter 5:

Philosophically at least, institutions of higher learning, universities in particular, have tended to establish and maintain an environment which facilitates discovery and advancement in knowledge. Such an environment develops and thrives best by exchange and collaboration among scholars with experience and perspectives around the world.

It is possible to see universities as components of a trans-national system or as autonomous partner institutions in a complex of international exchanges and relationships; but it is impossible to imagine even the smallest and most fragile university existing for long as a university without a library of work by scholars from a variety of countries and without at least some teachers and researchers who are in some form of communication with counterparts elsewhere.

Our starting point, then, is that *universities by nature are disposed to international perspectives and linkages* – to various forms of sharing and exchange. Some sharing may be of curricula (through, for example, the Commonwealth of Learning), of resource materials (publications, reports, documentation, databases), of knowledge itself (through joint research). The most visible kind of sharing is, however, undoubtedly through the movement of people. Exchange between *staff*, both academic and administrative, has been, since the Second World War, a high priority in the Commonwealth and there has been a wide variety

of international and inter-institutional arrangements to encourage the movement of university staff. Such arrangements include sabbaticals, study-leaves, attendance at international meetings and conferences, international visiting fellowships and, in the case of newly-established institutions, staff development programmes. Even in times of restricted finance and of foreign exchange problems, universities still try to ensure some opportunities for their staff to travel. The University of Nairobi Deans' Committee, for instance, has had an earmarked fund from the Kenya Treasury to support staff travel abroad and most Commonwealth universities retain the possibility of a sabbatical, even if not as a right.

What has emerged more recently has been an interest in the exchange of students. This has been partly because of the commoditisation of foreign students in those countries of the North whose universities use their fees to help balance ever more hard-pressed budgets. But there is a serious philosophical basis for encouraging students to travel to foreign institutions. If a university is seen as in any sense a community of scholars, the majority population in that community is the population of students, undergraduate, postgraduate and occasional. Sending students abroad and welcoming students from abroad is thus a necessary part of any strategy for maintaining the international character of universities. The Commonwealth (and common wealth) of scholars is made up of students as well as of academic researchers and teachers.

My starting points are, therefore, that it is in the nature of universities to have international connections and that those connections should be developed not only through staff mobility but also through the mobility of students, seen as major contributors to the culture and character of their university communities.

Underlying these two principles, there is, of course, the assumption that universities are sufficiently useful, both to their own societies and internationally, to be worth strengthening and developing. It is also a corollary of these principles that an element in strengthening and developing *all* universities (of the South and of the North) must be international exchange and collaboration, including the encouragement of student movement across national boundaries.

Using these principles, my focus will be on the strengthening and development of Commonwealth universities of the South. This is because of perceived imbalances both in the resources for international exchange available to universities of North and South (to the advantage of the North) and in the movement of students between South and

North, with much of the flow being to the North away from the South.

In following up this discussion, several difficulties must be recognised. The *first* is what Callan and Steele (see Chapter 8) have seen as:

... the inherent tension between the discourses of development and institution-building on the one hand and of transaction among equals on the other ...

The implicit view of inter-university relationships on which our initial principles are based is that of shared interests and mutual respect, and the explicit view is that *all* universities, as institutions, have to be subject to institutional change and development. It must, however, be acknowledged that much of the discourse about institution-and capacity-building has emanated from institutions in the North and reflects their concerns and preoccupations. It is for this, among other reasons, that many universities of the South have wished to turn Commonwealth interest to a diversification of student mobility, with a greater emphasis on North-South flows and South-South flows.

A *second* problematic issue arises from the concept, strong in the universities of the South, of universities as essentially tools for nation-building. If the prime task of a university is to contribute to cultural, economic and educational development within a country, a national government may not be particularly impressed by general arguments about the international character of knowledge. We have said that universities are valuable to their societies. The crucial reasons why they are valuable were thoroughly discussed in the 1988 congress of the Association of Commonwealth Universities, the report of which was published as: *What can we do for our Countries? The Contribution of Universities to National Development* (ACU, 1988). The kind of national preoccupations which a government may have are exemplified in Malaysia, where criteria for admission to universities combine academic achievement with ethnic origin. The '... policy is to ensure that university enrolment reflects the ethnic composition of the population, not only by the university as a whole but also by faculty ...' (see Chapter 10). Policy agendas of this kind will not predispose governments to an interest in the reception/admission of foreign students.

Further, where the national system does not have the capacity to meet the pressures of demand from home students, there will be political sensitivity about admitting foreigners, wherever they come from, as Ahmad and Basu have observed in Chapter 6; and there may be resentment if there is an imbalance between the number of students

coming into the country and the number of national students obtaining opportunities to travel abroad, as Dzvimbo reports in Chapter 11 is the case in Zimbabwe. It will be necessary to demonstrate clear benefits from the presence of foreign students to catch the attention of governments with such preoccupations.

A *third* point relates to the role of the Commonwealth as an international organism which cuts across geographical and cultural regions. The arguments for internationalisation may be accepted, but culture and geography would suggest that student mobility is easiest within a given region. Thus between 60 and 70 per cent of the foreign students coming to Nigeria are from the neighbouring country of Cameroon, while 41 per cent of Kenya's intake come from its four geographical neighbours, two Commonwealth and two not (Akinpelu in Chapter 7 and Walji in Chapter 11). It is also becoming apparent that the universities of the United Kingdom are increasingly involved with universities in the rest of Europe, as the European Community develops closer political and economic ties (Chapter 3). These realities must be accepted, but the Commonwealth relationship still has a certain comparative advantage. The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada points out that in many cases there is a shared language of higher education, English, and that the universities of the Commonwealth have some family likeness in organisation and institutional culture (Egroun-Polak in Chapter 9). It may be that the Commonwealth relationship would be especially helpful in:

- (a) developing intra-regional South-South connections and
- (b) encouraging general North-South student traffic

The three issues raised above are collectively about policies of national governments. The policy context for our whole discussion is that decisions are largely not in the hands of universities themselves, but are taken by governments, whose prime concerns are not necessarily about scholarship (and who may occasionally even see foreign students as a threat). From our standpoint, the Commonwealth as a wider political arena becomes important as a policy forum beyond the national. *It should also be noted that international links and relationships may be valuable in preserving university autonomy.*

### *The present picture*

The Commonwealth Heads of Government in November 1991 made the affirmation already quoted in Chapter 1, of 'the fundamental importance of enhanced student mobility for Commonwealth cohesion

and for the future of the Commonwealth itself'. Jasbir Singh gives us a historical outline and an indication of recent developments in Chapter 3. Over the decade of the 1980s, member Governments' concern had been with impedance to mobility caused by the imposition by the post-industrial countries of full-cost fees on foreign students, including those from the Commonwealth. The new fee structures made it particularly difficult for students from poor countries to gain places in universities of the North. The problems which arose led to the setting up of the Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility and Higher Education Co-operation; but as the decade wore on, it appeared that attempts to reverse the differential fees policy were without effect. As Lynn Williams (1990) said:

... even the Commonwealth Standing Committee ... finally conceded the point, albeit reluctantly. The Committee had consistently argued against full-cost fees since its inception but is now pinning its hopes for Commonwealth education as much on the Commonwealth Higher Education Support Scheme (CHESS) as on increasing access to Britain and other developed countries. CHESS is intended to aid the expansion and improvement of universities in the developing countries in order to cater for students who are not now able to study overseas.

CHESS should not, however, be seen as a second best. Within its ambit, newer universities in the countries of the South could gain new strength and greater diversity. The debates of the 1980s have enabled us to see the one-way flow of students from South to North as a distortion, leading to unhealthy clientage relationships, whereas South-South and North-South student movement could redress the balance.

There is still a fair way to go before developing country universities become hosts to substantial numbers of students from elsewhere. In 1989-90, 45 per cent of all Commonwealth students who went abroad went to an industrial or post-industrial country of the Commonwealth, while intra-Commonwealth South-South movement accounted for only 12 per cent of Commonwealth student shift. Of the Commonwealth South, only India, which has a huge higher education system, is a major host country. As Ahmad and Basu indicate in Chapter 6, in 1989-90, India had 12,606 foreign students, of whom some 5,365 were from the Commonwealth – only 104 from industrial countries. This is an impressive overall total, and within it, the Commonwealth figure may actually be slightly more (since there is an undifferentiated category of students from Africa included in the tables).

Other parts of the developing Commonwealth seem only to receive very small numbers of foreign students and few from the Commonwealth. In 1989–90, there were only 466 non-Malaysian students out of a total student population in Malaysian universities of 55,844. Indicative figures for Commonwealth students were 64 out of 181 undergraduates in three universities and 15 out of 57 postgraduates in two universities – though once again there is a catchall Africa category (Leong in Chapter 10). Nigeria, with a policy of five per cent places reserved for students from abroad and thus a theoretical capacity to take in up to 10,000, in fact only took in 751 in 1988–89 (Akinpelu in Chapter 7), and Kenya in 1991 received 466 foreign students, of whom 191 were from the Commonwealth (Walji in Chapter 11).

In sum it appears that, except for India, countries of the Commonwealth South do not attract foreign students on any scale and there is under-utilisation of awards tenable in universities of the South, such as those made under the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Programme (CSFP). It should be noted, however, that the position is different in the English-speaking Caribbean. While only about three per cent of University of the West Indies students are non-Caribbean, the University is dedicated to a wide number of Caribbean nationalities. It serves a community of small states scattered over many hundreds of miles and is designated in perpetuity to serve as a regional institution (Greene and Armstrong in Chapter 5). Thus it already has a multi-national character and function, in principle, although there are signs of reluctance among students to travel to UWI campuses at a distance from their own island.

The picture remains one of low foreign intake into the universities of the South and of under half that intake originating in a Commonwealth country. The obverse of this is the continued pull to the North, with very few students from the North arriving in the developing countries. In Australia, applicants for CSFP awards show a preference for the UK, and of the 4,400 students who go abroad independently of any managed schemes, most are believed to go to Europe or the USA. (This and other information concerning Australia in this chapter is derived from an unpublished paper made available to the Singapore workshop by the International Development Programme of Australian Universities and Colleges). From Canada, in 1987 there were estimated to be 19,975 students overseas; only seven were studying in Africa, 177 in Oceania and 277 in Asia (AUCC). From the United Kingdom, according to the Commonwealth Secretariat, 1,351 students went to other Commonwealth countries; only 74 had a destination in the South,

in this case India for all of them (statistics quoted by Callan and Steele in Chapter 8).

These general conclusions have been drawn from the work of contributors to this book, all of whom have produced extremely illuminating material. The data is not always comparable, but in combination provides more authoritative information than has hitherto been available. In moving towards a strategy for increased student mobility in the South, one of the constant problems has been lack of data and all the researchers complained of the difficulty of collecting it (one report mentioned a university which regarded information about foreign students as confidential). The Commonwealth Secretariat, perhaps in collaboration with Unesco, could very profitably build on past work to establish better data-gathering and monitoring in the future.

How then can developing countries be enabled to take in more foreign students, especially from the Commonwealth and how can students from Australia, Britain, Canada and New Zealand be encouraged to study in the less affluent countries of the Commonwealth? In both cases, the issue is one of costs and benefits. For *developing countries*, preoccupied with pressures from their own ever-growing constituencies of candidates qualified for university places, but who cannot get admission, would the benefits of receiving foreign students ever outweigh the political costs of disappointing home student demand? For the *post-industrial countries*, for whom, in the words of Callan and Steele (in Chapter 8), 'outward movement would always be a minority pursuit by comparison with the economic imperative to attract fee-paying students from abroad', can the cost of that minority pursuit be seen to be outweighed by any material and tangible benefit?

### *Facets of student mobility*

Before attempting to answer the questions of benefit and of appropriate strategies and mechanisms, it is necessary to say what we see as the make-up of a foreign student population. The most obvious are full-time undergraduates and postgraduates. On the whole, observers view postgraduates as most likely to be attracted and to cope with differences of culture, etc, but in both India and Nigeria the majority of foreign students are undergraduates, so no assumptions in favour of one category can be sustained. The issue of part-time undergraduates or postgraduates was not raised in any of the relevant reports, presumably because it is either impossible in practice for foreign students to find work while studying or because it is illegal in the receiving

countries, most of which have severe problems of modern sector unemployment.

Several reports do indicate that there are other shorter-term categories of student. Many spend a period on a foreign campus for research purposes. This may be institutionally-arranged as part of a split-site degree programme, or may be random, depending on student interest. Others are short-term visitors on an organised exchange, or for a work placement (often as part of a medical degree) or to learn the host country's language. Either of the latter may be part of a managed programme or may be independent, self-funded or individually sponsored.

There would be merit in looking at more varieties of short-term study. A short visit may whet the appetite of an individual, a student-group or a sending institution for further and longer programmes and may thus serve an information and 'taster' function. The University of the West Indies has a conscious strategy of attracting foreign students through an International Summer Programme in Caribbean Studies, offering both credit and non-credit courses (Greene and Armstrong in Chapter 5). Students in such programmes may not appear in the statistics at present, but I would suggest that they should. One report makes the point that there is a difference between serious study and plain tourism (Callan and Steele in Chapter 8), and the latter is obviously outside our purview or interest, but relatively short study visits must remain very much within our sights.

In addition, there is one other form of student mobility, which is neither a result of a study requirement nor just tourism. Students may belong to unions or to associations with a disciplinary base (Education, Economics). In the 1960s and 1970s, such organisations frequently held international gatherings and they provided a forum in which students from South and North could meet over a common interest. External funding disappeared in the 1980s, along with foreign exchange. Are there ways, appropriate to the 1990s, of encouraging more student discipline-based associations to meet in conference across national boundaries? The experience of Europe after the Second World War was that student meetings and conferences helped to rebuild the sense of an international university community and often led to practical aid from one student group to another (the purchase of dictionaries, the organisation of work-camps to put up temporary buildings) – a clear example of strengthening institutions.

## ***Lessons for strategy: Factors favouring student mobility***

Any Commonwealth strategy to expand foreign student numbers in the countries of the South must take account of favouring and inhibiting factors, in order to capitalise on the former and so far as possible to neutralise the latter.

First, what are the favouring factors? They relate to policies and the policy environment, to academic matters and to non-academic support of various kinds. The *policy context* is critical. Without some commitment from the host government it is impossible to see how there can be any substantial influx of students from abroad. Malaysia, for example, is reported as being 'keen to globalise and establish political, economic and educational links with developed as well as developing countries' (Leong in Chapter 10). India has implicit policy objectives of a more definite kind, seeing foreign students as potential 'goodwill ambassadors' for India in the future (Ahmad and Basu in Chapter 6, and Indiresan in Chapter 12). Nigeria has, as already noted, made a concrete explicit commitment to reserve five per cent of university places for foreign students and over the years has made special efforts to take in refugees, from Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa (Akinpelu in Chapter 7), while the very distinctive position of Singapore has led it to be ready to fill as many as 20 per cent of places with foreign students (Gopinathan in Chapter 13).

Beyond Government policies, *policy commitments by receiving institutions* are also essential. After all, they are at the sharp end, when it comes to making both academic and residential accommodation available and accepting pressure on libraries, laboratories and in particular on staff. Many institutions do have built-in policies, with the international aspect of universities' mission expressed in their charters or their statutes. For instance, one of the objectives of Jawaharlal Nehru University is to 'provide facilities for students and teachers from the other countries to participate in the academic programmes of the universities (*sic*)'.

*Policies of sending countries and institutions* can favour student mobility. Government help can range from exit visas to recognition of foreign qualified professionals. Sending institutions in Canada exemplify a basically favouring stance. Of 71 Canadian universities, 44 have an international role in their mission statements, while 48 provide opportunities for study abroad and 25 require knowledge of a second language – a useful incentive to study in a foreign country, at least for a

period. Thirty-one out of 68 responding Canadian universities asserted that students undertaking international studies could integrate them into the home curriculum (Eggon-Polak in Chapter 9). All these provisions are useful components of institutional policy in sending countries. They may converge in the policies of both hosts and senders where there is mutual recognition of qualifications, whole curricula or some modules of curricula and may be further crystallised by sharing teaching or exchange of teachers.

This leads us on from the policy base to prevalent *academic conditions* for successful foreign student placement. Reserved admission or, as in India, a waiver of local entry tests removes an initial academic hurdle. Within curricula, certain subject areas seem more attractive to foreign students and both receiving universities and senders' award schemes need to find which these are. Students from developing countries are interested in professional disciplines, such as Accountancy, Engineering or Medicine, particularly if they come from small countries whose universities cannot offer well-developed courses in those areas. In this context, India has an obvious magnet in its great Institutes of Technology (Indiresan in Chapter 12). Students from the post-industrial countries are likely to be interested in the host culture, religion, arts, history, anthropology and languages. Both Malaysia and India report an interest in Islamic Studies.

A sending country can foster such interests through specific award schemes. Examples are Australia's National Asian Languages Scholarship Scheme and its Awards for Research in Asia. Senders and receivers may come together as in the Indo-Australian Cultural Exchange Programme or the link between the University of Hull Centre for South-East Asian Studies and the counterpart departments in the Faculty of Arts and the Language Centre of the University of Malaya. In 1991, the scheme brought 18 British students to Malaysia as part of their Hull degree in South-East Asian Studies and Language.

A broader consideration of links will form part of the discussion of models of good practice later in this chapter (see page 25). An ingredient in the success of the Hull-Malaya programme is seen to be that students have some knowledge of the host's language and culture before arrival (Leong in Chapter 10). A factor for success in the hinterland between academic and non-academic provision is likely always to be some kind of preparation or briefing before students go abroad to another country. Both sending and receiving countries need to work out ways of doing this; perhaps intending students could be linked in to already organised training for volunteers from foreign NGOs in the

receiving country (for example, the training given to the British Voluntary Service Overseas volunteers).

*Non-academic support mechanisms* necessary to help foreign students make the most of their academic experience are well-documented. They include:

- good publicity and information (this was often seen to be lacking in spite of institutions' best efforts and the excellent work of the Association of Commonwealth Universities)
- simplified visa processing
- reserved accommodation in reasonable hostel facilities, or perhaps with host families, as is the practice in Zimbabwe
- guidance and counselling in the receiving institution, both academic and personal
- a recognised and designated person to whom a foreign student can have recourse in case of difficulty (for example, the University of Nairobi has an International Liaison Officer for its US students)

It is in these non-academic provisions that difficulties most often appear and the absence of such facilities loom as the main obstacles to foreign student reception and welfare.

### ***Lessons for strategy: Inhibitions on student mobility***

The single most serious inhibiting factor was, overwhelmingly, that of *cost*' (Callan and Steele in Chapter 8). Even where the receiving country's fees are low, there is the cost of travel and there are constant complaints of stipends being too low, or being affected by currency fluctuations or inflation. One angle on financial insecurity is provided by complaints over the absence of medical insurance. It was seen as a very positive aspect of the Malaysian Technical Co-operation Programme that it included medical costs.

Other *non-academic problems* identified were characterised as 'bureaucracy' or 'administrative difficulties'. These start from lack of information. Receiving countries' overseas missions are often not well-equipped to handle enquiries from prospective students, who may, for instance, be unaware that the host country's academic year does not match the academic calendar in their own country. Then there is often a good deal of red tape in obtaining a visa, student permit or research clearance, and one country's report noted that student

clearance took between four and six months. Such slowness is discouraging and may turn prospective students away to alternative opportunities. After arrival, a student may be faced with overcrowded accommodation and may be demoralised by what the AUCC called 'the absence of welcoming structures'. The lack of such structures may mean that foreign students are more easily alienated by perceived political instability; women students may feel especially insecure and in some cases African students have complained of colour prejudice. We have seen the importance of counselling; one university is reported as having two counsellors for ten thousand students (with no special recourse for foreigners).

On the *academic side* the main concerns are about the recognition of qualifications and about assurance of quality in the host institutions. In a perhaps overly self-critical mood, Akenpelu lists reservations about quality in Nigerian universities resulting from lack of resources over the years. He worries about staff morale and commitment, about the state of libraries, laboratories and classrooms, and about the lack of teaching materials. This very frank appraisal underlines the need for schemes which bring in foreign students to benefit the receiving institution in some way. Visible financial and other rewards would help in raising staff morale as well as in challenging them to deliver quality teaching.

Minor academic issues included the occasional restrictions by a host country on the students' choice of field of study and, for research students, the possible incompatibility of equipment.

In relation to the worrying problem of lack of uptake of awards under the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Programme (CSFP) for study in countries of the South, Callan and Steele give a succinct list of reasons, which echoes much of what has just been said:

Obstacles to takeup of CSFP may lie at many points in the sequence of information provision, decision, applications, nomination, offer and acceptance or otherwise of an award. Further, problems may arise at either end of the system in a geographical sense; 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).

### ***Mechanisms for progress: Types of support structure***

The discussion so far has been in general terms, to lay down broad principles. These principles, allied to the experience of successful models of practice, will now be used to suggest specific schemes. Mr Peter Williams, head of the Commonwealth Education Programme, asked the Singapore workshop participants:

Will student flows between countries with different levels of income have to be managed flows through administered schemes protecting students from hardship and inconvenience, or shall we be able to find individual adventurous spirits ready to take the plunge if only we market our wares better and with vigour?

My own suspicion is that if the universities of the South are effective hosts to foreign students more would be drawn by random attraction than by managed schemes; but, in any case, if all students, particularly those who are not participants in organised exchange, are to make the best of their academic experience, some support structures will have to be in place to avoid the inhibitions mentioned in the last section. We will therefore look first at types of support structure, seen as necessary to facilitate any targeted strategy as well as to make the best of unmanaged flows. The five areas of concern are: information; immigration; accommodation; student liaison; and orientation.

There was constant emphasis on the need for *better information* to potential students, both before and after they have taken decisions about applying to a given host country or institution. Basic information includes both academic information, on, for instance, entry requirements, types of degree, international currency of qualifications, and non-academic, about climate, health, culture, food. Most of the necessary academic data is published regularly in its handbooks by the Association of Commonwealth Universities, but greater institutional detail and publicity about non-academic conditions are often hard to come by. The ACU might be encouraged to publish a series of leaflets about universities in selected countries, which would be cheaper and more user-friendly than the yearbooks; but the main responsibility can only be that of the potential host country. Diplomatic missions and

cultural agencies representing such a country need to be better briefed and to have their awareness raised about the importance of encouraging potential students. The Republic of Singapore seems to have made a notable effort at publicising its institutions in this way (Gopinathan in Chapter 13).

The bureaucracy of *immigration* is often seen to be the fault of the diplomatic mission, but actually relates to policy back home in the host country. Receiving countries may have important political reasons for taking great care in the issue of visas, but the Commonwealth affiliation should allay concerns. A protocol on student visas, at first on a bilateral basis, but then extended multilaterally throughout the Commonwealth, would give a fillip to takeup of awards in given countries and also to other forms of student flow.

Once foreign students have arrived, *housing* is part of a welcoming arrangement. Most countries offer it, but often the reality is one of overcrowding and of insecurity if a campus is closed and all students are forced to leave. Delhi University already has an international students' hostel, but is unable to expand because of lack of resources. The University of the West Indies does expect to have finance, through the Lomé arrangements, for additional student hostels. There is very strong advocacy from contributors to this book for dedicated Commonwealth or international halls of residence, which would house a mix of international and host-country students, provide some recreational facilities and perhaps offer international-type menus. Their purpose would be to provide a welcoming and comfortable environment, enable incoming students to meet national students in a community atmosphere and also to ensure security in the event (however unlikely) of crisis on the campus. Top priority would be given to holders of CSFP and other Commonwealth awards.

A project for a Commonwealth students' hall in selected countries of the South might well be suitable for promotion by Commonwealth Ministers of Education. Finance would have to be sought from a major multilateral donor, such as the European Community, under the Lomé Conventions. Such a project would not simply be about bricks and mortar. The wardens of such halls would have to be helpful and committed people, perhaps paid an extra salary to undertake the task of foreign students' welfare.

*Counselling and liaison* are needed on a university-wide basis. Selected universities might be offered a budget by their governments to develop an effective service, as both a model and a possible help to students in other institutions as well. Pilot schemes of counselling and liaison

might also be appropriate mechanisms for Commonwealth support.

A form of encouragement to foreign students which spans both preliminary information and acclimatisation after arrival comprises *orientation courses*. It has already been suggested that NGOs in both sending and receiving countries might be approached to take students on to their orientation courses for foreign volunteers. Some host countries, notably Sri Lanka, have organised such programmes directly in the past, and several institutions in, for example, India and the Caribbean, organise cultural events for foreign students. The University of Malaya plans trips into the countryside for the students in the link programme with the University of Hull. The offerings appear, however, to be sporadic or limited to a select few. The Vice-Chancellors' organisations in relevant countries might take it on themselves to systematise and develop in-country orientation for foreign students, preferably with the involvement of some home students as well.

The implication of these suggested measures and mechanisms – better information and orientation services, quicker visa processing on a reciprocal basis, dedicated international residences and a campus liaison service – is that a will is needed by national governments. The Commonwealth Secretariat could raise awareness among them. A first step might be a seminar for selected countries' representatives on foreign student support and welfare. In advance of the seminar, research would be needed on student experience in the various countries. The post-industrial countries might be asked to participate, since they have amassed material on the foreign student experience in their universities, but the emphasis would be on the South. A lead might be taken by India, since it has the largest foreign student population in the Commonwealth South. Incidentally, one of the issues which a country faces as the number of students from abroad increases is that of co-ordination: in India ideas are being canvassed about a 'nodal agency' for handling foreign student affairs (Ahmad and Basu in Chapter 6). Such a seminar would fit in well with the CHESS management initiatives.

Another implication of the measures suggested is that certain institutions must be selected as foci for the development of support structures. This is in line with general thinking on the promotion of centres of excellence, perhaps on a regional basis, in the countries of the South. Foreign students would be steered to these centres, since qualifications would be more acceptable. There is, however, an issue of discrimination against smaller and weaker institutions.

These relatively mundane questions of non-academic welcome and support have been dealt with first, since they provide a necessary

framework for academic interchange and a basis for the encouragement of unorganised (and self-financing) student movement. With this groundwork, we can now move to the core issue of *academic provision, and accompanying non-academic issues of finance.*

### ***The way forward: Some models of good practice***

With a supportive environment, organised initiatives for positive enhancement of student flows can be worked out. There are already a variety of established models of good practice as well as newly developing ones. Not all are intra-Commonwealth, but all could be adopted within the Commonwealth. Established models fall into the following categories:

- award schemes
- link schemes
- direct student exchange
- targeted courses
- curriculum consortia

A defunct, but acclaimed model was the 'Study and Serve' scheme operated by the British-based Inter-University Council for Higher Education Overseas.

*Award schemes* have been the most long-standing ways of encouraging students to travel abroad. The most notable in the Commonwealth is the CSFP. The awards are made available within designated countries, and in spite of problems noted in terms of limited uptake, are still a basic mechanism for providing opportunities in universities elsewhere. The advantages of the CSFP are that it is comprehensive, has the support of Commonwealth Governments and could be developed further if the general support mechanisms outlined above are put in place. Other successful award schemes have been organised and funded by an individual Commonwealth Government, either unilaterally or bilaterally. Some exemplary programmes have been designed in Australia (IDPAUC). The unilateral scheme, Australian Awards for Research in Asia, known as AARA, has worked exceptionally well and is popular because it is extremely flexible. There is no restriction on fields of study, length of stay abroad or timing. Among well-reputed bilateral schemes is the Indo-Australian scholarship programme. Limited to only five scholarships a year, it has the advantage of commitment on both sides. All such national schemes tend to be small-scale, but they work, perhaps for that very reason.

Some awards offered to a national government are not for their own students, but to other nationals for training in a third country. These awards have been a feature of technical assistance schemes, generally regional. There are signs that third country training awards may become more popular among donor-country governments, since awards to foreign students to be received in the North have become so expensive owing to the introduction of full-cost fees – a curious paradox, resulting from the absence of a coherent overseas student policy in, for example, the UK (Williams, 1990).

Probably the most widespread phenomenon favouring student flow is the development of *inter-university links*. Such links may be organised under a national agency, such as the Australian Targeted International Links Programme (TIL), the UK Committee for International Co-operation in Higher Education (CICHE) or the Indian Cultural Exchange Programme, or they may be between two institutions, such as those developed between US universities and individual Commonwealth institutions (California-Nairobi). The conditions may be fairly loose or may be based on a formal protocol, such as the University of the West Indies' Memoranda of Agreement or the Indian Memoranda of Understanding (for instance, the memorandum governing the Shastri Indo-Canadian Institute).

The activities covered by links are diverse. Leong lists the following activities (see Chapter 10), as foci for inter-university co-operation under link arrangements:

- Split-site study by foreign students spending a period in Malaysia as part of a degree requirement in their own country
- Split-site study for foreign students taking a Ph.D. from their own base, but with a supervisor from the receiving institution
- Direct student exchanges
- Staff exchange
- Joint research and publication
- Exchange study tours by staff and students of the institutions
- Exchange of other resources

A similar list appears in UWI's Memoranda of Agreement. These cover:

- Staff exchange
- Research collaboration
- Materials exchange
- Student exchange
- Joint publications

- Provision of specialists
- Curriculum development

Not all links highlight the movement of students. Of over 40 TIL agreements between Australian and foreign institutions, only 16 emphasise exchange of persons – staff or students. Moreover, there is generally more emphasis on links in staff movement than on opportunities for students.

The value of links lies in their very diversity and their relative cheapness – constantly referred to by the British CICHE. It is worth asking here whether there is a Commonwealth role, through CHESSE, in the encouragement of links.

Bilateral university relationships have led to some most successful models of *direct student exchange*. The most notable is perhaps the 'California model', between California and Nairobi (Walji in Chapter 11). It is based on general principles of equitability and mutual benefit. There is a written agreement between institutions on numbers to be exchanged and length of stay (one year). Selection is by the sending institution, meeting criteria agreed with the receiving institution. There are many merits in this: financial savings, a genuine equality in the exchange, mutual recognition of courses for credit. It should be easily adaptable for South-South university relations, particularly between institutions in the same region. This is because the main visible expenditure is on travel and this would be reduced between neighbours. The development of CUSAC should enable the negotiation of such South-South exchanges, on at least a pilot basis under Commonwealth auspices.

Outside the ambit of link (or any bilateral) relationships, there is the possibility of a university in the South, after a reasonable assessment of the market, offering *courses targeted to students from elsewhere*. The International Summer Programme in Caribbean Studies already mentioned is a good exemplar. The advantages of such programmes, well-known in the campuses of the North, include such benefits as the usage of plant during vacations, profit for the institution and some additional payment to staff. Again, it would require only a little push from the Commonwealth Secretariat to enable universities in other regions to get such vacation programmes off the ground.

A variant on the theme of targeted courses, but devised for long-term students, is the *collaborative curriculum*. The two English-speaking Caribbean universities, UWI and the University of Guyana, have built up a Consortium Graduate School in Social Sciences, to capitalise on

joint strength and make courses both more appealing and more prestigious. At the moment, the students all come from within the region, but this precedent could be used elsewhere to create an inducement for foreign students to participate.

All these models could be copied or adapted and would be useful equally for South-South and North-South interchange. A former model was used to build up North-South partnerships. This was the 'Study and Serve' scheme. Essentially, students go to another country for a professional (generally postgraduate) course and in return they work, once qualified, for a set period in the country where they have trained. The key condition for success is that the qualification is portable – it has recognition in the student's home country as well. New versions of this scheme, with the Commonwealth acting as broker, would make good sense in the 1990s. It would certainly fulfil the expressed desire of Commonwealth Heads of Government for greater Commonwealth cohesion.

We have so far looked at well-tried models. There are some new directions emerging from multilateral organisations. There might be new possibilities of developing student exchange through the EC/ACP under the Lomé Convention. Callan and Steele (1991) point out that a resolution of the EC/ACP Joint Assembly in September 1991 proposes scholarship programmes and exchange schemes for teachers and students. Further off the drawing board is Unesco's UNITWIN – another plan dependent on locating the strengthening centres of excellence in the countries of the South. The plan seems to be to involve the linking up of several institutions in a sort of multiple twinning. One example is foreshadowed by a letter of intent agreed between four universities, Zimbabwe, Eduardo Mondlane, Western Cape and Utrecht under the auspices of SADCC and Unesco. It includes the establishment of special chairs to provide leadership in the centres of excellence and thus build up centres for postgraduate study and research to be used 'across national frontiers'. Nothing is, however, said about finance. Commonwealth Ministers of Education will obviously need to observe the development of UNITWIN and to learn from the immediate experience of the University of Zimbabwe.

A third new development is the reported establishment of branch campuses by foreign institutions in a country of the South. British and Japanese universities are both said to have such campuses in Malaysia. This could be seen as certainly a vehicle for bringing foreign students to the country but may vitiate much of the benefit to them and the receiving country if they are segregated and follow separate courses.

## *The way forward: A Commonwealth strategy*

The models discussed are useful mechanisms, but to be fully effective they would have to be placed within a coherent strategy. No individual country can build one up, but *the Commonwealth as an institution* would logically do so, working through the Education Ministers, the Secretariat, the Standing Committee and programmes such as CHES. In addition it would need to develop and monitor projects and activities in very close collaboration with the Association of Commonwealth Universities.

*The Commonwealth alone can give the necessary political lead.* It would from the start ensure that agendas were set by the developing countries, through, for example, the CHES higher education management initiative. Further, the Commonwealth alone can make the appropriate financial dispositions, arranging agreements, mobilising multilateral funding. Its role would be: to catalyse; to organise multilateral programmes; to foster pilot projects; to monitor progress; and to gather the relevant information.

Multilateral programmes could be based on existing ones or developed from scratch. The CSFP is obviously susceptible to improvement through better publicity and perhaps through more flexible and short-term awards. New ones could include the Commonwealth 'Study and Serve' scheme suggested above. The Commonwealth Secretariat could also look into ways of encouraging more 'California-type' exchanges within the Commonwealth by mobilising finance for travel costs. It might ask the Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility and Higher Education Co-operation to study the options for a coherent package within the CHES framework. Ideas worth picking up include:

- a pool of places on a barter basis administered through ACU
- an inter-Commonwealth academic credit programme in selected subjects
- a set of policy guidelines for member countries on, for example, foreign student quotas for admission

It would encourage changes in national policy if some pilot projects could be set up. As already suggested, direct inter-institutional student exchange would obviously be susceptible to this treatment. Pilot student liaison offices would be another possibility.

The monitoring and information role would be very important.

Current knowledge about foreign students has been greatly enhanced by research commissioned by the Secretariat. The next stage would be a database and some moves towards monitoring what is happening and diffusing the information. This could have a motivational and incentive effect on Member Governments and on universities within member countries.

Above all, the Commonwealth's action would be critical in dealing with financial arrangements – negotiating with EC/ACP for example and perhaps with Unesco for UNITWIN deals. There is a need for more creative thinking about cost-free or inexpensive measures to support student mobility. A major possibility is through debt purchase as suggested by Greene and Armstrong in Chapter 5.

The Singapore workshop participants, including those who have contributed to this book, produced some ingenious and interesting ideas to improve the current situation and to increase flows of Commonwealth students to the universities of the South, such as a new look at possible differential fees in the South, more awards for post-graduate field study, further development of work placement schemes in partnership with NGOs. All of them need to be set in a broader framework of policy.

It was said earlier that a political lead from the Commonwealth would motivate Member Governments and encourage them to expand and maintain student flows to the South. *We return to the key point. The Commonwealth as an organism can only successfully promote policies which can be seen to benefit members more than they cost them.* A final word therefore follows on the perceived benefits of such strategic action.

### ***Afterword: The benefits of greater student mobility in the South***

What are the benefits of foreign student movement into the South? There are general academic rationales beyond what was said at the beginning about global human understanding. Such movements can bring international perspectives into teaching and research and they can expose home students to a variety of cultural influences. Non-academics, however, may need to be convinced by other types of argument.

From the point of view of a receiving government, foreign students can bring economic benefits to the academic system if they come as part of a package which includes support for an indigenous institution to

become a centre of excellence. They may also appear attractive if they come with payment in foreign exchange. From the point of view of institutions, these arguments are not irrelevant. We have already noted that academic staff morale may be improved if there are extra rewards for teaching foreign students.

What about the sending countries? Elizabeth Dines in Chapter 4 has made a very careful attempt to build up a rationale for Australian universities, which is also more broadly applicable. Here I would emphasise that in a world increasingly trans-national in its economic organisation, students who go abroad gain languages and other skills which widen their own career options and may place them in international arenas where they can represent their own country's interests. At the least, they come home with knowledge, ideas and qualifications which fit them to be valuable in the professional or managerial workforce.

There *are* ample and demonstrable practical benefits which make student mobility an end worth pursuing. Since the Commonwealth is founded in ideals, let us not, at the last, shirk from expressing the ideals within which these practical benefits are set. They are ideals of internationalism, the sharing of knowledge to ensure solutions to international problems and the sharing of scholarship with new generations across national boundaries, to ensure a true Commonwealth of scholars.

# **PART TWO**

## **ACADEMIC INTERCHANGE AND INSTITUTION BUILDING IN THE COMMONWEALTH**

---

- 3 Trends, Problems and a Commonwealth Project** **35**  
*Jasbir Singh*  
Introduction  
Trends in student flows  
Reasons for declining mobility  
Boosting mobility  
A Commonwealth project: Academic Interchange and  
Institution Building
- 4 Student Mobility Networks** **43**  
**The Case for a Commonwealth Scheme**  
*Elizabeth Dines*  
Introduction  
Background  
Student mobility in Europe  
Student mobility in the United States of America  
Student mobility in the Asia-Pacific Region  
The implications for Australia  
The case for involvement in a Commonwealth scheme

# 3

## *Trends, Problems and a Commonwealth Project*

---

Jasbir Singh

### *Introduction*

Commonwealth student mobility is a long standing phenomenon and remains one of the cornerstones of Commonwealth relationships. Educational interchanges form an important part of the enduring links and ties. Many Commonwealth leaders have received part or all of their higher education in another Commonwealth country. Close personal, professional, political and business ties have been formed and sustained through student interchange. Study abroad has formed an important component of human resource development programmes for developing countries, and small states (which are the majority of our members) have inevitably depended on other countries for the provision of high level and specialised study and training.

The movement of students among Commonwealth countries is the most valued element of higher education co-operation and has been on the agenda of higher education consultation since the first conference of Commonwealth Ministers of Education, which was held in Oxford in 1959. It forms the basis for the best known of the awards schemes – the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan. The relevance of exchange for Commonwealth connections, as well as concern at the weakening of these links from reduced exchange, has frequently been expressed.

Documents portray with urgency the need to keep a high degree of Commonwealth student mobility. The extent to which the Commonwealth attaches importance to student mobility may be demonstrated from the fact that in 1982 the Secretary-General

appointed a Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility pointing out that:

...student mobility and education interchange within the Commonwealth were important to the national development efforts of Commonwealth countries and to maintaining Commonwealth links...

The Secretary-General affirmed that unless educational interchange between countries is assured a special place in our educational systems, the Commonwealth connection itself would be in danger of impairment.

### *Trends in student flows*

Changes in student mobility have surfaced largely since Britain introduced full-cost fees in 1980, followed by Australia, New Zealand and Canada (partially). In 1989 Heads of Government expressed great concern at the evidence adduced by the Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility and Higher Education Co-operation in its Sixth Report, *Progress through Co-operation*. The Committee's evidence showed that:

- Intra-Commonwealth student mobility to the four industrialised Commonwealth countries had declined by over 10 per cent in the decade between 1977 and 1987.
- In the principal Commonwealth host countries, the most recent trends had been for Commonwealth student numbers to continue to decline whilst the student intake from non-Commonwealth countries was increasing; Unesco statistics suggested that mobility of students involving exchanges with and between non-Commonwealth countries appeared to have grown by a quarter, while intra-Commonwealth student mobility stagnated.
- In consequence, the proportion of all students from abroad accounted for by Commonwealth countries had declined from 57 per cent to 50 per cent between 1984–85 and 1987–88, and 47 per cent in 1988–89.
- When these trends were compared with those for other major host countries outside the Commonwealth, it was found that their intake of students from abroad was in some cases growing appreciably, including their intake of Commonwealth students.
- Patterns of intra-Commonwealth student mobility revealed a

heavy concentration on a few main host and a few main sending countries, with Malaysia and Hong Kong accounting for just over half the total number of Commonwealth students hosted by the four Commonwealth industrialised countries.

Trends have changed slightly since 1989. There has been a promising reversal to the decline in intake of Commonwealth students by the industrialised countries. In 1989–90 the figure had climbed back to 65,000, the same level as in 1984–85 and preliminary estimates for the early '90s indicate that the increase continues (see Appendix I for recent statistics). However, there are a number of issues related to the phenomenon which are of great concern to the Commonwealth Secretariat.

- Mobility is still largely into those three 'developed' Commonwealth countries (Australia, Britain and Canada).
- The concentration remains of a few main sending countries: the richer NICs, such as Malaysia and Hong Kong. The numbers from the poorer African countries and the Asian subcontinent have greatly diminished.
- Mobility among the developing countries is extremely limited. Countries like India (which is the largest host developing country) are drawing students from a limited range of countries and in a few disciplines only.

### *Reasons for declining mobility*

Two principal factors have influenced present trends in student mobility:

#### **1 The impact of high fee regimes**

Reasons for the decline and imbalance in Commonwealth student mobility have been documented by the Standing Committee, especially the close link between levels of fees and flows of students. The effects of high fees have been magnified by rapid rises in living costs in many developed countries and the depreciation of some countries' currencies against, for example, the Canadian dollar or the British pound. To illustrate this last point, whereas fees in Britain for an overseas undergraduate taking a science course increased roughly six and a half times between 1979 and 1990, the cost in Guyanese dollars of these tuition fees was *60 times*

*higher* in 1990 than in 1979 because of the change in value of the Guyanese dollar relative to the pound.

High cost fees and poor exchange rates make it impossible for students from many developing countries to pursue higher education in the traditional centres of learning.

## **2 New regional affiliations**

There have arisen special relationships between the major Commonwealth host governments and some of their non-Commonwealth neighbours and trading partners which have placed Commonwealth students at greater relative disadvantage. In Britain, the question of equitable fees for Commonwealth students is further complicated by the differing relationships in place in the European partners who had a colonial past. France, in particular, has overseas departments like Martinique and Guadeloupe, which are treated as part of Metropolitan France, so that students from these Caribbean islands have access to all the European Community arrangements and programmes like ERASMUS that favour European student mobility. This led (perhaps unjustifiably) to invidious comparisons being made by Commonwealth Education Ministers at their Eleventh Conference in Barbados.

From their point of view, Commonwealth scholars are likely to be further disadvantaged as Europe moves ahead with re-arranging its foreign policy in the new context of Central and Eastern Europe and the break up of the Soviet Union. The results include schemes such as TEMPUS, which permit East European students easier access into the higher education institutions of Western Europe. The logic of Commonwealth concern seems clear enough: European students are going to have their movement into Britain (which is the pole of attraction for large numbers) facilitated; by comparison, in the absence of special sponsorship, Commonwealth student mobility into Britain may further decline both absolutely and relatively.

Of the other main receiving countries, Canada follows a fairly even-handed policy as between Commonwealth and non-Commonwealth countries and particularly leans favourably towards some of the Francophone countries in Africa. Australia has always shown keenness to play a leading role in the Asia-Pacific Rim and has recently extended its aid priority (including educational aid) from South-East Asia to include Taiwan and Korea.

## ***Boosting mobility***

To combat declining Commonwealth mobility and to achieve a more balanced pattern of mobility, the Secretariat has from time to time proposed a number of schemes. These have included: the institution of new award schemes/programmes; more scholarships for women; awards for students enrolled at a distance; flexibility in credit transfer; exploration of link and split-site arrangements; better student support services, as well as opportunities for employment; and expansion of fee-free exchanges. While many of these ideas, such as split-site courses, have taken off significantly, for some of the countries there is still concern that the direction of flow remains from the developing to the developed countries, and that in many instances such schemes have actually impeded the development of proper exchange schemes and two-way flows of students. They are often seen as hampering the strengthening of institutions in developing Commonwealth countries.

The Commonwealth Secretary-General recently proposed a number of strategies to counter the high fees and enable greater student mobility. These were discussed between the Secretariat and interested governments at the meeting in June 1992 of the Standing Committee on Student Mobility and Higher Education Co-operation. The Secretary-General proposed a five-point plan:

### **1 An acceptable basis for computation of fees**

This requests that only those items which properly and directly relate to the study programmes undertaken by the overseas student should form the basis for charging.

### **2 Fee reduction for postgraduate students**

Many postgraduates contribute to research projects undertaken for the benefit of the host country and constitute a resource for the host country.

### **3 Expanded scholarship provision**

Despite the expanded programmes in Australia, Britain and Canada a need for more awards is recognised. Cost-effectiveness considerations will often be best served by putting awards on an in-country or third-country training basis, which would also have the merit of diversifying the pattern of intra-Commonwealth student flows.

### **4 Tuition-fee scholarships**

As overseas students can sometimes economise on living costs, a higher proportion of available scholarship monies should be

concentrated on financing tuition fees, which often have to be paid 'en bloc' and are a fixed sum.

#### **5 Reciprocal arrangements for fee remission**

Such arrangements should build on examples that already exist for waiving of overseas fees on a reciprocal basis, for example, the home-fee status accorded to each other by Australia and New Zealand.

This plan was considered by the Standing Committee in June 1992 and the proposals were supported by the great majority of participants. As a statement after the meeting declared, however:

... there was acute disappointment that the industrialised host countries were neither able to change their position in any respect in relation to these points, nor to advance alternative proposals. In the absence of a willingness by the industrialised countries to commit additional resources which would enable fee levels to be reduced or scholarships to be expanded, no progress was possible ...

The Commonwealth government representatives deplored a lack of political will and repeated the fear that Commonwealth relationships might be put in jeopardy.

At the same time, they acknowledged that among major host countries, India and some provinces of Canada had met and on occasion went beyond the Secretary-General's proposed criteria. The meeting did discuss other measures, particularly to diversify patterns of Commonwealth student mobility, and commended the initiative of the Commonwealth of Learning.

### ***A Commonwealth project: Academic Interchange and Institution Building***

The Commonwealth Secretariat continues to look for ways of ameliorating high fee structures. At the same time, on other fronts, the Secretariat is keen to explore other arrangements and initiatives which will favour the expansion of student mobility. It is anxious to achieve this within a framework of growth and sustainable development of developing country institutions. Mindful of the need to build institutions and capacity in developing countries, its project, Academic Interchange and Institution Building, has been designed on the premise that both student mobility and institution building are closely inter-

twined and dependent upon each other. Student mobility adds dimensions to developing country institutions that help them grow while strong centres of learning attract students to these institutions and countries.

The problem is complex and, as in the case of the proverbial chicken and egg, we tend to ask which should come first? I think we need not be concerned with trying to determine which should be the starting point, student mobility or institution building, but rather to think of schemes which attempt to achieve the two in tandem, that is, promote the interface between student mobility and institution building. We need to think of arrangements that may be put in place to channel students from one institution and/or country to another. At the same time, we need to think of the arrangements and initiatives needed at the national and institutional level to improve recipient capacity. They may include better information, recognition of qualifications, improved accommodation and welfare and opportunities for students to work, as well as aspects of the quality of teaching and research.

The task now is to think out and recommend co-ordinated programmes of exchange and student flow among developing country institutions and from the developed to the developing country institutions. The vision is a framework within which Commonwealth link and exchange programmes can be planned, to enable selected institutions in Commonwealth developing countries successfully to host academics and researchers from other developing country institutions.

Any realistic planning must be done bearing in mind the make-up of the Commonwealth – a group of fifty countries, with limited resources. In the group are: four industrialised countries – Australia, Britain, Canada and possibly New Zealand; a number of newly industrialising countries, such as Singapore and Malaysia; and a large number of very poor or poor countries. Many of these countries are far too small even to support a higher education institution; thirty of them have populations of under two million.

Large pools of money are not likely to be available. While committed to the ideals of mobility and association, Commonwealth governments often cannot match these with hard currency. Thus the focus has to be on creative ways of maximising resources. We need to see what resources, however little, are available from all partners in the enterprise; and we should not underestimate the input of developing countries, who may be able to make small concessions of fee waivers and the like. Reflection is needed on the ways we can best take advantage of these resources inside developing countries and combine them for best

effect, with any external resourcing we may be able to identify. Thus while schemes like ERASMUS spring to mind, we have to take the lessons from these schemes and work out ways of implementing them with none of the financial backing that the European Community can provide.

The Workshop in Singapore in April 1992 was designed to take the project forward, with some small-scale, implementable recommendations, within a coherent programme of activities and initiatives, for which the resources would be attainable, and working where possible in partnership with other Commonwealth agencies. The Workshop was seen as a landmark meeting, from which a new approach to Commonwealth student mobility crystallised – an approach based on greater diversification of student destinations, the encouragement of more South-South co-operation in higher education, and the development of a consortium of universities of North and South to engender pivotal study abroad schemes. The Commonwealth Universities Study Abroad Consortium or CUSAC is the first fruit of the new approach.

# 4

## *Student Mobility Networks*

### *The Case for a Commonwealth Scheme*

---

Elizabeth Dines

#### *Introduction*

This paper seeks to contribute to current discussion about the value of a programme of student exchange among Commonwealth countries. It is a slightly modified version of a paper presented to the International Development Programme national conference on international education in Canberra in October 1992 and raises the issue both in the Commonwealth-wide context and from an Australian perspective.

The first part outlines the background to the proposal emphasising the extent to which it has been generated by policy-makers with a uniquely Commonwealth perspective. The point is made that for those without that orientation the benefits of the proposal are not self-evident.

The body of the paper looks at student mobility in Europe, the United States and the Asia-Pacific region, noting the extent to which governments in these countries actively support student exchanges. Universally it is considered that student mobility is a way of ensuring that countries will be able to maintain their international competitiveness in the future.

In the final section, the implications of the overseas experience for Australia are considered. It is argued that Australia needs to be involved in student mobility on an international scale, not merely in a regional scheme and that the Commonwealth proposal provides an appropriate vehicle for this. It is hoped that in developing this rationale for Australia, I may have contributed a useful train of thought for other member countries also.

## *Background*

Renewed vigour was given to discussions of student mobility in member countries by the Singapore meeting on academic interchange and institution building organised by the Commonwealth Secretariat Higher Education Unit in April 1992, with a mandate from the eleventh conference of Commonwealth Education Ministers (for full details, see Part One). Some of the chief concerns expressed are given by Dr Jasbir Singh in Chapter 3. They led to the establishment in 1982 of the Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility, which for almost a decade argued energetically for adjustments to full-fee policies in the interests of maintaining student mobility but to little avail.

It is clear that governments of the industrialised Commonwealth countries will not resile from the principle of cost recovery for overseas student enrolments, preferring to channel aid and subsidies through other mechanisms such as scholarship schemes. The Standing Committee's deliberations are now focused on ways of reducing the dependency of developing Commonwealth countries on overseas education. The Commonwealth Higher Education Support Scheme (CHESS) and the Commonwealth of Learning are outcomes of a new emphasis on co-operation. The intention is to expand the overall capacity of universities in the developing Commonwealth countries to cater for local demand and to provide higher level graduate training. It is hoped that increased interaction with universities in the industrialised countries as well as co-operative arrangements in distance learning will lead to this.

Student exchanges are seen as an essential element of this co-operative approach. The Barbados Conference expressed support for student mobility as a way of alleviating the high cost of overseas education imposed on developing countries by the fees policies of the industrialised Commonwealth countries. The ministers advocated the establishment of reciprocal exchange arrangements amongst developing countries, and new linkages which would reverse the normal flow of students from industrialised to developing countries.

The Singapore meeting was called to explore the feasibility of the proposal. The meeting was very supportive of the concept of increased student mobility within and into the developing countries of the Commonwealth as a dimension of the larger exercise of developing and enriching academic institutions. However, for educational policy-makers who do not have a Commonwealth perspective the proposal is problematic.

Internationally, the trend is towards greater accountability of publicly funded education and there is little enthusiasm for the expansion of education budgets unless it can be clearly demonstrated that there will be tangible, generally economic, benefits. An initial reaction from hard-pressed policy makers is therefore likely to be:

- How will increasing student mobility in general benefit my university/country?
- Are there any particular advantages in a Commonwealth scheme?
- Will the benefits outweigh the costs?

These questions cannot be swept aside, for there is no point in turning to the basics of implementation (and no prospect of harnessing the necessary resources) if there is not at the outset the political will at national levels to set such a scheme in place. The extent to which the proposal captures the interest or imagination of governments and of participating institutions will be directly related to their perceived advantages of student mobility.

I suspect that in the current world-wide recessionary climate such advantages are not obvious to educational policy-makers. Indeed the greater likelihood is that a litany of potential disadvantages will preclude any further discussion. Such concerns might include:

- Governments of developing countries may be too concerned with unmet local demand to contemplate accommodating students from the industrialised Commonwealth.
- Universities in industrialised countries may doubt that their students will wish to study in developing countries. They may have no confidence in the capacity of those countries to provide an appropriate education for them.
- The very premise that student mobility will lead to academic strengthening of the host institutions may be questioned, or, if accepted, may be viewed as an entropic activity, divorced from the priorities of governments.

Making the case for a student mobility scheme that is restricted to participants from Commonwealth countries will be even more difficult. For many member governments the Commonwealth is no longer a 'salient category'. Australia and Canada are both actively pursuing economic ties with Asia, and the United Kingdom is increasingly looking towards an expanding and economically vibrant Europe.

Singapore is extensively involved in joint ventures and development projects with countries throughout Asia and is a member, like Malaysia, of ASEAN, an economic grouping which owes nothing to Commonwealth ties (and which excludes Australia). Similarly, in Africa economic benefit rather than a shared colonial history forms the basis of continuing diplomatic and trade alliances, such as ECOWAS, the Economic Community of West African States. For the West Indies, ties with the United States or South America are likely to be of higher priority.

Thus economic regionalism sets a framework for policy makers which is not conducive to supporting the Commonwealth proposal. The scheme is global rather than regional and may appear to offer no particular benefits in terms of economic alliances for the participating nations.

Yet there is evidence that international student mobility is increasing. Before discounting the potential benefits of a Commonwealth student mobility scheme it seems sensible to see why more students in various parts of the world are taking up opportunities for student exchange, and why their governments are helping them to do this. The main section of this paper is therefore devoted to examining the overseas experience of student mobility against the background of government labour market and human resource development policies.

### *Student mobility in Europe*

There are a number of student mobility schemes operating in the European Community. ERASMUS, the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students, is the best known, both for the number of students it assists and the extent of Government funding provided. In 1991–1992, 74 million ECU (approximately \$A35m) was allocated to the scheme, with 60 per cent earmarked for student mobility grants. Approximately 1,500 grants were provided, involving 59,000 eligible students, or four per cent of the Community's total student population. This level of central EC support for ERASMUS is the more remarkable when one considers that, within the parameters set by the Treaty of Rome, education is *not* a joint community responsibility but a responsibility of each member state.

The rationale for ERASMUS is summarised in the background paper for the 1990 Conference in Siena. It notes:

The ERASMUS programme sets out primarily to achieve a significant increase in the number of students from higher education institutions

spending an integrated period of study in another Member State. It sees this experience as a means of producing graduates, more European in outlook, with the experience, background and language skills necessary to develop and support the intensified co-operation in the economic and social sectors implied in the Single European Act. It also sets out to promote intensive co-operation between higher education institutions across boundaries of Member States and through mobility of teaching staff and other means, to secure improvement in the quality of higher education and training and thus assist the Community to maintain its competitiveness (*sic*) in world markets. The interactions seen in these exchanges are seen as contributing to European cohesiveness. (Commission of the European Communities, 1990a:41).

The Siena Conference concluded that the European dimension should be the primary focus of strategic planning for higher education, foreshadowing changing employer expectations about the mobility of labour and the formulation of directives concerning the mutual recognition of degrees. It recognised the value of ERASMUS and other mobility programmes in preparing young people to live and work in the complementary national programmes (Commission of the European Communities, 1990b).

The same emphasis is found in reports of the Industrial Research and Development Advisory Committee (IRDAC) on Skills Shortages in Europe and on School and Industry. They argue that the Community needs to pay greater attention to education and training if Europe is to have the highly skilled and flexible workforce needed to exploit its advanced technologies and to maintain its competitiveness in the face of the rapid growth in productivity evident in Japan and other newly industrialised nations of North-East Asia. In a comparison of the age profile of member states with their Asian competitors, it is concluded that it will not be easy to compete with countries with a younger, cheaper and more highly skilled workforce. Student mobility programmes are advocated as a strategy for combatting this competition.

Student mobility in the European context is very much an expression of European Regionalism. The arguments are put forward from the perspective of the urgent human resource development needs of an advanced industrial federation keen to maintain its international competitiveness. The focus is on a flexible and mobile workforce that can operate effectively in a given profession in several member states. In pursuit of this objective, recent pilot schemes within ERASMUS have refined the model, to ensure that high quality, portable, professional

training is provided. Secondary to that goal is the desire to create a measure of understanding of other cultures, and ways of thinking and behaving, that will support the development of greater intercultural understanding amongst member states, leading ultimately to the forging of a European identity.

What is most surprising is the extent to which the political and economic agenda of European student mobility has been enthusiastically embraced by universities and by students. This is evident in Britain in the readiness to develop new courses which combine professional training in, say, Law or Engineering with European Studies; in the acceptance of significant numbers of students from elsewhere in Europe at home student fee levels; in the active participation in pilot credit transfer schemes. It is an orientation, which were it not for the diversity and the political and economic significance of Europe, could be characterised as parochial.

There are, nevertheless, traces of broader concerns in those very policy documents which argue for the primacy of the European Dimension. Ecology is seen as the prime existential question for the society of the future, raising global rather than merely regional issues. It is recognised that the increasing dependence of economic development on technological development and the centrality of communications technology to advances in scientific research will give rise to problems and opportunities best resolved in a supranational context. There are signs that an international orientation to student mobility might coexist with the current regional focus in the network of relationships which some universities have fostered outside the European Community.

Although the focus of the European position is strongly regional the need to develop and maintain international contacts is recognised. There is strong support for student mobility in the European Community on the grounds that such programmes contribute to:

- the development of a European identity
- increased portability of professional qualification
- a more flexible workforce
- increased language skills and greater understanding of cultural differences

The extent of public funding for the ERASMUS Programme demonstrates that the EC member states are prepared to pay in order to achieve the skilled human resource base required to maintain their international competitiveness.

## *Student mobility in the United States of America*

Student mobility in the United States is characterised by a major imbalance between outward and inward student flows. At present about 400,000 students from overseas study in American higher education institutions each year. In the main they come from developing countries and the Pacific Rim. They are chiefly enrolled in full-degree undergraduate or postgraduate programmes and they ultimately take out American degrees. By contrast, only about 70,000 American students study overseas each year, about three-quarters of them in Europe, as part of a junior year (or semester) abroad. Most live together and study in special programmes taught in English. (IIE, Annual)

United States government policy has been very much in evidence in the development of programmes to recruit overseas students to America throughout the eighties. Glen Shive (1991) summarises a decade of development of the American overseas student programme from the recognition of the recessionary impact of the downward demographic trend on the traditional sources of students, school-leavers, through the early days of marketing American education overseas with perhaps too much commercial zeal, to the more mature, highly professional approach of the nineties. A critical contribution of government has been its direct and indirect role in providing financial assistance, particularly for postgraduate research students. This has earned for the United States a reputation for generosity and altruism which other countries find hard to match. Yet the great majority of students pay their own way, and despite the protestations of the international professionals, the commercial nature of the activity is not lost sight of. Robert Atwell, President of the American Council on Education, speaking at the ACE's 1992 annual meeting, noted that:

... as an industry, higher education is a net exporter by any number of measures, not the least of which is that over five times as many students come to our universities as we send to other nations ... (Atwell, 1992:14)

The imbalance between inward-bound overseas student programmes and outward-bound Study Abroad programmes is now attracting the attention of educators and policy makers. International educators have argued convincingly in recent years that America is in danger of succumbing to an inherent isolationism if more young people do not, during the course of their post-secondary education, gain some understanding of what it means to live and work in another culture. The National Task Force on Undergraduate Education Abroad (1989)

concluded that: 'as a people [Americans] are poorly educated to deal with the political, economic and social issues which [they] will face in a new global era' and urged that opportunities for American students be broadened and diversified (quoted Burn, 1990).

Commenting on the Task Force's report, a well-known advisor to the government on international education, Barbara Burn, writes:

Opportunities for experience abroad are confined to a small fraction of American undergraduates, mainly upper-middle class, and still focus predominantly on Western Europe and on studies of the humanities and social sciences .... At a time when American citizens and professionals require much more international knowledge, the narrow scope of undergraduate education abroad constitutes a grave neglect of extremely important needs (Burn, 1990).

By comparison, Burn notes that ERASMUS will prepare European students

... not only for the professional, commercial, technical, linguistic, academic, and diplomatic needs of a united Europe, but also for performing effectively in the world market of ideas and trade.

Evidence that these views constitute something more than special pleading on the part of language teachers and international educators is in the action plan for making the United States 'more nationally competent and globally competitive' (Hefferon, 1990:19, 20). This report summarises the outcomes of a two-year study which collected views from a very wide cross-section of American society including all levels of education, business organisations, state and local governments on the relation of international education to the ability of America to cooperate and compete with the rest of the world. Of particular interest are the recommendations encouraging the educational and exchange sector to be more responsive to the private sector's needs in the globalisation process.

That message has permeated educational thinking to the extent that international competence and competitiveness are now the focus of policy for schools as well as for the post-school sector. AMERICA 2,000, a statement of the nation's educational goals, includes as one of its six goals the following:

By the year 2,000 every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global society ...

Recent changes in legislation governing the funding of higher education demonstrate the extent to which the rhetoric of study abroad for global competence has prevailed. In the past two years a series of legislative amendments have supported increased participation in study abroad by making existing loans and financial assistance to students portable and recently by providing funding for 5,000 additional scholarships by 1994. Five thousand scholarships will also be provided to students from Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union and non-European countries.

At the level of educational diplomacy, steps have been taken to give American students access to European universities (Cardiff, 1990), and more effort is being directed to developing Study Abroad and exchange opportunities in non-traditional and 'exotic' locations, for example, Africa, Korea, Australia.

In spite of what from the Australian perspective appears an admirable record in internationalising education, there is little complacency amongst American professionals. Atwell continues:

The lack of financial aid to meet the costs of studying abroad explains the pitiful reality that less than 1% of our students have an international experience - at a time when the European Community, through projects like ERASMUS and TEMPUS, is striving for 10%. But I believe it is just another manifestation of our perilous disdain for and disinterest in the rest of the world (Atwell, 1992:15).

He goes on to say that budget woes must not be allowed to deflect American institutions from the critical task of developing programmes which address American ethno-centrism. To do so would be to succumb to neo-isolationism.

Although considerable numbers of American undergraduates study abroad, this only amounts to about one per cent of the undergraduate population. There is increasing recognition from the private sector and from government that study abroad programmes will contribute to increasing global competence and competitiveness. The current approach is at once broader than the more regionally focused policy framework of the European Community and less specific in not providing opportunities for students in professional courses to add to their professional training while overseas. The promotion of study abroad in non-traditional destinations including non-English speaking countries demonstrates awareness of the need to be internationally competent.

## *Student mobility in the Asia-Pacific Region*

In recent years, the West has watched with admiration and even dismay as one Asian economy after another has set off on the rapid rise to fully developed status. Garnaut (1989) maps the rise of the vibrant internationally-oriented economies of North-East Asia; Japan, Korea, Taiwan and Hongkong. To these should now be added Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand. The People's Republic of China, the sleeping dragon, is stirring, promising rates of growth that could eclipse its neighbours. Vietnam is poised for development in the wake of the anticipated lifting of the IMF embargo.

A common feature of government policy in all of these countries is the high level of resources committed to education and the exponential rate at which the educational infrastructure has developed. In some countries, for example, Korea, spending on education has matched defence spending. In spite of this, all countries in the region still have a level of unmet demand for higher education.

The pattern of student flows to the West is well-established, with the dominant flow being to the United States. In brief, some students study overseas because the expertise is not available locally, others because they were unable to gain a place in local institutions.

Governments vary in the extent to which they support their citizens studying overseas. In Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand governments offer sponsored places overseas for selected students as part of their overall human resource development policies. In Japan and Korea both private sector and government support doctoral and postdoctoral studies for significant numbers of students each year, chiefly (but not exclusively) in the United States. Their commitment to these programmes is to ensure that they are in a strong position to maintain their international competitiveness. Singapore and Hong Kong similarly recognise the need for a future professional workforce that is technically advanced and globally competent, and are seeking to meet their needs, not by sponsoring students to study overseas, but by recruiting nationals and others who have trained overseas at their own expense. Hong Kong does not expect in the foreseeable future to be in a position to train more than about seven per cent of its required graduate workforce, so great is its anticipated need for highly trained professionals.

An interesting development is the number of Asian students studying elsewhere in Asia. Korean students are studying as fee-paying students in the Philippines; the University of the South Pacific recruits fee-paying overseas students; and Singapore, with its technological

sophistication, is increasingly attractive to students from Australia as well as other parts of Asia. The lower fee regimes in all of these countries, as compared with the fee structures of the United States, the United Kingdom or Australia, is undoubtedly a factor. So too is the fact that English is the language of instruction in all of these countries, given the status of English as the international language of business.

The nations of the Asia-Pacific region are experiencing rapid rates of economic growth and social development. It is recognised that the workforce of the future will have to be scientifically and technically advanced and able to operate in a global context. Mastery of English is recognised as important for access to advanced science and for competing in the international business environment.

Education is recognised as the key to further development and country after country is committing massive funding to developing its educational infrastructure. In spite of this, there is a level of unmet demand in all of the countries of the region which generates an outward flow of students to the industrialised nations of the West. This dependency is unwelcome to students and home governments alike because of the financial drain on families, the outflow of capital and the potential loss of intellectual capital if students do not return. A new consumer culture is developing, however, as students and governments recognise that they can exert leverage over host institutions where these are financially dependent on overseas student fee income.

### *The implications for Australia*

Mobility, particularly overseas, is not a dominant feature of undergraduate life for Australian students. According to the Unesco figures, approximately 2,600 students studied overseas in 1990, the majority of them undertaking postgraduate study in the United States. All this is, however, about to change.

It is now widely recognised that in a world where economic and possibly diplomatic activity will be dominated by a handful of large regional trading blocks, Australia is at risk. Government policy is firmly committed to building strong economic ties with Asia, but the reverse is not the case. The dominance of English as a global language has paradoxically not favoured Australia in establishing themselves in Asia. Those many students from Asia who have studied in Australia since the 1950s have learned much more about Australia than Australians have about Asia. It is true that there are some outstanding examples of economic and diplomatic links that had their roots in student days, but

the simple assertion that it is worthwhile making friends with future leaders of Asia by educating them in Australia needs to be tested. Malaysia and Singapore do not appear to favour Australia economically because of this. Similarly, Australian involvement in the Korean War does not appear to carry any weight in contemporary business negotiations.

There is a need to increase the outward flow of students to Asia if Australia is to become integrated with the region. A deeper understanding of the ways in which contemporary Asian cultures operate is needed. Knowledge will come, not from Asian students who are studying in Australia, but by having a significant number of young Australians spending a period studying or working in Asia during their most formative years. This view has now crystallised in an initiative of the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee to establish a student mobility scheme in the Asian-Pacific Region. Although the University Mobility in the Asia Pacific (UMAP) Programme is in its infancy, it has already achieved the support not only of the Australian Government but of a number of key governments in the region.

How then does Australia rate against its industrial competitors in Europe, the United States and Asia?

A common theme is the recognition that the future is one of increasing global interdependence. There is strong support at government level for student mobility as a necessary element in training the flexible, mobile and internationally competent workforce of the future. There are also differences; Europe displays a strong regional focus in contrast to the broad-based global orientation of the United States.

The Australian focus at present is also very regional. This is a risky position for Australia. Asia must clearly be a priority for Australia but not the only priority. Africa and the Indian Ocean Rim are equally legitimate targets for Australian companies and as relevant as the Pacific Rim to business in the West. To maintain Australia's international competitiveness it is likely that more and more Australian companies will become part of international consortia or will move off-shore to take advantage of cheap labour. This means that there will be an increasing need for managers who can deal with government officials in foreign countries, and negotiate with private companies, for example, those offering infrastructure support: cleaners, refuse collection, transport, providers of raw materials, language problems of workers.

The focus will not necessarily be Asia. For companies in Western Australia, Africa, India or even Europe may be a more logical

destination. Australian wine makers are growing and making wine in France, many companies are now seeking out opportunities in Eastern Europe. ANZ Bank through its international affiliations is active in Africa and the Indian sub-continent. South America too is being explored by outwardly oriented Australian businesses.

What then are the implications for those involved in the development of Australia's most valuable resource, the future workforce?

It would seem that Australia, no less than its international competitors, must see to it that it has a workforce that is technically advanced and internationally, not just regionally, competent. There are many Australians in professional and managerial positions who are competent in living and working in another country, in another culture. People who can communicate across cultural and linguistic barriers are needed. To expose a high percentage of the future professional workforce to the experience of living, working and studying in another country during the formative undergraduate years is recognised by competitors as the best way of achieving this objective. Can Australia afford to do less?

### *The case for involvement in a Commonwealth scheme*

Increased international student mobility must be a goal for Australian universities. The final issue to address is why should Australia become involved in a Commonwealth scheme? Is it not enough for universities to pursue linkages with overseas universities in Asia or elsewhere, independently of any formal scheme, just as they have for many years built up their academic networks on the basis of personal contact? If there are advantages in being part of a formal scheme why not concentrate its energies on the development of UMAP?

The advantages of being part of a Commonwealth scheme are these:

#### **1 An international scheme**

A Commonwealth network of student exchanges provides a global network of relationships. In addition to providing a continuing link with the other industrialised Commonwealth nations, it gives Australian students access to India and Africa, key points on the Indian Ocean Rim. Although this region is not a priority area for government, business sees it as an area of opportunity. There are opportunities for Australian universities to contribute to the resolution of the economic, political and ecological problems of

Africa through participation in externally funded aid projects. Some universities are very keen to do this.

Being involved in a Commonwealth scheme does not preclude involvement in a regional scheme. UMAP clearly offers the potential to integrate with Asia and it is important to make the most of that opportunity. But a solely regional approach is not sufficient. A Commonwealth scheme complements Australia's own regional initiative.

## **2 A formal framework for student exchange**

The experience of international student exchange shows that student mobility is fostered by establishing a formal framework within which the potential barriers to exchange can be discussed and conditions satisfactory to the exchange partners can be negotiated. Thus ERASMUS provides a set of principles to guide decisions on such matters as credit transfer and mutual recognition of qualifications. The pilot UMAP Programme aspires to do the same. On the financial side, it is virtually impossible to rally government support in the form of contributions to student travel outside the framework of a formal scheme.

## **3 A common language of instruction**

English is the language of instruction of the Commonwealth universities. This removes a formidable barrier to student mobility although it does nothing to broaden the very narrow language base of many Australian undergraduates. In terms of the sheer pragmatics of getting a pilot student mobility operating, the status of English as the lingua franca of Commonwealth universities is a bonus.

## **4 A shared academic culture**

The common heritage of the Commonwealth universities is still evident in the large degree of conformity in their ideals, their structures and their processes. Albeit there are major differences in standards across universities, the quality control mechanisms are well understood. The basis structure of degree programmes, the concept of the Honours degree and the practice of external examining, are all sufficiently familiar to answer many of the questions raised by the difficult tasks of assessing comparability and setting standards for credit transfer.

In the next few months several Australian universities will begin to plan with the Commonwealth Secretariat the first stages of a Commonwealth student mobility scheme. The mechanics will be easy

compared with the difficult logistics of UMAP or the bureaucracy of ERASMUS precisely because the Commonwealth universities share a common academic tradition and for the most part a common language of instruction. These two factors alone remove the most significant barriers to student mobility, leaving funding as the major obstacle. I am confident that when the substantial long-term advantages of this programme to Australia's future development are recognised, even the funding obstacle will fade.

# **PART THREE**

## **PERSPECTIVES FROM THE SOUTH: SOME VIEW POINTS**

---

- 5 Student Mobility and Internationalisation**  
**A Perspective from the English-speaking Caribbean** 61  
*Ancilla Armstrong and J E Greene*  
The internationalisation of higher education  
Higher education in the English-speaking Caribbean  
The scope of student mobility: UWI's experience  
A review of co-operative programmes at UWI  
Types of student mobility programmes  
New directions  
Support facilities required  
Conclusion: Lessons from the UWI experience
- 6 Academic Exchange**  
**Student Flows, Exchange Schemes and Capacity Building**  
**in India** 78  
*Karuna Chanana Ahmad and Aparna Basu*  
Introduction and background  
Key issues and perspectives  
Higher education in India  
Student mobility: Analysis of recent trends  
Foreign student admission policy in higher education  
Agencies involved in foreign student admission

Major academic exchange schemes  
Uptake and utilisation of awards  
Interest/willingness to internationalise campuses  
Capacity building and institutional strength  
Student finance and the case for a dual fee structure  
Barriers to mobility  
Comments and recommendations

**7 Policy, Expectations and Shortfalls  
Nigerian Views and Experiences**

**108**

*A Jones Akinpelu*

Preliminary

The international inheritance

Government and institutional policies

Foreign enrolments: Statistics

Factors affecting foreign student flows

Recommendations

Conclusion

# 5

## *Student Mobility and Internationalisation*

*A Perspective from the English-speaking Caribbean*

---

Ancilla Armstrong and J E Greene

### *The internationalisation of higher education*

The issues involved in student mobility are integral to what appears to be a renewed emphasis on the internationalisation of higher education. Institutions of higher learning, universities in particular, have tended to establish and maintain an environment which facilitates discovery and advancement in knowledge. Such an environment develops and thrives best by exchange and collaboration among scholars with experiences and perspectives from around the world. Exchange programmes, whether at the student or faculty level, help to enlarge the scale of research into scientific and social phenomena, increase the basis for cross-cultural comparisons and enhance capabilities for applying scholarly research to the solution of persistent global problems.

This trend can be summed up as follows: the emphasis is now *economic* as well as cultural and social, and the key words are *competition* and *development*. Competition is among countries, among graduates of higher education from different countries, and also among institutions of higher education for international talent and discovery. Development concerns influencing higher education are, on the other hand, within countries. In order to improve their competitiveness, private sector enterprises are looking to higher education as an important source of expertise relevant to the new global marketplace (CERI, 1990).

Internationalisation of higher education may be identified with several policy objectives:

- *External agreement* bringing the expertise of the university into the

world community, through the enrolment of foreign students, provision of technical assistance activities in other countries and the involvement in cross-national research.

- *International education* enriching the educational process through the incorporation of international perspectives into the academic programme, developing foreign language capability, and expanding the institutional arrangements for international exchanges for students and faculty.
- *Cost/benefit* calculating the potential gains through offsetting the costs incurred in pursuing external agreements and international education with the real and potential gains from co-operation.
- *Economic development* promoting greater immediate and long term commercial gains by placing emphasis on the role of co-operative programmes on economic development for the market place.

Among the questions of relevance, especially to higher educational systems like those in the Caribbean, are:

- *What* are the incentives for the institution?
- *Where* are the funds for co-operative arrangements to come from?
- *How* should priority areas be established to ensure maximum benefits to the country/region as a whole?
- *Who* is in the best position to determine priorities in programme areas and overseas links?
- *Why* do policies governing exchange programmes appear to focus on North-South relations almost to the exclusion of South-South relations?
- *What* effects will the increasing cost of education, especially for foreign students from developing countries, have on the attractiveness of exchange programmes?

## ***Higher education in the English-speaking Caribbean***

In order to place in context student mobility and the internationalisation of higher education in the Caribbean, it is necessary to describe briefly the role and development of tertiary education in the region. In the Caribbean, *tertiary level education* normally refers to the comprehensive range of institutions beyond high school and includes vocational, technical and university. *Higher education* generally refers to those programmes offered in the region's two universities: the University of Guyana (UG); and the University of the West Indies (UWI),

with campuses in Barbados, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago. It also includes undergraduate programmes offered by tertiary level institutions, notably the College of Arts, Science and Technology (CAST) in Jamaica. Before the founding of UWI, in 1948, the main source of higher education was the external degree from London University. UWI continued to grant London University degrees until 1962, when it acquired its independent charter. In the same year, the University of Guyana was established.

Over the past thirty years, the tertiary level institutions have gradually been shifting away from academic courses to those with a technical-vocational and para-professional orientation. This trend has created a demand for more advanced courses in those areas which the UG and UWI have been unable to meet. Partly as a response to this problem, the University of the Virgin Islands, with campuses in the US Virgin Islands of St. Thomas and St. Croix, has established strong links with the OECS, while CAST (Jamaica) has introduced undergraduate programmes in business and technical education. At the same time, colleges in the USA attract a relatively large number of Caribbean students. Interestingly, USAID reports that in 1986, 11,444 Caribbean students were enrolled in overseas universities, most of them in the USA. Total enrolment at the UWI and UG in the same year was 11,606 (USAID, 1986).

Several of the 'pull factors' influencing Caribbean students to study abroad at that time still persist: greater course options; lower entry requirements; greater opportunities for work/study; flexibility in combining programmes and in completing degree requirements; and support from migrant families for part/full time study because of better economic circumstances abroad. Table 5.2 provides the latest available estimate of higher education enrolments by Caribbean students in the Caribbean and the United States. Included in these figures are both students who receive government scholarships for study abroad and privately financed students, a category that is difficult to estimate. More recently, the gap in financing students' education at home and abroad has widened, partly due to the depreciation of some currencies in the Caribbean and partly to the discriminatory tuition fees charged by universities in the USA, UK and other Commonwealth countries to which both government and privately sponsored students go.

The pressure on the two Commonwealth universities in the region remains. They are expected to generate skilled manpower to fill scientific, technical, professional and managerial positions in the public and private sectors of the region. Several manpower studies have high-

lighted the continuing deficiency in the supply of the human resources required for the development of the region. Table 5.1 shows the changes of enrolment in UWI over the past thirty years according to country of origin (see end of chapter). Yet recent manpower reports show that of the population aged 18 and above, under three per cent attend university in the Caribbean compared with 12 per cent for Latin American Countries; one per cent over the age of 21 possess a university degree; only 12 per cent of senior and middle level managers in Jamaica had university degrees; and less than 13 per cent of Caribbean school teachers had university degrees (World Bank, 1990).

The University of the West Indies has been designated by the CARICOM Heads of Government in 1989 as a regional institution in perpetuity. Its responsibility for higher education in the region has been aptly described by the Vice Chancellor, Sir Alister McIntyre (UWI, 1990):

The years (since 1948) have seen many changes in the national life of the people of the Caribbean, most of the senior posts in the civil service and the professions are now filled by graduates of this University. The Cabinets of the West Indian nations contain former students of Mona, Cave Hill and St Augustine and UWI's Alumni are well represented in the areas of business, art culture, community development, education and science and technology. We have seen the withdrawal of most of the former colonial powers, but the other side of the coin is that the resources which they provided in the past cannot now be taken for granted. More and more we have to rely on our own resources.

### *The scope of student mobility: UWI's experience*

Studies on student mobility identify the phenomenon, as we have above, as part of the strategy for internationalising education. The Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility and Higher Education Co-operation is, for example, concerned with the new protectionism which is likely to have serious implications for education. In so far as a retreat into educational protectionism creates barriers that inhibit student flows among Commonwealth universities, it raises also as many academic problems as political ones. One statement epitomises the philosophy of the Committee (Commonwealth Standing Committee, 1983):

While countries may seek to reduce their dependence and to develop their own institutional capacity, there will still remain educational

needs which are best met beyond national boundaries. This is very true of the small countries which cannot support an adequate range of educational institutions and therefore depend heavily on opportunities overseas. For large and small countries alike the horizon of self-sufficiency is constantly receding.

It has been difficult to document the details from which to analyse the scope and content of student mobility programmes at UWI since 1948. The records are relatively sketchy and incomplete. Until very recently there has been no regulation or centralised policy governing any type of co-operative agreement. From the University records, an attempt has been made to classify co-operative programmes that involve student mobility in the early period between 1948-80. For the period after 1980, a list of these programmes was compiled on the basis of responses from faculties across the three campuses and a classification of current programmes is also provided.

*Non-Caribbean nationals studying at UWI:* from data available in its Office of Planning and Programming, the University has been admitting students from outside the Caribbean region in its regular degree programmes as well as specially registered non-credit students, but overseas students studying at UWI have formed only a small percentage of total enrolment. They made up less than one per cent in the early period, 1948-62, two point five per cent in 1962-80 and three per cent, 1980-90. Over 60 per cent of these Non-Caribbean students have come from North America, usually on short-term assignments. The rest comprise students from the UK and the rest of Europe and to a lesser extent from Africa. Under the Commonwealth scheme sanctioned by the Nassau Agreement in 1982, the UWI enrolled eight students from Southern Africa to various full-time programmes. More recently, an agreement between the Mexican Government and UWI provides for student groups and faculty from Mexican universities to receive language training in English at the UWI campuses on a reciprocal basis which permits students and faculty from UWI to receive training in Spanish. There has in addition been a development, especially since the mid 1970s, for graduate students to pursue split-site degrees using the UWI facilities for their field study and having joint supervisors at UWI and the home university, mostly in the USA. The number of these candidates remains undocumented and requires more detailed investigation. As far as could be ascertained, no formal attachments are worked out, leaving the arrangement largely up to the goodwill or otherwise of the individual supervisors.

*Study tours:* another type of overseas student is the one who comes as part of a group on short-term study tours ranging from one to four weeks. The practice has emerged from these groups to arrange through respective faculties for formal lectures/seminars to be provided by local faculty for an agreed stipend; the groups normally require classroom accommodation and access to library facilities; they are housed in halls of residence for which they pay the commercial rates. Since these study tours normally occur during the UWI vacation periods, there is little disruption of its regular programme and in addition they provide income at least for the halls of residence. Between 1988-90, the number of study tours from overseas was 12 at Mona, seven at St Augustine and five at Cave Hill, with party numbers ranging from six to 20. Each tour was co-ordinated with a member of faculty from the home university. Of these 24 study tours, 19 were from the USA, one each from Mexico, the Netherlands and Germany and two from the UK.

UWI has recognised the need to systematise its policy regarding internationalisation and mandated its Office of Academic Affairs, in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Relations, to review and make recommendations on a strategy for student mobility, as part of its overall policy for co-operation and linkages with other institutions. The next section of this paper derives from that review, which is described because of the general issues which it has thrown up and as a possible exemplar for other Commonwealth institutions. Co-operative programmes, however, have tended to include student exchange only as one element in a package – and often a comparatively minor element.

## *A review of co-operative programmes at UWI*

*The policy:* co-operative relationships have apparently been guided by The University Charter, which states, *inter alia*:

The university shall have the following powers:

- 1 To facilitate other institutions or branches or departments thereof and to recognise selected members of the staffs thereof as teachers of the University, and to admit the members thereof to any of the privileges of the University, and to accept attendance at courses of study in such institutions or branches or departments thereof in place of such part of the attendance at courses of study in the University and upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as may, from time to time, be determined by the University.

- 2 To enter into any agreement for the incorporation in or association with the University of any other institution and for taking over, in whole or part, its rights, property, privileges, liabilities and engagements and for any other purpose not repugnant to this Our Charter.

There is no detailed policy statement regarding the purposes, planning and establishment of these linkages, but it is assumed that such relationships will be guided by the considerations discussed in Section 1 of this chapter.

*Development of links with other institutions through:*

- 1 Personal contact, where either a member of faculty at UWI was aware of the interests and work of a colleague at an external university or vice versa, and contact was made. In some cases, former members of staff who moved to external universities maintained contact with UWI colleagues and encouraged formal linkages.
- 2 Exploratory visits by either of the two parties sometimes led to heightened interest and the establishment of formal linkages.
- 3 Initial contact with academics serving as external examiners sometimes blossomed into other areas of collaboration – research, exchanges, seminars, etc.
- 4 An expression of interest in collaboration by an external institution led to further discussion and a formalised agreement. Initial contact was often between a senior member of administration, for example, the Vice Chancellor, the Principal, Pro-Vice-Chancellor and someone of similar rank at the external university.
- 5 Agencies or Governments promoted collaboration in several instances, by making funds available for this type of activity, for example, the UK's Committee for International Co-operation in Higher Education (CICHE), the Government of Nigeria, USAID.

In cases where external agencies contributed to the establishment and maintenance of linkages, proposals were more frequently implemented and reports on visits and other aspects of the programme tended to be more detailed.

*Characteristics of proposals and Memoranda of Agreement:* the majority of links were between a single department on one campus with a corresponding department at the external university. Many of the universities were British and the programmes operated through CICHE. Other links were with North American universities.

Memoranda of Agreement, on the other hand, suggested a wider

thrust: links between faculties or between the external university and a campus, for example, DePaul University (Chicago) and the Cave Hill Campus; Faculty of Law, UWI and the College of Law, Florida State University; St Augustine Campus and La Universidad Simon Bolivar.

Activities associated with links included:

- staff exchange
- research collaboration
- exchange of materials
- provision of specialists
- student exchange
- joint publications
- curriculum development

Staff exchanges and research collaboration appear to have been common to most programmes. Early relationships, particularly in the Faculties of Medicine and Natural Sciences, included provision of specialists in areas where local expertise was limited.

Statements of *objectives* were often confused with strategies or activities, but objectives properly so termed included:

- improvement in the quality of teaching programmes
- stimulation of research activities
- fostering staff development opportunities

*Organisation and management of linkages:* Co-operative programmes have been managed in an unco-ordinated fashion. There is no central office on any UWI campus which can provide detailed information on all linkages. The key units involved in administering the programmes reviewed were:

- Individual academic departments
- Deans' Offices
- The Registry
- The Bursary
- Appointments Committees

The distribution of responsibilities was as follows:

- 1 *Academic Departments* were responsible for planning and administering the academic matters of their linkage agreements determining priorities, nominating staff for exchange visits, arranging programmes for visitors, selection of exchange students, identifying courses for students and related matters.

- 2 *Deans' Offices:* the Dean of the faculty signs formal agreements along with the Principal, and is responsible for the overall supervision of the programme including approval of requests for funding.
- 3 *The Campus Registry:* under the CICHE Scheme, a co-ordinator within the Registry received and disseminated information between departments and CICHE. Reports were provided, but no assessment of programmes has ever been undertaken by the Registry. Besides this special function, the Registry maintained files on all relationships attempted. Leave arrangements for staff, and travel plans for both staff and students were also handled by the Registry. Arrangements for visitors such as accommodation, travel were similarly arranged.
- 4 *The Bursary:* all financial matters were executed by the Bursary on the vice of the Registry in the case of CICHE and departmental instruction in the case of other programmes.
- 5 *Appointments Committees:* these approve leave for staff to travel to overseas institutions and confer status on visiting staff.

*Implementation issues:* few problems were reported, but in most programmes there was neither formative nor summative evaluation. Reports and correspondence highlighted the following concerns:

- 1 *Lack of funds* led to the dormancy of a large number of proposals. This situation, to a large extent, ought to have been foreseen. Few proposals addressed budgetary considerations, and while the Memoranda of Agreement included a clause on the need for obtaining finances, files do not reveal any attempts on the part of the UWI to identify sources, let alone pursue these. One may well ask whether it is useful to prepare Memoranda of Agreement based solely on aspirations and expectations of external funding.
- 2 *Turn-over of staff,* both at UWI and the collaborating institute, contributed to the still-birth of some proposals and the demise of programmes initiated. This phenomenon serves to highlight the very personalised nature of many of the linkages.
- 3 *Disagreements with funding sources:* in two instances, the funding agency (CICHE) disagreed with components included in the proposal.
- 4 *Failure to implement a pre-project condition* has led to at least one proposal being held in abeyance. Post-doctoral fellowships were anticipated at Cave Hill and a proposal between the Department

of Microbiology, King's College, London and the Department of Biology, Cave Hill was drawn up based on this assumption. However, since neither the necessary equipment nor the fellowships were put in place, the staff exchanges and other activities have been shelved.

- 5 *The need to ensure equity* between collaborators was mentioned with respect to remuneration, length of attachment and teaching responsibilities. One should note that queries of this nature occur during implementation, where there is an absence of detailed collaborative planning.
- 6 *Allocation of time for collaborative research*: one report suggested that since collaborative research requires 'time to distil and agree on likely projects based on the perceptions of the parties involved', there is a need to extend the duration of such programmes if this objective is to be satisfactorily accomplished. At the end of a three year period, only likely projects might be identified.

Other factors mentioned which underscore inadequacies at the planning stage were:

- *the need for recognition of the programme by the Administration*, particularly to facilitate leave arrangements and other entitlements
- *limited UWI input* into proposals
- *queries on arrangements for credit transfer* for student exchange programmes
- *UWI's inability to reciprocate conditions enjoyed by UWI students abroad* such as subsidised meals, inexpensive accommodation, etc.

Only a few proposals were detailed enough to anticipate problems which could occur and include mechanisms for resolving these, hence minimising 'crisis' situations at the implementation stage.

*Outcomes*: there is virtual unanimity regarding the benefits which UWI has derived from those co-operative programmes which came to fruition and were sustained over three years or more. In Science and Technology in particular, UWI scholars have profited from the comparative advantage of the collaborating institutions. Staff members have reported glowingly on the 'refreshment from exposure' benefits derived from a 'richer more intellectually varied environment ... the balance given to teaching programmes both in relation to the perspective from the developed and developing world, as well as a mix of a wider pool of specialised expertise'. It was also noted that visits to departments have had a positive effect on morale and there were

several cases where joint publications and new courses were developed. One department observed that in instances where UWI staff were involved in teaching at external universities, the department's prestige as a centre for teaching and research was enhanced.

Collaborating institutions were also seen to have benefited. They gained understanding in the needs and priorities of particular disciplines in developing countries. Staff members and students had the opportunity to explore new areas of research and for comparative study and to learn from UWI scholars, particularly for the development and expansion of their Caribbean Studies programmes.

### *Types of student mobility programmes*

UWI has had limited experience in organised and institutionalised student mobility programmes. Nevertheless, based on the activities undertaken since the inception of the University, some classification is possible as they relate to the programmes in the earlier period (1948–80), the current programmes and new directions that are likely to form the pattern for future programmes.

Between 1948 and 1962, in the formative years of the University of the West Indies, the process of internationalisation was largely one-way. In the period 1949–50, of the 56 members of the faculty and senior administrative staff in the University located at Mona (the only campus) at that time, 84 per cent were expatriate; by 1959–60, the staff, which had spread across two campuses numbered approximately 198, of which 60 per cent were expatriate. By 1969–70, the Caribbean nationals recruited to teaching and administration numbered 62 per cent.

A significant development related to the training of graduate students. Until 1965, the University of the West Indies was largely an undergraduate school and so was the University of Guyana, which was then in its third year. Graduate training was undertaken at universities abroad, mostly in the UK and the USA and to a lesser extent in other Commonwealth countries, and contributed directly and indirectly to staff development. By 1979–80, 45 per cent of the University staff comprised professionals who had received at least a Bachelor's and/or Master's degree from the University and had pursued an advanced degree or diploma elsewhere. In other words, the early experience in student mobility was in essence linked to graduate studies and twinned with staff development.

Between 1965–75, more formal arrangements developed for graduate

training programmes and staff exchanges with the emphasis on development assistance to UWI. Two illustrations of this type of link arrangement are:

- 1 *Manchester University/UWI/University of East Africa*, in government and public administration. This tripartite scheme sponsored 10 candidates with MAs in Government from UWI to read for the Ph.D. degree at Manchester University. Nine successfully completed their degrees, six of whom returned as lecturers at UWI, four subsequently qualified as lawyers and three of those are also active politicians, two of whom have actually held ministerial portfolios. The training programmes were also accompanied by the exchange of staff among the three participating universities resulting in the expansion of offerings in the respective departments of government.
- 2 *The University of Michigan/UWI scheme*, in scientific social science methods. This scheme resulted in five Ph.Ds in Political Science, four of whom returned as members of the teaching staff. It was also responsible for training approximately 28 UWI graduate students and faculty from the social sciences between 1968–84 in the international consortium in survey and quantitative techniques at McGill University, Centre for the Study of Developing Areas and UWI: and sponsored similar training for economists and political scientists in development studies. Eight UWI economists received graduate degrees and there have been staff exchanges that have persisted for over a thirty-year period in Economics as well as in Agriculture.

Memoranda of Agreement for link arrangements currently being implemented are for programmes all making provision for undergraduate and graduate exchanges, in designated subjects, for two to three years.

- *Undergraduate and graduate exchanges* in designated subjects: Jackson State University, School of Science and Technology and UWI Faculty of Natural Sciences, Cave Hill; Florida State University, Faculty of Social Science and the UWI Faculty of Social Sciences; DePaul University, Faculty of Law, and the UWI Faculty of Law, Cave Hill; La Universidad Simon Bolivar and UWI Department of Spanish, St Augustine.
- *Graduate training as part of a link*: The University of Florida (Gainesville) Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences and

Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management, UWI Faculty of Agriculture, St Augustine; University of Guelph and UWI Faculty of Agriculture.

- *Technical assistance:* bringing the experts to the students: Faculty of Languages, Polytechnic of Central London and Language Department, Faculty of Arts UWI, Mona for Postgraduate Diploma in Spanish.
- *General programmes:* with the Mexican government for staff and student exchanges focusing on Language training, Agriculture, Science and Technology; Health Promotion Department, University of Wales and the Department of Social and Preventive Medicine, UWI.

### *New directions*

In the contemporary period, the programmes are increasingly reciprocal compared with the relatively one-way orientation of the earlier period when the emphasis was more on technical assistance to UWI than on co-operation. This is understandable in the circumstances where the University programmes were in the process of being developed. The University is now embarking on new ventures in internationalising student mobility. In its development plan to attract overseas students, an important strategy is the organisation of an *International Summer School in Caribbean Studies*. This will permit the University to offer a range of credit and non-credit courses in a cross-section of programme areas. At the same time income will be generated and plant more fully used during the Summer session. Another possible instrument for attracting foreign students is the *Consortium Graduate School in the Social Sciences*, a joint UWI/UG programme in development studies which admits 15–20 students per year on a full-time basis in a highly competitive process. The programme, inaugurated in 1985, has so far not admitted any non-Caribbean candidates, but is already an example of intra-regional co-operation, a model that may have to be followed in the organisation of other regional training and research programmes.

As a regional institution with three campus sites, UWI needs to broaden the concept of student mobility to include student flows among campuses. There are models for this type of regional mobilisation of resources, such as ERASMUS in Europe. There are several complementary facilities that must be developed and implemented in order that UWI and the region as a whole can participate meaningfully in student mobility programmes.

## *Support facilities required*

In order to accommodate and adequately host overseas students on its campuses, UWI will need to improve its facilities in several areas, while any parallel programme to encourage travel abroad by Caribbean students requires new financial programmes.

*Incoming students:* to sponsor student exchange activity on its campuses, the University needs to develop and upgrade its physical facilities to accommodate overseas students, perhaps using the opportunity provided to double on-campus student accommodation by the Lomé III and IV programmes. Better library, laboratory and computer facilities would enhance UWI's capacity to provide quality programmes and minimise extra demands on faculty to supervise overseas students. Especially in the case of foreign language students, adequate language laboratories would be an asset. Improved student support services and recreational amenities are needed and it must be stressed that properly organised students' international centres require dedicated staff at various levels to improve the well-being of overseas students by ensuring that there are on-going extra curricular activities geared to their needs. It is in many ways comparable to the norms of hospitality to guests.

In addition, there is need for greater emphasis on public relations to establish contact with prospective students and client groups that might be interested in participating in student mobility and other exchange programmes sponsored by UWI.

A facility which, if enhanced, could serve both Caribbean and external students is the UWI Distance Education Experiment (UWIDITE). It has been in operation for 10 years and is used for conferencing and the transmission of courses across the English-speaking Caribbean by means of satellite communication. The system is currently being upgraded so that it can more effectively respond to the growing demands, especially for the delivery of credit and non-credit courses on an open-university type model. Such an improved facility should be able to respond to the needs of student mobility programmes. This would permit cross-campus participation in specific activities and greater rationalisation of resources.

*Outgoing students:* to enable Caribbean students to move abroad finance is critical. Some new thinking is developing about financial arrangements. One is the build-up of a special fund from which awards can be made to facilitate both intra-regional student mobility and study and travel outside the region. Within the UWI, the fund should be

dedicated and organised in the form of an endowment.

In addition to the traditional methods of financing student mobility and other co-operative schemes, a new strategy is being proposed, that is *debt conversion*, whereby an agency, including a higher educational institution in a developed country, may purchase a portion of the region's outstanding debt for purposes of the development of higher education, including support of overseas study by students from the country or region concerned.

### ***Conclusion: Lessons from the UWI experience***

Student mobility is seen as part of an overall strategy of the University of the West Indies to enhance its role in the internationalisation of higher education. This strategy embraces a variety of links and co-operative arrangements with other institutions in other parts of the world. The Office of Academic Affairs review, which has been described, shows that the University does have some capacity to develop and implement co-operative programmes. It has contributed ideas, provided vital resources in the form of personnel and facilities, and an environment conducive to the pursuit of proposal objectives. Nonetheless, several questions remain:

- 1 Is that capacity being most effectively utilised?
- 2 What is the limit to the capacity?
- 3 What roles must the various units play in the establishment, implementation and evaluation of co-operative programmes?

These questions would need to be asked by any Commonwealth higher education agency which wishes to nurture better student exchange.

We believe that other institutions share the UWI experience, that several offices and units have an interest in and a responsibility for fostering linkages. Faculties and departments are the chief beneficiaries. Therefore it is not surprising that individual staff members, heads and deans seek to initiate and effect linkages to meet individual interests, or departmental and faculty needs. The interests of the institution as a whole may not be best served by this type of arrangement.

How should departmental and faculty initiatives be co-ordinated? What mechanisms must UWI or any similar institution have in place for efficient management and accountability for both single campus and multi-campus programmes? Who should assist with the development of collaborative or link proposals? Who evaluates and rationalises

proposals developed? For example, can a department with an academic staff of eight to ten effectively manage a linkage programme with three or more external institutions simultaneously? Who reviews these programmes?

These issues are not yet being addressed in a systematic manner. Unless they are, UWI or any other university, faced with intensified efforts to increase the number of collaborative programmes, risks the potential embarrassment of making various commitments, without having established the necessary mechanisms for management and accountability. Moreover, the development of programmes ought to be closely related to the available resources and ongoing programmes to avoid over-extending capacity.

Furthermore, UWI appears in the past to have sought linkages largely to fulfil its need for increasing staff development opportunities, gaining access to specialised equipment, etc, without full recognition of the tremendous expertise it commands itself and which could be of great benefit to others. Future proposals might emphasise these resources, in, for instance, tropical agriculture, Caribbean Studies, tropical marine biology, etc, since external institutions will be seeking some measure of reciprocity and a basis for fund raising.

Co-operative programmes have proven to be useful strategy for institutional development and, as efforts are made, by UWI and sister Commonwealth institutions, to pursue their further development, these types of collaborative arrangements will continue to be of importance. If such programmes are to be effectively implemented and optimum use be made of scarce resources, greater attention must be given to the formulation of clear policy guidelines, the establishment of appropriate administrative mechanisms, and adequate marketing of the University's resources.

**TABLE 5.1 University enrolment growth: University of West Indies, 1960-61/1988-89**

Country	Enrolments				
	1960-61	1968-69	1978-79	1988-89	1988-89 1960-61
Barbados	82	412	1,015	1,699	20.7
Jamaica	442	1,833	4,148	5,209	11.8
Trinidad	126	1,258	2,648	4,206	33.3
Non-Campus Countries	131	439	494	603	4.6

Source: UWI (1990)

**TABLE 5.2 Higher education enrolments of English-speaking Caribbean students: Caribbean and United States**

Origin	(1) Caribbean	(2) USA	Ratio (2)/(1)
Jamaica	4,800	2,300	0.5
Barbados	1,200	300	0.3
Trinidad	3,300	1,800	0.6
Guyana*	1,800	1,000	0.6
Bahamas	100	1,500	15.0
Other Non-Campus*	400	3,900	9.8

Source: UWI and UG Statistics (1983)

\* Note Guyana and other non-campus figures are estimates

# 6

## *Academic Exchange*

*Student Flows, Exchange and Capacity Building in India*

---

Karuna Chanana Ahmad and Aparna Basu

### *Introduction and background*

Within the Commonwealth, India has a special place as a country with a large and complex system of higher education, which is both a major host to foreign students and a sender of its researchers abroad. For this reason, the Education Division of the Commonwealth Secretariat commissioned both a report on general higher education and a specific case-study on technical education (see the Chapter in Part Five by Jayalakshmi Indiresan).

This report is based on the premise that academic linkages can be catalytic in the institution-building of higher education in developing countries, since these links are likely to add an international dimension to institutions in the forms of students, knowledge and resources. It addresses itself to issues associated with enhancing student mobility in institutions of higher education within the developing countries and from among the developed to the developing countries within the Commonwealth. Its more specific focus relates to academic exchange schemes, capacity and institution building in selected universities in India. The intention was to examine:

- the policy thrust
- exchange schemes in operation
- the role of the various agencies involved in exchange schemes
- the capacity of higher educational institutions to absorb more foreign students
- the need for institutional build-up and support structures

Much of the discussion relates to foreign students in *universities*, although universities are not necessarily synonymous with higher education overall. It focuses on *all* foreign students in India, unless specific references are made to Commonwealth countries. This was because key personnel interviewed at the national and institutional level did not differentiate between students from the Commonwealth and outside. A distinction was, however, made between developed and developing countries and between neighbouring and other foreign countries.

This qualitative study is based on secondary data and on extensive interviews held with key personnel involved in the admission of foreign students, both nationally and at institutional level. Our insights and observations have been illuminated by case-studies of two universities:

- 1 The University of Delhi, (DU), Delhi
- 2 Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU) New Delhi

There are, however, certain gaps in the information at institutional level. For instance, JNU does not compile information on various schemes or on how many foreign students are self-financing; further, grades of foreign students in JNU are not compiled separately. These gaps could not be filled within the short time available.

### ***Key issues and perspectives***

A discussion of foreign student admission policy cannot be isolated from the discussion of policy making in higher education, ideological orientations of the state and the size of the higher education system. Earlier studies on foreign students in India do not evaluate and monitor student mobility with respect to institutions/courses of choice. The statistical data, even when collected, are not used to reflect trends and to project future demands. They do not focus on interests and capacities, nor on specific barriers to academic exchange or on the policy issues highlighted in this study.

Higher education in India faces several challenges. These challenges arise in part from the burgeoning demand from students, who finish school, to enter the universities and colleges. Since population has grown rapidly and the number of secondary school students has also multiplied, many more students are qualifying for entry to university and other higher education courses. Besides, higher education is viewed as an instrument of social and occupational mobility. Therefore,

there is intense competition for places in higher educational institutions. This has made admission standards unreasonably high in academically excellent/good institutions.

The universities are pulled in different directions due to pressures from within and outside the system. Political turbulence due to student unrest and demand for more places, facilities, etc through student unions is a crucial internal source of pressure. Democratic politics and the demands placed on universities by national policies governing student intake, reservation of places for specific groups of students on the basis of non-academic criteria, dependence for funds on state and central government and political accountability are important external factors. India's vice-chancellors face a crisis situation in which institutional autonomy remains a theoretical proposition – a crisis heightened by severe resource constraints.

The government's response to demographic pressures and social demand has been to off-load on to the universities the problem of managing the student intake. Thus, inordinate political commands influence or even dictate university intakes. Rational planning and management seem virtually impossible. Therefore, while the issues of entry standards, admission criteria and quotas are university problems, they are also influenced by macro-policy decisions.

With increasing student numbers, the challenges are to sustain and improve the quality of higher education provision. Quality is at risk where enrolments exceed capacity. This has happened in several universities which have succumbed to the pressure of numbers.

The historical autonomy of universities and its fierce defence by faculty, staff and students, provides them limited insulation and, therefore, the capacity to plan and manage their institutions in spite of political pressures. Central universities are in a somewhat better position than the state universities to resist these pressures. The existence of institutions of excellence is attributable, not only to the belief in autonomy, but also to the need to train personnel for the expanding professional and technical needs of the economy.

The expanding education system, the highly subsidised fees, the 'capitation fees', the burgeoning private colleges (referred to below), student unrest and trade unionism on campuses are all to be understood in this context.

## *Higher education in India*

In 1988–89, there were 144 universities (five being exclusively for women), besides 25 autonomous institutions. Of the 144, ten are central universities while the rest are state universities. Central universities receive full grants from the central (federal) government through the University Grants Commission while the state universities receive partial grants from the central government. Both the institutions selected for this study are central universities.

The other important distinction is between affiliating and unitary universities. In an affiliating university, postgraduate teaching and research takes place in the university departments, while undergraduate teaching is done in colleges which are 'affiliated' to the universities. However, the syllabus for the colleges is laid down and the examinations are conducted by the university. Other academic matters such as who should be admitted, the range of their academic attainments, what subjects to introduce, etc, are also decided for all colleges at the university level. The majority of universities in India are of the affiliating type. A unitary university does not have any affiliated colleges. Teaching takes place at the university departments. In some unitary universities, undergraduate teaching is done, but by the university itself. DU is an affiliating university. JNU is a unitary university, where only postgraduate teaching and research is done (except in the School of Languages, where undergraduate courses are provided in some foreign languages).

The third type are the agricultural universities, the fourth technical universities, such as Roorkee University. In addition, certain institutions are regarded as institutes of national importance. These include the five Indian Institutes of Technology, All India Institutes of Medical Sciences at New Delhi and Chandigarh, Indian Statistical Institute, etc, while several research institutes have been set up outside the university orbit, such as the Indian Institute of Public Administration (New Delhi) and the National Institute of Design (New Delhi). Twenty-eight institutions, such as the Indian Institute of Science (Bangalore) are given the status of 'deemed to be universities'. There are 40 laboratories under the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research. The significance of these developments is that substantial scholarly and scientific research is done outside the universities.

There are no private universities, though several colleges are set up through private funds. All these, however, have to be 'recognised' by affiliation to a university. There are 6,900 colleges all over India (of

which 825 are exclusively for women), which offer courses in arts, science, commerce, engineering and medicine. The majority of them are privately managed, though they get government grants. The fees in these colleges are unbelievably low (often only five hundred rupees a year), since higher education is subsidised by the government. Professional colleges, such as those of medicine and engineering, are more expensive and more than half of them are managed by the government. A few (about five per cent) of the professional colleges, notably in Karnataka and Maharashtra, charge what is known as 'capitation fees'; students may be required to pay a large sum of money to meet the capital costs of the college. Fees would then be ten to twelve times higher than in a government college.

The universities of India vary enormously in their size, capacities, academic standards, level of discipline and efficiency. In some universities, the quality of teaching is excellent and good research work is done, library and laboratory facilities are adequate, examinations are held and results declared on time. In some states, on the other hand, universities may be closed for months, classes are not held, teachers are not paid and examinations are held a year or two behind schedule. Thus, the quality of teaching and research varies from excellent to bad or indifferent across universities, colleges and departments within a university.

Nonetheless, what is noteworthy is the gigantic size of the higher education system and the presence of a fairly large number of universities, colleges, departments and institutes which provide high-calibre teaching facilities at a heavily subsidised rate. The total enrolment in higher education in 1988–89 was estimated to be 3,947,922 and the number of teachers in higher education was 54,973.

### *Student mobility: Analysis of recent trends*

In 1989–90, the year for which information at national level is available, there were 12,606 overseas students in India, compared to 11,759 in the previous academic year. On an average, 90 per cent of the foreign students are undergraduates and 10 per cent postgraduates. Of these not more than five to seven per cent are sponsored candidates. The rest are self-financing.

The most notable sending countries in 1989–90 were:

#### *Commonwealth students*

Kenya	2,856
Malaysia	870

Sri Lanka	550
Bangladesh	362
Nigeria	241

*Non-Commonwealth students*

Sudan	1,633
Jordan	1,599
Nepal	807
Ethiopia	476
Iran	404
Palestine	231

There were 26 universities with an intake of over a hundred overseas students each, of which 15 had over two hundred (see Table 6.2). Pune University, Maharashtra, had the largest enrolment of foreign students (2,165), followed by Mangalore University in Karnataka (918) and Delhi University (797). Another 262 foreigners were studying in the five Institutes of Technology.

In terms of countries of origin, the largest number of students at Pune University came from Sudan (769), followed by Jordan (717) and Ethiopia (221), while in Mangalore, the largest enrolment is from Malaysia (639). At Delhi University, students from different countries are distributed among a total of 46 countries (see Table 6.4).

Most of the foreign students at Pune University are enrolled in general courses at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels. On the other hand, a majority (1,021) of students in medicine and pharmacy (out of 1,064) are registered in universities located in Karnataka state. It may be noted that several private medical colleges affiliated to universities in Karnataka state charge 'capitation fees'; it is presumed (in the absence of more reliable information) that most of these are self-financing students. Of the 334 engineering students (barring those in the Indian Institute of Technology and Roorkee University), 121 are in universities in Karnataka state.

### ***Foreign student admission policy in higher education***

An objective of JNU as set out in the First Schedule of the JNU Act, 1966 spells out very clearly the role that the university can/should play in providing leadership in the training and higher education of students from developing countries. It reads as follows:

... provide facilities for students and teachers from other countries to participate in the academic programmes of the universities.

This reflects a widespread awareness of the role and responsibility of Indian universities. Despite this, however, and despite the known demand from abroad for Indian higher education, no coherent policy regarding the admission of the foreign students has evolved so far. Foreign students are being admitted all over the country without any clear cut guidelines. Discussions with key personnel at the national level did, however, indicate the presence of a perspective and of implicit guidelines. For instance, a distinction between developing and developed countries is made in the context of student inflows and preference is given to students from the former. Considerations of neighbourly co-operation and assistance, and foreign policy objectives, also tend to influence foreign student admissions. There is also a guideline that foreign students will be five per cent of the total student intake.

Not only are there no policy or clear cut guidelines, there is no streamlined procedure for the admission of foreign students, nor a co-ordinating organisation/agency for this purpose. The bewildering variety in the higher education system adds to the complexity of a situation where several agencies are involved in the process, as is demonstrated below.

### *Agencies involved in foreign student admission*

Several agencies are involved in the admission of foreign students in the universities. Their roles are:

*Indian Council For Cultural Relations (ICCR)* This is the nodal agency for arranging the admission of most foreign students. Sending country allocations are made by the relevant ministries/departments. ICCR sends out admission forms to Indian missions abroad in December (a function previously undertaken by the MHRD). There is a difference in the approach to general education and to professional courses (especially engineering, medicine, pharmacy, etc). For professional courses, information about country, name of the technical institution and of student is generally provided beforehand. The ICCR only helps in the admission procedure and in disbursing the fellowship. For general education ICCR also allocates *scholarships* to selected students (the word scholarship is used inclusively to embrace fellowships as well). ICCR processes applications received through Indian missions abroad. Then, depending on institutional and course preferences

indicated, the application is sent to three institutions. After an institution accepts the application, the ICCR takes a decision regarding award of scholarship and informs the student through the Indian mission. The verification of eligibility requirement/equivalence is the responsibility of the receiving institution.

The ICCR also pays attention to the socio-cultural welfare of foreign students. It finances tours to places of interest in India and arranges cultural activities. It provides funds to universities for payment of token honoraria to the foreign students' advisors, for arranging cultural activities at the campus and outside and for hiring English language teachers, etc. Funds for all these activities are provided to universities for all foreign students, regardless of whether they are sponsored or self-financing. However, budgetary allocations for these activities are very limited.

*Ministry of Human Resource Development* Since the transfer of its scholarship division to the ICCR, this plays a limited role in the admission of students, although it continues to be in charge of the overall policy thrust. It is also involved in giving clearance to applications of research scholars/graduate students for fieldwork. It arranges their affiliation to placement in various universities. In this process, the UGC is also consulted and clearance is sought from it. MHRD, along with UGC, also takes care of memoranda of understanding signed by Indian universities with universities/institutions abroad.

*University Grants Commission* This organisation is involved, directly or indirectly, in most foreign student admissions in the universities. Apart from its role in giving clearance to applications received from MHRD and other agencies, it allocates a few doctoral fellowships and research associateships out of the quota for Indian students. It also administers, from time to time, any special (one time) schemes that the government may wish to execute between universities in India and abroad.

*Ministry of External Affairs* The Student Cell of this ministry arranges the admission of self-financing students in professional courses. It has a standardised procedure and a prescribed proforma. For more details, reference may be made to the companion study on technical education.

*Educational Consultants India Limited (Ed-CIL)* A comparatively recent public sector undertaking, this arranges, on commercial basis, the admission of self-financing students and of those sponsored by their own countries/employing organisations. Training of working or professional persons is also arranged. It is prepared to cater to the special training needs/academic requirements of sponsoring agencies

and of individuals. It has entered into Memoranda of Understanding with some Indian institutions which provide the academic and other support structures for specially designed courses. Most of the admissions handled by Ed-CIL are for professional courses or for short-term training courses of employed persons/professionals from developing countries. It looks after all aspects of a student's/trainee's stay in India: receiving at the airport, escorting to the institute, monitoring academic progress through periodic reports from the receiving institution, ensuring accommodation, etc.

*Indian Missions Abroad* It was observed that, although there was a heavy dependence on these by the agencies already listed, they do not have updated, complete information to assist foreign students in their quest for admission. Its lack of information is about educational systems and institutions as well as procedural matters. This is partly because of the bewildering variety of courses, programmes, and institutes, and partly because most receiving institutions do not supply any brochure or instruction manual providing details of their admission procedure. For instance, while DU has prepared a booklet which is mailed to Indian missions in December, JNU does not have such a brochure. Most Indian missions abroad seem, in any case, ill-equipped to handle information relating to the multiplicity of educational systems and variety of admission criteria and procedure.

*Association of Indian Universities* AIU plays a twofold role. First, it provides equivalence of the entry eligibility qualifications of students from different countries. Second, it compiles the national level data on all foreign students in Indian higher education. For this, it has to depend on the receiving institutions, which send uneven and delayed information.

As mentioned earlier, some universities have entered into Memoranda of Understanding with specific institutions or universities abroad for receiving groups of students or individual students. These MOUs need clearance from UGC and MHRD. They may also be signed directly by the MHRD and a foreign university/institution for bringing in students.

These are the main agencies involved in making arrangements for the admission of foreign students, and they are responsible for a multiplicity of schemes for the reception of these students.

## ***Major academic exchange schemes***

Sponsored students generally come for higher studies to India not as individuals, but as participants in some scheme or special arrangement. Information obtained from the ICCR, MHRD, UGC at the national level and supplemented from the two case studies showed that there were five types of arrangement:

- scholarships of the Government of India
- admission through Memoranda of Understanding
- sponsorship by the sending university/institution
- short-term or casual visiting
- self-financing

*Scholarships/Fellowships of the Government of India* are awarded under four types of scheme:

- 1 *Multilateral/bilateral schemes* such as the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan and the General Cultural Scholarship Scheme. There are 75 and 180 scholarships respectively under CSFP and GCSS (both of which are the responsibility of ICCR). While the former scheme is meant for students from the Commonwealth countries, the latter is available to students from all developing countries.
- 2 *Bilateral Cultural Exchange Programmes (CEPs)* The government of India has entered into such programmes with several countries. Scholarships are assigned to students under each of these; currently ICCR offers scholarships, ranging from two to ten, to students of 20 countries. In addition, there are also other reciprocal arrangements.
- 3 *Special agreements with specific countries* At present, ICCR has four, with Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Mauritius, and Angola.
- 4 *Special one-time scheme* The government of India announced several scholarships for Sri Lankan students in 1990. UGC was entrusted with its implementation. So far, one third placements have been made.

At the national level, the important schemes are those that bring *researchers* to India, through the US Educational Foundation in India (USEFI), New Delhi; The American Institution of Indian Studies (AIIS) New Delhi; and the Shastri Indo-Canadian Institute (SICI), New Delhi.

The first two are funded through the US India Rupee Fund, and the third by the MHRD. All these schemes work well and scholarships are fully utilised. There are two other important and successful schemes offering admission through Memoranda of Understanding. The Berkeley Professional Studies Programme brings 10–12 graduate students from all over the US for a year. These students are affiliated to universities and institutions all over India on the basis of research proposals approved by the receiving institutions. This programme is administered by a co-ordinating office at Berkeley and at New Delhi. The co-ordinating officers process the applications, obtain bureaucratic clearances, arrange for admission or affiliation, generally look after the needs/sensitivity to Indian climate, awareness of Indian culture, accommodation of students and arrange for orientation course at New Delhi. Faculty members from DU are involved in co-ordinating the orientation programme and a large number of students become 'casual students' at DU. The graduate students have to pay a small amount in USA, but after their arrival in India, they are fully funded through the US India Rupee Fund. The second, similar scheme brings every year 12–15 undergraduate students from the nine campuses of University of California to four colleges of general education of DU. This is the Education Abroad Programme (EAP) of the University of California. It has co-ordinating offices at Santa Barbara, California and New Delhi. The office that handles BPSP at New Delhi also looks after EAP. Selected undergraduate students have to earn 36 credits, which are added to their total credit requirements in the US. They either attend regular courses or specially designed courses, on such subjects as Indian society and culture. The co-ordinating office at New Delhi provides support and service similar to BPSP. This scheme is fully funded by the University of California, USA.

Mostly these students come from and are sponsored by the industrial and post-industrial countries of the West. More recently, students from Eastern countries have also been coming. One example was an Indonesian student coming for M.Phil/Ph.D. Programme in International Studies; he was a university teacher on academic leave and was being financed by his university. Most students come for short-time specific courses under these schemes.

Casual students come under different programmes/schemes, MOUs or may be sent by an employing agency or the university where they are enrolled. Casual students may also come in the self-financing category. Countries of origin have usually been North American or European, but students from Japan and newly industrialising countries,

such as Korea, have also started coming. Those from the Western countries come for specific courses related to Indian society, art, culture, religion, etc. Those from the East come for language training, for doctoral degrees, and for short-term specific courses. Jamia Millia Islamia (JMI), a central university at New Delhi, attracts students from the Middle East and elsewhere for Islamic studies (a Japanese student, for example, is undertaking research on Sufism at JMI). Discussions with teachers, foreign student advisors and wardens revealed that the casual students, generally, are more motivated since they have very clear cut objectives. They come for shorter periods and so do not tax the existing facilities, such as accommodation. They also come well-equipped with required academic skills such as language ability. They adjust well with Indian students since they also tend to be more sensitive to Indian culture and society.

Self-financing students form a majority of foreign students in India. Barely five to ten per cent of the total student inflow would be of sponsored students. Even this estimate presumes that the utilisation rate of scholarships will be fairly high (it will be shown later that it is not). At JNU, self-financing students have come from Japan, Korea, Indonesia, Sudan, and Ethiopia. At DU, there are good numbers from the Middle-Eastern countries, especially from Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan; there are also Palestinians, some of whom may be receiving financial support through the UN Office for Refugees. Several students from the Middle Eastern countries register at Jamia Millia Islamia (JMI), the third Central university at New Delhi which caters to the education of Muslim students. Currently, it has 200 foreign students, most of whom are self-financing undergraduates. Students from Indonesia and Thailand reported that their governments provide them with lists of approved universities. Students are given permission to seek admission only in those universities. They write directly to DU and JNU. Once the university informs them that they are eligible for admission, they have to seek the necessary clearance and complete the admission formalities.

### *Uptake and utilisation of awards*

The most recently available data on CSFP is seriously disturbing. Under this scheme, 75 scholarship and fellowships are offered by India every year to students from Commonwealth countries – the largest number offered by a developing country within the scheme. Not all of these are taken up. In 1990–91, 47 nominations were received; 24 admissions were arranged and only 15 actually joined. All of them were women

who came for postgraduate work. In 1991–92, 62 nominations were received, 35 admissions were offered, but only 10 joined (three men and seven women). Similarly, the Indian Council for Cultural Relations scholarships scheme (which includes four Commonwealth countries: Kenya, Malaysia, Mauritius and Sri Lanka) was not fully responded to.

The reasons for under-utilisation are also barriers to mobility. The main reasons are: lack of information, bureaucratic hurdles, lengthy procedures and time lag between granting of admission by the receiving institution and the information being received by the student.

The under-utilisation of CSFP was also discussed at the meeting of CSFP administrators in Barbados in October, 1990. They saw it as in part attributable to the scarcity of quality management and trained administrators, to poor organisation and planning and to lack of clear cut admission procedures and of infrastructure and personnel directly entrusted with foreign student admissions (as in EAP). Concerned officials also pointed out that students were not just interested in scholarships as such or in any institutions or courses. Unless they are placed in institutions and courses of their choice, they are unlikely to accept the award. For instance, there is preference for universities in the South of India, since the North is considered disturbed. Again, they prefer reputed and recognised institutions. The presence of other students from country of origin or of friends are also positive factors. Attention to these factors can increase the uptake of the scholarships. India is not alone in facing the paradox of demand alongside under-use of opportunities. For India, as for other Commonwealth countries, the question arises: since scholarships are available, why do they remain under-utilised? Do institutions lack the will to admit foreign students? Or do they lack the capacity to absorb them? The next two sections seek to answer these questions.

### *Interest/willingness to internationalise campuses*

Our interviews with key personnel indicate that much co-operative activity is already taking place and there is scope to harness that significant potential in the area of co-operation for higher education development through enhanced student inflow.

*At the institutional level*, special provisions, such as foreign student quotas for admission to courses and hostels, waiving of entrance tests, direct admission from abroad, are indicators of willingness. Moreover, higher education is highly subsidised (and therefore inexpensive), yet India is one of the few countries which has not introduced a dual fee structure. (This policy is being changed, 1993, Ed.) Some universities,

such as Pune in Maharashtra have started charging a higher registration fee from self-financing students to create facilities for foreign students. Even this rise remains marginal. In other provisions too, no distinction is made and the benefits enjoyed by Indian students are extended to foreign students. For instance, university education is free for women students at Baroda University, Gujarat. Women students from abroad are also exempt from paying tuition fees. Similarly, at JMI, women students are exempt from attending classes and may register, then take the examinations 'privately' at the end of the academic year; this benefit is available to foreign women as well.

From the *national and institutional viewpoint*, there is consensus that if India helps in training experts for other developing countries, she is fulfilling international obligations. There are also political ramifications of establishing linkages with other developing countries and newly emerging nations through students, who may be future bureaucrats, diplomats, etc, and who are likely to become goodwill ambassadors for the country in which they trained.

On the part of the institutions too, the presence of foreign students has a desirable influence on Indian students, who are exposed to varied cultural influences without going abroad. On the other hand, foreign students who stay in India are instrumental in expanding the sphere of cultural influence. Internationalisation of campuses creates opportunities for academic exchange of experts. Indian academics and experts, who go to foreign universities, attract more foreign students to their own institution. For instance, some foreign students at JNU mentioned that they came either because they had come in contact with a JNU faculty member in their country of origin or because they were familiar with the published work of some faculty members. Besides, DU and JNU were on the approved list of their countries. Thus, academic exchange programmes may have several beneficial effects and implications.

Almost every one contacted was aware of these implications and expressed opinions in favour of student inflow. Heads of universities, however, were guarded about conditions for that inflow. This is due to the likely political issues raised by the presence of noticeable numbers of foreign students on the campuses in an atmosphere where the universities are already beset by the democratic pressure mentioned earlier in this chapter. Their interest is also qualified by certain conditions, namely, the preference for students of high academic calibre, and for dispersal instead of concentration of too many foreign students on one campus.

There is consensus on giving preference to students from neighbouring and developing countries. Our survey indicated that the children of Indian emigrants settled abroad (for example, in Surinam, Fiji, Mauritius) showed a preference to come to India. Cultural proximity and the desire to familiarise with one's cultural roots could be the reasons. Once on campus, they were rated higher on adjustment than the other students. Discussions with foreign students from neighbouring countries and those of Indian origin also reinforces the point that they were better adjusted.

Incoming foreign students are attracted by the relatively good academic facilities, and easy admissions, as well as by the low tuition fees in India. English as the medium of instruction is an added attraction. Indian higher education is able to meet the unsatisfied demand for advanced education and training which is either not available in the country of origin or is too expensive, too competitive or of too long a duration. Some cannot find admission in their own countries, as in Iran, or they come to avoid military service, as from Jordan and Palestine.

On the basis of readily available information and interviews with key personnel it is found that the demand for professional courses, such as medicine, MBA and engineering courses is high among students from developing countries or those who are new nations; for Islamic studies among those from the Middle East; for courses on Indian religion, art, music cultural and philosophy from Western countries. The students in the last category tend to be either short-term casual students or to come for fieldwork. The students coming from Far East and from South-East Asia tend to prefer language training, social sciences and work for research degrees. There may, however, be exceptions. Systematic information ought to be collected from the universities to make more reliable statements about current preferences.

### ***Capacity building and institutional strength***

In looking at the capacity to receive foreign students comfortably and without political or structural difficulties, it is necessary to take into account: student intake; staff and faculty; courses offered, including special courses for foreign students; accommodation; counselling and welfare provision; and library, laboratory and computer facilities. All these aspects were given point by our case-studies of JNU and DU.

With regard to *intake*, most universities can admit more students without overstressing their seating capacity, especially in general education. But since places are limited and there is strong competition

among Indian students, it is desirable that the number of sponsored places for non-Indians in any one institution should remain limited. As already noted, DU and JNU each make special provision for foreign students, of the order of a quota of five per cent of DU's total enrolment (or a maximum of 6,000 foreign students) and 10 per cent of JNU's post-graduate population (or 400 such students).

Many universities have adequate provision of *staff and faculty*, both qualitatively and quantitatively. The faculty members in DU and JNU can meet international standards. To maintain familiarity with other systems of education and to upgrade skills and knowledge, faculty exchange programmes need to continue evolving.

Immense variation and choice in *courses* are available in higher education in India. There may be a case, however, for more special courses, such as bridging courses, remedial, reduced and summer courses to be introduced in selected institutions, to meet their specific requirements of language, subject content and time at their disposal. Additionally, it is important that cultural and other orientation programmes are on offer. As mentioned earlier, cultural programmes are organised by the ICCR, orientation programmes by the ICCR and Vishwa Yuvak Kendra (run by international Youth Hostel Association) New Delhi. ICCR also arranges and provides support to universities for socio-cultural activities. Case studies indicate, however, that none of these activities are undertaken on a regular basis. Foreign students expressed a keen desire to become familiar with Indian culture and society and with campus culture as well. They would undoubtedly respond well to orientation programmes conducted annually on a regular basis, which would help their adjustment.

There is an acute shortage of *accommodation* on Indian campuses. At the same time, students prefer to live on the campus with Indian students, so long as catering facilities meet their expectations. (Otherwise, they would prefer to live in separate hostels with kitchen facilities; some are willing to pay more for these facilities.) This imposes a severe strain, even where the receiving institutions reserve places for foreign students. JNU is an example of a university which, in spite of very high per capita hostel places, is under constant pressure from the students' union to expand accommodation. The situation in other universities is worse. DU has plans to add to the existing International Students' Hostel, while JNU plans to build a new one, but neither projects can take off, due to lack of funds.

*Counselling and welfare* are also essential components in institutional reception of overseas students. Until the present, there has been no

provision for counselling for Indian or foreign students at either DU or JNU, although a counselling unit for women students has recently been set up at the former. There is a need for both academic and social counselling. For instance, foreign students from the Middle East generally enrolled in language (Persian) courses at JMI, but after informal counselling, they tended to shift to professional courses. The emotional and socio-cultural problems can also be handled through a counselling cell.

Such provision would be in addition to a Foreign Student Advisor (FSA), who should play a vital role in the orientation, adjustment and general welfare of foreign students, besides looking after their admission and other administrative requirements. FSAs are generally full time faculty members who take on this additional responsibility, so that they are unable to devote their full attention to this activity. Universities do not have earmarked funds for appointment of full-time advisors or of staff for an international student office. Some universities may appoint office staff depending on the foreign student intake. DU does have an office which looks after the admission of all foreign students. The FSA has streamlined the admission procedure and produced the printed brochure mentioned earlier. JNU has not assigned any clear cut role to the FSA, who looks after their cultural activities only. Consequently, although there are not many students in JNU, they seem bewildered and confused by the multiple authorities they have to approach for various problems. Streamlining of the FSA office and a full-time foreign students' advisor with well-defined functions is crucial to enhance student mobility.

*Libraries, Laboratories and Computer Facilities* There is a wide variation offered by the Indian universities. The two chosen here for in-depth analysis are central universities and thus have better resources than the state universities, yet there is tremendous strain on the existing facilities. While the resources are dwindling, the numbers are increasing. General education gets much less funding than technical education. Devaluation has compounded the problem since, in the coming years, fewer books and equipment will be bought and imported. In the contemporary situation, knowledge generation is increasingly dependent on modern information technology, so that universities will, certainly, need support to provide facilities at international standards for their own students, apart from attracting students from abroad to strengthen student mobility.

In answer, then, to the questions about will and capacity, the climate of opinion is largely favourable and the university system could support more student inflow, provided only that finance could be made

available for infrastructure and services. Where is the finance to come from? Altruism should not prevent another look at issues of generating more fee income.

### ***Student finance and the case for a dual fee structure***

India has a favourable fee regime, due to a highly subsidised fee structure. The question of a dual fee structure, therefore, becomes relevant. In the absence of a clear cut official policy on a differential fee structure, a consensus does not emerge about charging higher fees from foreign students. In the meantime, some universities, such as Pune in Maharashtra, have started charging higher fees from self financing students. We have mentioned earlier that Ed-CIL arranges admissions for sponsored (by non-Indian governmental sources) and self-financing students on full cost basis in government run and 'capitation fee' colleges. Still the demand for Indian higher education has not decreased.

It is also felt by national and institutional officials, that India has the skill, the knowledge and in market terms, a valued commodity to sell. Therefore, it should make it saleable and then charge more than full cost. The higher fees should be used for resource mobilisation and to meet the expenses of educating the foreign students and providing extra facilities. Some argue in favour of making a profit. However, while working out the cost, sponsored students should be left out, since the government of India pays for them. Investment in them may be seen in the context of inter-country programmes of co-operation and assistance. Students funded from elsewhere and those who are self-financing must, on the other hand, pay for their education. According to one view, a distinction should be made between self-financing students from the developed and those from the developing countries. The former should pay more than the latter who might be denied access to higher education if fees were increased.

Another, divergent, view is that dual fee structure should not be introduced, but that a fee rise in India is long overdue and this should be done speedily. Only after the Indian students are charged more, should the foreign students be asked to pay on full cost or differential basis.

The foreign students themselves made several points. First, if they are to be asked to pay more, they should be informed well in advance.

Some expressed reservations about their ability to pay. Second, they should be assured a good return for their money. Some mentioned better facilities and a better standard of accommodation and catering. Others stressed the need to improve the quality of staff in some colleges of DU. Many were willing to pay more if they were assured admissions in good departments and colleges, accommodation in hostels and food arrangements to their satisfaction. If these conditions were met, the students from developed countries would be willing to pay more than the actual cost.

For those who cannot afford higher fees, the sponsored schemes should help, but are still faced by under-utilisation. What are the barriers to student mobility?

### ***Barriers to mobility***

Barriers to mobility have been identified from the institutional perspective as well as from the students' viewpoint. They are *administrative*, *academic* and *socio-cultural*.

On the administrative side, lengthy admission procedures, indifference of Indian missions abroad, bureaucratic delays and hurdles, very short advance notice of admission and involvement of too many agencies and organisations are well-known hurdles. There is also a lack of co-ordination among different ministries, universities and other organisations. The ICCR is now the nodal agency for all students who receive government of India scholarships. But no information is available on self-financing students, who have no reference point. After a student has come to India, then the absence of a centralised agency at the national level and an office at the institutional level, lack of a streamlined procedure at the receiving country and institution, and indifference of most foreign missions in India, are some of the other administrative barriers. Discussions with students and officials contacted underscore the desirability of another nodal agency at the national level, which should have links with foreign missions in India and Indian missions abroad. The Indian missions in foreign countries should create a desk to encourage and monitor student inflow. Foreign students also stressed the role of foreign student advisors in institutions to help with orientation and the overcoming of academic and socio-cultural difficulties. Commonest socio-cultural barriers are different food habits, reluctance to adhere to hostel restrictions, culture shock on arrival in India, absence of any orientation course at this end and absence of residential accommodation in an alien land which increases

loneliness and emotional deprivation. While students from neighbouring countries or of Indian ancestry adjust better, those from African countries complain of colour prejudice. This, too, underscores the need for orientation courses for foreign students and involvement of Indian students and faculty in them. Orientation courses are essential to enhance student mobility. Discussions with Sri Lankan students revealed that such a course had been conducted in Sri Lanka in the past, but has now been discontinued. These may be arranged at the country of origin or at the receiving universities.

Among the academic barriers, three are prominent. These are: lack of information on eligibility requirements; language disability; and poor academic calibre of some foreign students. AIU provides information on equivalence if sought by institutions as well as by individuals. In fact, AIU would like governments and institutions to approach it for equivalence far in advance. It has a set procedure to provide the information.

Even though several students have proficiency in English language, it is inadequate for communication, verbal and written, in higher education courses. There is wide consensus that tests in English (like TOEFL) should be conducted at the entry point. The information is that some Indian missions conduct these tests for sponsored students, but it is not a uniform practice. As mentioned earlier, remedial courses and teaching of English as a foreign language are also proposed as measures to remove this handicap to foreign students and to ensure quality.

There is widespread recognition of the fact that the foreign students who come to India are not always the best. They may therefore be weak in their discipline or subject. This happens because there are no uniform criteria of admission. There is wide variation in the qualifications and skills of those who come. Added to that is the complexity of the Indian situation, where there is no accreditation system. The data from DU confirms the widely held impression about the low academic calibre of foreign students. JNU does not compile grades of foreign students separately nor did discussions give any such indication. It may also be because quite a number come for research degrees which do not require grades.

The issues of quality of students, the selection procedure, and the dual fee structure are more prominent in technical education in comparison to general education. This is for two reasons. First, the students in the IITs are of uniformly high quality and are admitted through a very demanding selection procedure, so that comparisons

between good and poor students are feasible. Contrastingly, in general education, there is wide variation in the quality of students, so that comparison is difficult and definitive statements about the quality of students are difficult to come across in the university setting. This is true even when entrance tests are conducted, as in JNU. The selection procedures are not very rigorous. A second reason is that technical education, especially at IITs and Roorkee University, is very expensive and the places are also very limited. The demand for these is far higher than for general education. Considering the demand and the cost involved, the question of dual fee structure assumes significance. In such a situation, what may be required are reduced courses, special courses during the summer and coaching by research students, as is done in the linguistics department of DU. This arrangement is informal and has worked well. There is need to institutionalise such arrangements in order to replicate them.

Another dimension to academic quality is the quality of the receiving institution and its staff. Students of DU complain of the poor quality of teaching in some of the colleges. They would like to be admitted to colleges where regular and good teaching takes place. There were students who complained that JNU was not what it used to be or was expected to be. They referred to the experiences of their teachers, at whose instance they had come. They noted that the preoccupation of Indian students with public examinations for the All India Administrative Services had diluted the teaching programme. They stated that they were willing to work but somehow neither the Indian students nor the teachers were interested. Faculty development programmes through exchange schemes may reduce teachers' dependence on the classroom situation and help them devise individual student oriented courses.

### *Comments and recommendations*

This survey has pinpointed the strengths and weaknesses of India as a host country for a large number of foreign students. Its strengths include a large and developed higher education system with well-reputed institutions at its apex. There is a strong foreign demand and reasonable capacity to meet some of the demand, provided political pressures are recognised, and the essential support needs of the incoming students are taken into account. The problems are: the lack of explicit policy (although we have stressed *implicit* policy thrusts); and an absence of good data on foreign students in India (without such

data, it is probably not realistic to suggest major policy). At present, data are either not available or are compiled in such a manner that they are not easily susceptible to analysis.

Collection, compilation and analysis of secondary data to locate trends, choices, grades/performance of foreign students at home and abroad and their distribution by countries of origin, by receiving institutions and courses (general or professional) is imperative to identify strengths and weaknesses. Gaps in information ought to be filled through such a database which includes information on sponsored and self-financing students. It will provide answers to several pertinent questions. For example, students from which countries prefer which courses and which universities? Is there any difference between sponsored and self-financing students in terms of performance, motivation, choice of courses and institutions? Why are women not adequately represented (which is indicated by case study data)?

Apart from providing answers, a strong database will highlight areas that need strengthening and show the directions for action in the future.

From the secondary data, it becomes evident that the extent of under-utilisation of CSFP and other scholarships is high. On the other hand, exchange or bilateral schemes looked after by institutions, such as the USEFI, AIIS, and SICI, or those administered by offices set up for the express purpose of promoting student inflow on a limited scale (such as the India Study Centre at New Delhi for BPSF and EAP), seem to be feasible schemes. While they differ in character, what is common to these successful schemes is that institutional support structures have been set up in both countries to look after the overall problems relating to student mobility. In addition, the procedure is streamlined and multiple agencies are not involved. A student/research scholar is generally in contact with two offices, one in the country of origin and the other in India. The student needs for eligibility entry requirements, finalisation of admission, orientation, familiarisation with Indian climate and culture, provision of accommodation or help in renting residence are taken care of by the institutions. Discussions with students who come under EAP and BPSF reveal that they are generally satisfied with the arrangements.

The conclusion is that the success of a scheme does not seem to depend on the choice of courses, or because it involves a developed country, or brings only research scholars, or because it is fully funded by the country of origin, or on availability or non-availability of accommodation. It depends more on the presence of a nodal agency/office

with earmarked functions to look after all the aspects involved in the movement of students from one country to another. These offices/agencies take care, in an efficient and professional manner, of the administrative, socio-cultural, physical and emotional needs of foreign students.

On the broader plane, there is a need to extrapolate this experience and establish similar offices or to identify agencies which can treat the matter of student mobility holistically and humanely. At the least, functionaries should be appointed, within the large impersonal bureaucratic organisations, with the sole function of handling foreign students. We support and are strongly convinced of the potential of Commonwealth collaboration in higher education, and suggest that, rather than institute a new/special fund, student mobility could be substantially enhanced through existing bilateral/multilateral schemes. What is required is to increase their utilisation and realise their full potential.

There are several steps which need to be taken in order to tap, release and harness that potential. They are recommended, in the light of Indian experience, not only to India and her institutions, but also to fellow Commonwealth nations and agencies. The recommendations which emerge are the following:

- creation of the database
- streamlining current procedures, organisational set-up; removal of bureaucratic hurdles and provision of speedy and effective communication through MIS, and an office with designated functions along the lines of existing viable schemes
- selection of certain institutions and involving them directly in the admission processing
- concentration of academic and support structures in selected universities
- award of fellowships to self-financing students at the recommendation of the receiving institutions and on the basis of the academic performance in India

Support structures needed in any host country, in order of priority, are:

- 1 Accommodation, seen as the most urgent need at the national/institutional level and also by individual students. Commonwealth Students' Hostels along the lines of Commonwealth Hall in London are a feasible solution. Provision

of places for Indian students ought to be made so that foreign and Indian students get an opportunity to live together.

- 2 Library, laboratory and other modern facilities (such as word-processor and computer facility, etc).
- 3 Foreign student office with centralised information/function to handle all aspects of admission. (This may need extra funds for full/part time FSA, for supporting staff and for computer, etc, to provide readily available information about foreign students.)
- 4 A Management Information System (MIS) for bridging the communication gap, speeding up admission procedure, linking different agencies, and helping generate a database.
- 5 A centralised/nodal agency to collect/collate information at the national level. The existing procedure is very lengthy and uneven information is provided by the receiving institutions. (Availability of this information, on trends, choice/preferences/bottlenecks would enhance capacity utilisation of existing schemes.)
- 6 Mobilisation of the existing capacities of universities to contribute to the expansion of student mobility through training of staff at selected departments/centres to teach English as a foreign language. Uniform language tests may be introduced at entry points in countries which send large numbers of students to India. Language courses should be introduced at receiving institutions.

The Commonwealth Secretariat can also be a catalyst be setting up structures and institutions outwith but linked to the existing structures. It could establish a Commonwealth Institute of Higher Education or new organisational machinery at New Delhi with branch/zonal offices in different parts of India. These offices should be assigned the task to deal with all aspects of student admissions in an effective, professional and humane way. MIS should be an integral part of this networking of agencies/administrative structures. These may also provide support for institutional build-up to select institutions for enhancing student mobility.

Finally, the vice-chancellors have to meet the challenges posed by expanding enrolments, increasing political pressures. The issue of foreign student admission cannot thus be decided purely on academic and economic considerations. Political considerations cannot be wished away. Yet given the willingness, capacity, and an implicit policy thrust, it is possible to assert that student mobility can be enhanced. The Commonwealth Secretariat may devise a management programme which would respond to these challenges through provision of

resources for support structures and expertise to improve institutional and systems management with specific attention being paid to enhance student mobility.

The Secretariat has a two-fold role: to help in the existing institutional build-up; and to provide support structures to maximise the take-up of current scholarship and sponsored exchange schemes.

[This paper is based on consultations with eleven officials at national level, including officials of the Ministry of External Affairs, the Ministry of Human Resource Development, the Indian Council for Cultural Relations, and Educational Consultants India Ltd (Ed-CIL). Eight senior academics and officials of the University of Delhi were interviewed, and thirteen from Jawaharlal Nehru University (including both Vice-Chancellors) – other discussions were held with selected teachers, Indian and foreign students. The original study included further information on DU and JNU, which as been omitted here for lack of space.]

**TABLE 6.1 Foreign students enrolled at Indian universities, 1989-90, numbers and countries of origin**

**A. COMMONWEALTH**

<i>Country</i>	<i>No. of Students</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>No. of Students</i>
AUSTRALIA	8	MALTA	1
BANGLADESH	362	MAURITIUS	164
BARBADOS	1	NAMBIA	1
BOTSWANA	13	NEW ZEALAND	3
BRUNEI	3	NIGERIA	241
CANADA	23	PAKISTAN	7
CYPRUS	1	SEYCHELLES	8
DOMINICA	1	SINGAPORE	18
FIJI	24	SRI LANKA	551
GAMBIA	2	TANZANIA	95
GHANA	2	TRINIDAD and TOBAGO	88
GUYANA	11	UGANDA	48
HONG KONG	3	UNITED KINGDOM	70
KENYA	2,856	WEST INDIES	16
MALAWI	6	WESTERN SAMOA	2
MALAYSIA	870	ZAMBIA	14
MALDIVES	16	ZIMBABWE	5
		Total Commonwealth	5,534

## B. NON-COMMONWEALTH

Country	No. of Students	Country	No. of Students	Country	No. of Students
AFGHANISTAN	140	IRELAND	4	RWANDA	3
AFRICA (unclassified)	97	ISRAEL	1	SAUDI ARABIA	29
ANGOLA	38	ITALY	3	SOMALIA	158
ARGENTINA	2	JAPAN	35	SOUTH KOREA	16
BAHRAIN	117	JORDAN	1,599	SPAIN	6
BELGIUM	2	KOREA	24	SUDAN	1,633
BHUTAN	128	KAMPUCHEA	5	SWEDEN	4
BRAZIL	1	KUWAIT	148	SWITZERLAND	6
BULGARIA	3	LAOS	6	SYRIA	27
BURMA/ MYANMAR	12	LEBANON	16	THAILAND	158
CAMEROON	2	LIBYA	4	TIBET	78
CHILE	1	LIBERIA	1	TURKEY	3
CHINA	3	MALI	1	UAE	97
COLOMBIA	1	MONGOLIA	3	USA	137
DJIBOUTI	1	MEXICO	2	USSR	21
EGYPT	47	NEPAL	807	VENEZUELA	1
ETHIOPIA	476	NETHERLANDS	3	VIETNAM	73
FRANCE	30	NORWAY	1	YEMEN	107
GERMANY	20	OMAN	6	YUGOSLAVIA	2
GREECE	1	PANAMA	2	Not Classified	75
HUNGARY	6	PALESTINE	232		
INDONESIA	81	PHILIPPINES	11		
IRAN	404	POLAND	6		
IRAQ	47	QATAR	5	Total Non-Commonwealth	7,079

Total all countries (Tables A & B) 12,613

**TABLE 6.2 List of Indian universities with more than 100 foreign students, 1989-90**

<i>University</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>No. of Foreign Students</i>
PUNE UNIVERSITY	Pune, Maharashtra	2,165
MANGALORE UNIVERSITY	Mangalore, Karnataka	918
DELHI UNIVERSITY	Delhi	797
MARATHWADA UNIVERSITY	Aurangabad, Maharashtra	701
PUNJAB UNIVERSITY	Chandigarh, Punjab	629
NAGPUR UNIVERSITY	Nagpur, Maharashtra	528
MADRAS UNIVERSITY	Madras, Tamil Nadu	435
M.S. UNIVERSITY OF BARODA	Baroda, Gujerat	397
RANI DUGAVATHI UNIVERSITY	Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh	340
BARKATULLAH UNIVERSITY	Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh	303
MYSORE UNIVERSITY	Mysore, Karnataka	256
BOMBAY UNIVERSITY	Bombay, Maharashtra	250
SUKHODIA UNIVERSITY	Udaipur, Rajasthan	214
SHIVAJI UNIVERSITY	Kolhapur, Maharashtra	213
ROORKEE UNIVERSITY	Roorkee, Uttar Pradesh	200
Dr M.G.R MEDICAL UNIVERSITY	Madras, Tamil Nadu	170
KARNATAKA UNIVERSITY	Dhorwad, Karnataka	168
AGRA UNIVERSITY	Agra, Uttar Pradesh	163
BANARAS UNIVERSITY	Vanarasi, Uttar Pradesh	163
JAMIA MILLIA ISLAMI	Delhi	157
BANGALORE UNIVERSITY	Bangalore, Karnataka	157
MADHURAI KAMARAJ UNIVERSITY	Madhurai, Tamil Nadu	144
DEVI AHOLY UNIVERSITY	Indore, Madhya Pradesh	128
RAJASTHAN UNIVERSITY	Jaipur, Rajasthan	127
L.N. MITHILA UNIVERSITY	Darbhanga, Bihar	122
ALIGARH UNIVERSITY	Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh	102

*Note: Indian Institutes of Technology foreign student intake was: Delhi 83, Bombay 62, Kharagpur 62, Kanpur 28, Madras 27, Total 262*

**TABLE 6.3 Annual enrolment of foreign students, Delhi University, 1961-62 to 1991-92**

<i>Year</i>	<i>No. of Students</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>No. of Students</i>
1961-62	337	1977-78	1,279
1962-63	383	1978-79	1,503
1963-64	407	1979-80	1,371
1964-65	360	1980-81	1,088
1965-66	396	1981-82	807
1966-67	424	1982-83	793
1967-68	452	1983-84	836
1968-69	478	1984-85	804
1969-70	549	1985-86	793
1970-71	653	1986-87	812
1971-72	647	1987-88	628
1972-73	724	1988-89	684
1973-74	784	1989-90	797
1974-75	830	1990-91	Not available
1975-76	809	1991-92	900

**TABLE 6.4 Countries of origin of foreign students enrolled at Delhi University 1991-92 (Commonwealth Countries listed first)**

<i>Country</i>	<i>No. of students</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>No. of Students</i>
BANGLADESH	60	ETHIOPIA	58
CANADA	11	GERMANY	2
FIJI	2	INDONESIA	5
GHANA	1	IRAN	18
KENYA	57	IRAQ	4
MALAYSIA	3	ITALY	2
MAURITIUS	101	JAPAN	10
NIGERIA	13	KOREA	30
PAKISTAN	2	NEPAL	131
SEYCHELLES	2	QATAR	1
SRI LANKA	28	ROMANIA	1
TANZANIA	3	SOMALIA	20
TRINIDAD	2	SUDAN	46
UGANDA	24	SWEDEN	1
UNITED KINGDOM	10	TAIWAN	1
ZIMBABWE	2	THAILAND	40
Total Commonwealth	321	TIBET	85
AFGHANISTAN	20	TURKEY	1
BHUTAN	15	USA	9
BRAZIL	1	USSR	5
BULGARIA	3	VIETNAM	3
BURMA/MYANMAR	7	YEMEN	8
CHINA	4	YUGOSLAVIA	4
COLOMBIA	1	Total Non-Commonwealth	536

All foreign students classified 857

Others whose countries were not reported 43

Total foreign students at the University 900

*Notes:* Approximately 30 per cent of all foreign students are female  
 Approximately 10 per cent of all foreign students are Government scholars

# 7

## *Policy, Expectations and Shortfalls* *Nigerian Views and Experiences*

---

A Jones Akinpelu

### *Preliminary*

The focus of this chapter is on explicit government policy and its context. The perspective from the English-speaking Caribbean was one with a stress on the international nature of universities and on the issues associated with reifying international aspirations. The perspective from India is that of a large and complex national system already in some international demand, where underlying policy thrusts can be seen but where there is no overt expressed national policy. Nigeria, which has also a developed higher education system (though on a smaller scale), does have an expressed government policy. This chapter gives a brief account of its impact, possible tensions between such a policy and concepts of institutional autonomy, and the gap between expectation and practice.

It is an extract only from a longer paper which included a detailed survey of foreign student flows into Nigeria.

### *The international inheritance*

As with the Caribbean and India, university education in Nigeria started on an international note, in accordance with the perceived traditional universal nature of universities. The first university institution, which was the University College, Ibadan, was in special relationship with the University of London, and this opened its doors to a variety of scholars from different parts of the world. This would seem to have set a pattern for the ready acceptance of the concept of internationalisation of the university campus in Nigeria.

Since those modest beginnings, there has been considerable expansion in the number of universities in the country, from one in 1948, to two in 1960, five in 1962 and 31 in 1991. This chapter deals mainly with the student aspect of the internationalisation of the Nigerian university campuses, with a view to finding out the degree of the internationalisation, what are the facilitative or constraining factors, and what could be further done to promote greater and smoother foreign student flow between the developing countries of the Commonwealth, as well as between the developed and the developing countries of the Commonwealth.

In order to study the policies of government concerning foreign students and academic exchange, information was sought from a number of agencies (see *Note* at the end of the chapter). In order to study policy implementation, a sample of nine out of the 31 universities was used. Six were selected from the oldest or first-generation universities, since they have had a longer period in which to build up international links, and three others were surveyed, on account of their proximity to neighbouring countries, which exposes them to student flows from across the borders; the latter are listed as Border Universities (see *Note*).

### ***Government and institutional policies***

The national and institutional policies on foreign students are positive, friendly and reciprocal. The government of the Federation welcomes students from all parts of the globe and in fact has a set admission quota reserved for foreign students. This has been increased from two per cent to five per cent of the annual enrolment of each university. The universities are supportive of the government policies on foreign students, in that they accept applications from any part of the world. The actual determination of whom to admit, however, rests squarely with each university, where students' admission is generally based on academic entry requirements, availability of courses applied for, the admission quota for each course, as well as the adequacy or otherwise of the human and material resources for each course. In consideration of all these, a university may or may not be able to admit foreign students up to five per cent of its annual student enrolment. On the other hand, it should be noted that, occasionally, the Federal Government may use the national selection machinery set up through the National Universities Commission (NUC) and the Joint Admissions and Matriculation Board (JAMB) to place one or two students in a

university. In such cases the university has no choice but to admit a student once he/she is qualified. This happens especially with refugee students who are received as part of an agreement with a UN or other refugee agency.

The principal actors in any change in policy or negotiation for exchange schemes are the Vice-Chancellors and the Federal Ministry officials on behalf of their Ministers. In the case of bilateral agreements which involve educational, scientific, economic, cultural and technical exchanges, officials of the relevant Ministries like Education, Science and Technology, Information, Finance and Economic Development, Foreign Affairs and the Presidency play active roles in any policy change or negotiation.

The Nigerian 'climate' is generally protective of foreign students and the Federal Government is interested in encouraging the flow of foreign students into the country. Its interest stems from a dynamic foreign policy which sees Nigeria as a leading Commonwealth nation and more particularly as a leading nation on the African continent and in ECOWAS (the Economic Community of West African States), with educational resources to be offered as part of bilateral agreements. Currently, the country has bilateral agreements in education with about 30 countries, of which the majority are African. It has also played a significant part in the education of refugees from elsewhere in Africa and has over the years taken in substantial numbers of refugees from the former Rhodesia and from South Africa and Namibia. A recent agreement was with the South African Relief Fund (SARF), which recruits and arranges admission for about 30 young men and women annually from South Africa and Namibia.

This is the policy nationally. It is generally believed that the political, social and cultural situation within Nigeria is favourable to foreign students, especially to the African students who are in the majority. African students integrate easily and move freely about since it is not easy to distinguish them from Nigerians.

Institutional policies in all the universities surveyed were reported to be favourable to foreign students. Nigerian universities offer some guidance and counselling through university registries, although only two of the nine institutions studied have a designated foreign students' office. In general, they offer foreign students:

- reserved admission space
- reserved accommodation
- fee rescheduling

Some assist with visa processing and some offer special English language programmes.

The factors favouring and hindering foreign student flows will be discussed later. Here we will discuss the application and implementation of the national and institutional policy.

### *Foreign enrolments: Statistics*

Enrolments have fluctuated considerably over the last few years and it seems unlikely that they have ever approached the Federal Government's five per cent target, which in 1988–89 would have been 8,600, given the total enrolment at all Nigerian universities of 172,464 students. The rather small numbers may be deduced from Table 7.1.

The figures are only complete for 1989–90. Data for all years are available for only four of the institutions (UNN, UNL, UDU, and ABU), which receive the largest cohorts of foreign students, accounting for 656 or 97 per cent of the total of 678 recorded for 1989–90. Only one of the Border Universities, the University of Calabar, received more than 50 foreign students that year.

There is cause for belief that there is now an upward trend, although numbers of foreigners are nowhere near the maximum for the estimated capacity available to them. Meanwhile, it is discouraging to note also that similar results are obtained in respect of Commonwealth awards tenable in Nigerian Universities, as the figures in Table 7.2 show.

The most successful of the schemes through which foreign students flow into the country appears to be that organised through the South African Relief Fund. Although small-scale, it provides a model for success. It works well because it has a clear mandate to train a specific number of South African and Namibian students each year. It has strong political support in the Presidency, to which it is attached. It has adequate funds and a strong secretariat. SARF handles all placements, and also all arrangements for accommodation and food. Other bilateral award schemes do seem to work, but affect quite small numbers also. It was observed that 70 per cent of foreign students currently in Nigeria are privately sponsored.

Very few of the foreign students in the country are from the industrialised and post-industrial countries. Those received came usually from the United Kingdom and the United States of America, and make up only about one per cent of the foreign students in Nigeria. By contrast, between 60 to 70 per cent of the foreign students in Nigeria are

Cameroonians. Others came in trickles from the following countries: Botswana, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Ghana, India, Kenya, Lebanon, Niger, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Tanzania and Uganda. Most come for undergraduate programmes and enter courses in Medicine, Science and Technologies.

### ***Factors affecting foreign student flows***

Students from other African countries find it easy to adjust to Nigerian life. It was noted at the University of Calabar that:

... most of the foreign students come from Cameroon, from where they just walk across the border to the University. Many of them do not bother to observe any immigration formalities, since they bear names similar to Nigerian names and are black like Nigerians. Some just make use of plain travel permits obtained from the Nigerian embassy.

The reluctance of students from the North may be due to extreme poverty of information on academic standards in Nigerian universities, but it is believed that students from other developing countries find it easier to adjust to the socio-cultural conditions of the country than those from the industrial and post-industrial parts of the world.

One deterrent to all students from abroad is economic and is attributed to the effects of the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAP) of the Federal Government. The prices of goods and services are very high and it has become increasingly difficult for foreign students to manage on their awards or private money. Neither the Federal Government nor universities have organised subsidies or top-up support schemes and fee-waivers are only offered to students on exchange programmes.

At the same time, although Nigerian universities have the theoretical capacity to take in larger numbers of foreign students (10,000 would make up the five per cent Government quota), they all require strengthening of their academic and support structures. There is an acute shortage of academic staff in all disciplines. The quality of existing academic staff is believed to need improvement, especially because research habits are dying out (owing to lack of research grants and unsatisfactory libraries) and many have no formal training in university teaching skills. Economic difficulties have also led to a decline in library, laboratory and recreational facilities, supply of instructional materials and teaching space.

Other problems faced by all students, but which bear particularly hard on non-Nigerians, are overcrowding in student hostels and the occasional sudden closure of universities as a result of student unrest.

## *Recommendations*

The political will seems to be favourable to the reception of foreign students. To make it easier for Nigeria to look after them and enable them to make the most of their stay, several strategies are recommended.

One important recommendation is the establishment of Commonwealth or International Houses in four zones in the country to serve as acculturation centres and 'rooming' houses, and as the first port of call for Commonwealth and other foreign students in Nigeria. They could also serve as vacation centres and as 'refugee camps' for foreign students at any time Nigerian universities are summarily closed down. The former regional offices of the British Council could host these centres, for the purpose of easy administration and contact with universities and other agencies.

The Federal Government will need to give thought to the establishment of a fees equalisation and subsidisation fund to cushion fee fluctuations arising from foreign exchange policies of the host countries. Any students wishing to study in another Commonwealth country would then be required to pay only the amount he or she would have needed to pay in his own country (or whichever fee is lower) while the rest comes out of the fund. Perhaps ultimately a Commonwealth fund would become feasible. Fees should remain in local currency for students from African or developing Commonwealth countries but in international currency for students from developed Commonwealth countries, who could be given the opportunity to pay in instalments.

There is also need for wider information dissemination among Commonwealth countries on higher educational opportunities available in different member countries and the prospects of foreign students making use of such opportunities.

## *Conclusion*

Our study clearly indicated that while Nigeria has taken a policy lead in declaring its readiness to accept a five per cent quota of foreign students in its annual higher education intake, the reality is far below expectation. Some strategies for improvement are the responsibility of the Federal Government and others of the universities themselves, but the whole issue is seen in a Commonwealth-wide framework.

Each Commonwealth country could follow Nigeria's lead and earmark a quota of five per cent of its total annual higher education

enrolment for foreign students, 40 per cent of which should come from other Commonwealth countries. The Commonwealth's goal should be an exchange rate of 40:60 between foreign students from the developed and developing countries of the Commonwealth. In addition, member governments should be encouraged to establish both subsidy funds and bursary funds. A bursary fund could be open to competition among self-funding Commonwealth students, based on their first-year performance.

Discussion is needed on these matters among Commonwealth members at large, perhaps facilitated through the Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility and Higher Education Cooperation and the ACU. Deliberate efforts will have to be made to enhance the capacity of the universities in the developing countries. These could include more mutual fee-waiver and subsidy schemes, the encouragement of a greater flow of students from industrialised to developing countries, strengthening of academic programmes in the latter and more flexible scholarship awards.

Universities are traditionally part of an international world of scholarship. Internationalism is not a reality when student exchange is not fully welcomed and supported.

*Note* Information was obtained by questionnaire and interview in all cases. The government, foreign and international agencies consulted were:

- Federal Ministry of External Affairs
- Federal Ministry of Education:
  - Scholarship Division
  - Bilateral Agreement, Commonwealth and African Affairs (BACAA)
- Federal Ministry of Finance and Economic Development
- The Presidency:
  - South African Relief Fund (SARF)
- National Commission for Unesco
- United States Information Service (USIS)

The universities involved in the study were:

1st generation University of Ibadan, Ibadan (UI)	Founded 1948
University of Nigeria, Nsukka (UNN)	1960
Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife (OAU)	1962
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria (ABU)	1962
University of Lagos, Lagos (UNL)	1962
University of Benin, Benin City (UNB)	1970

Border Univs: University of Calabar, Calabar (UNC), South Eastern, University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri (UNM), North Eastern, Uthman Dan Fodio University (UDU) North Western

**TABLE 7.1** Estimates of foreign student enrolment in nine Nigerian universities, 1985–86 to 1989–90

<i>Year</i>	<i>UI</i>	<i>UNB</i>	<i>UNN</i>	<i>UNC</i>	<i>OAU</i>	<i>UNL</i>	<i>UNM</i>	<i>UDU</i>	<i>ABU</i>	<i>Total Reported</i>
1985/ 1986	NA	NA	2	NA	NA	200	NA	28	87	317
1986/ 1987	192	NA	10	NA	14	250	46	20	141	673
1987/ 1988	174	NA	11	7	8	230	29	18	255	732
1988/ 1989	145	NA	40	13	22	240	29	46	216	751
1989/ 1990	141	65	50	53	22	250	29	3	265	678

**TABLE 7.2** Foreign applicants for Commonwealth awards tenable in Nigeria, 1988 to 1991

	<i>1988</i>	<i>1989</i>	<i>1990</i>	<i>1991</i>
Number of applicants	14	14	15	11
Number given award	8	10	8	10
Number utilised	4	7	3	4

**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 takeup 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

# 9

## *Internationalising Canadian Universities*

### *Student Mobility to Developing Countries*

---

#### Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada

#### *Context*

The concept of internationalising Canadian universities is currently an issue of considerable interest. The Smith Commission, an independent commission established by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, recommended that internationalisation be integrated into the mission statement of every university (Smith *et al*, 1991). This would require both adapting the curriculum in Canada and encouraging Canadians to pursue studies abroad.

The AUCC is fully aware both of European schemes to promote greater student mobility and of recent Commonwealth calls for more two-way mobility between post-industrial and developing countries (Commonwealth Secretariat, 1989 and 1991).

At the end of October 1991, the International Division of AUCC committed themselves to undertake a preliminary study on the flow of Canadian students to Commonwealth developing countries, for the Commonwealth Secretariat. To date, very little research had been done in this area, and little was known about the out-flow of Canadian students to educational institutions abroad.

This pilot study was based upon questionnaires and interviews. It has attempted to reflect some perceptions of administrative staff at Canadian universities and awards organisations, as well as a number of Canadian students who could be contacted. It provides an overview of the situation and highlights some general trends.

Findings must be qualified by its limited data base. In 1987, only 439 Canadians were studying at the post-secondary level in developing

countries in Africa, Asia and Oceania. The enquiry remains of interest, however, because of the qualitative content of responses. Canadian universities do indicate an interest in strengthening their links with universities in the developing countries of the Commonwealth, while Canadian students voice the desire to learn more about the socio-cultural and economic environments of these countries.

### ***AUCC and the internationalisation of Canadian universities***

Two specific issues which the Smith Commission Report highlights are the importance of stays abroad as part of co-operative educational programmes, and the internationalisation of research. The promotion of regional studies, history, culture and language are equally necessary.

According to William Saywell, President and Vice-Chancellor of Simon Fraser University in British Columbia, internationalisation implies not only the presence of foreign students on campus, but also exchange arrangements and programmes in foreign countries for students and faculty – and the administrative structures to support such programmes (Saywell 1991).

The Commission recommended that federal government agencies be asked to fund the increasing number of opportunities for studies abroad and educational exchanges. In Canada, both provincial and federal governments play a role in funding universities. (Although autonomous, almost all Canadian universities receive the vast majority of their funds from public sources.) While there is no Department of Education at the federal level, each province has a Ministry of Education responsible for the organisation and administration of public education.

In 1991, the AUCC carried out a survey of its 89 member universities on the topic of 'Globalisation: Challenges and Opportunities for Canadian Universities'. Some of the findings were as follows:

- 44 of 71 universities declared that their international role was mentioned in their mission statement (64 per cent include in this role the international experience to be provided to Canadian and foreign students)
- 25 of 71 universities require knowledge of a second language
- 48 of 71 universities offer students an opportunity to live for some time or even up to a year in another country

- 31 of 68 universities allow students to integrate their international experience into their programme of studies
- 51 of 66 universities stated that they were actively engaged in human resources development in developing countries through a teaching programme

### *A general statistical picture*

Canada ranks fifth among host countries in the world in the number of international students received, and students from abroad make up close to 20 per cent of its student population. In 1987–88, this country's international students came mainly from Hong Kong, the United States, the Philippines, China, Malaysia, the United Kingdom and Singapore.

Since there is no requirement of a legal clearance to leave Canada, there is no direct source of information on the number of Canadian students going abroad. The Unesco *Statistical Yearbook* is limited (as Callan and Steele have explained in Chapter 8). The only way to remedy this lack of information would be to carry out surveys in host countries, and even this route might not produce complete information.

According to Céline Fortier (1990), the Canadian student body at the post-secondary level in Canada increased from 606,907 in 1980 to 770,100 in 1987. In 1987, 53.5 per cent of these students were at the undergraduate level and only 6.2 per cent at the graduate level. The number of Canadians studying abroad increased from 17,929 in 1980 to 19,975 in 1987. Of the latter figure, seven Canadians studied in Africa, 277 in Asia, 155 in Oceania, 3,845 in Europe and 15,691 in the United States. The breakdown by level of study was 55.9 per cent at the undergraduate level and 39 per cent at the graduate level. As shall be seen later, this last figure does not correspond to the level of study of participants in this survey, no doubt because funds available for study in Commonwealth developing countries focus on graduate studies.

### *Conduct of the survey*

The methodology used in this research was similar to that used by Callan and Steele. Due to the paucity of background information and the limited time available it was decided to use questionnaires and interviews as a means of collecting data. These have the advantage of collecting responses on focused items of interest, and allowing for comparative studies with other countries, the International Division of AUCC maintained close liaison with the UK Council for Overseas

Student Affairs in the preparation of these questionnaires. By soliciting responses from both students and universities, it was hoped that both individual and institutional perspectives might be better reflected.

Two questionnaires were prepared, targeting Canadian institutions and Canadian students who had studied in 51 Commonwealth developing countries. Questions fell into two categories: closed questions which required a 'yes', 'no', or optional answer; and open questions which solicited feedback and recommendations. (Information acquired through the latter category of questions has been reflected in the survey results in the following pages.)

*The institutional questionnaire* was prepared in English and French, to respond to the needs of all Canadian universities who are members of the AUCC. It sought both quantitative and subjective information related to:

- types of exchange programmes in which the university is engaged
- sources of financial support
- Canadian scholarship administrative structures
- numbers of Canadian students abroad in each of the Commonwealth developing countries, since 1980
- assessment of the availability in Canada of information on Commonwealth developing country universities
- opinions on the obstacles of Canadian student mobility to Commonwealth developing countries
- the impetus for an exchange programme with a university in a Commonwealth developing country

The institutional questionnaire was sent to the 58 International Liaison Officers (ILOs) who are charged by their university to coordinate international issues in their institution, and to three organisations that administer awards for overseas study: the Canadian Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan Committee of the AUCC; the International Development Research Centre (IDRC); and the Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE). Of the universities, 22 responded (34 per cent); no francophone university was among the respondents. All three organisations solicited provided replies.

*The student questionnaire*, prepared in English only, sought information on:

- personal motive for choosing to study or undertake research in a Commonwealth developing country

- academic level obtained prior to going abroad
- field of study abroad
- financial support
- type and duration of stay abroad
- assessment of access to information on host country and university administrative and academic structures
- assessment of Canadian mechanisms which promote student mobility to Commonwealth developing countries
- suggestions for areas of improvement within the host country (both academic and non-academic)

The questionnaire was sent to the 20 Canadian scholars who had studied in Commonwealth developing countries between 1980-90, and could be traced through the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan. It was also sent to 40 Canadian embassies in the countries involved, with the request that they forward it to any Canadian student whom they could contact. At the AUCC's request, CBIE and IDRC sent the questionnaire to their 49 awardees, and IDRC posted a notice in its international newsletter. International Liaison Officers were asked to forward the questionnaire to relevant students in their institutions. Of the 69 students contacted, 21 (30 per cent) responded, including three participants who had studied in the 1970s and 18 in the 1980s. Ten host countries were involved: Ghana, Hong Kong, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Sri Lanka and Zimbabwe.

With limited time available, *interviews* took place with programme administrators of the AUCC, IDRC, CBIE, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), as well as with one Canadian student who has been to Ghana in the 1970s. Feedback from these interviews is reflected in the analysis on the following pages, which represent the distillation of a substantial piece of research.

### ***Canadian universities: Programmes and viewpoints***

*Exchange Programmes* The majority of responding universities do not have an *exchange programme* whereby Canadian students can study or conduct research in a developing country of the Commonwealth. This may reflect a perceived lack of interest on the part of the students who seem to prefer to study in the United States, Europe, or Latin America, or who opt for studies in science/technology and feel that the

developing countries cannot offer strong programmes in these areas. A lack of interest on the part of the potential host institutions/countries was also cited. Insufficient financial resources is considered a major obstacle to the establishment of an exchange programme.

Only four of the 58 universities approached offer a Canada-Commonwealth developing country exchange programme. All four programmes are founded on contacts established by individual professors or the university's historical emphasis on such a link. Respondents underlined the availability of external funding as a major contributor to the success of their programmes. In all cases, the Canadian institution recognises the exchange as forming part of the student's degree programme, and for two universities, the exchange is a requirement. Among the four universities which have an exchange programme in place, all fields of study are covered, although agriculture, the arts and administration are highlighted, while languages and medicine are in some cases restricted. Exchange programmes apply to all levels of study except Diploma/ Certificate, although the emphasis is on graduate studies, possibly due to the availability of funding at that level.

Among the remaining respondents, one university is in the process of developing programmes which include exchanges with developing countries, and another has indicated an interest to set up a programme with Commonwealth developing countries in the future.

*Financial support* Although potential sources of external funding exist, few universities offer financial support for study in Commonwealth developing countries. Only two of the four universities which offer an exchange programme provide financial support. Of these two, only one institution considers this financial support adequate. While this is a very small sample, it is indicative of the low level of internally available resources that such programmes have to offer.

Many university respondents, however, suggested external sources of support, including: the Association of Commonwealth Universities, CIDA, CSFP, the Commonwealth Foundation, External Affairs and International Trade Canada, IDRC, and some university scholarships and programmes. Thus, there was an awareness of possible funding for students who are prepared to apply to external sources. Programme staff can also facilitate the process by having application forms available in their offices, and by keeping abreast of each funder's selection criteria, as well as new sources of money.

*Administrative structures for award schemes* The administrative structure of the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan is satisfactory, according to respondents. The application guidelines, the selection

process and the follow-up procedures all live up to the expectations of Canadian universities.

Respondents were also satisfied with the operation of other scholarship/fellowship programmes in which their universities participated. These included: IDRC Young Canadian Researcher Awards, CIDA Awards for Canadians (administered by CBIE), CIDA programmes for Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Malawi Scholarship Fund, CIDA's Africa 2000 Programme, Jamaica Training Plan, Canada-Caricom Scholarship Programme, Kenya General Training Fund, Pan-American Health Organisation, Health Manpower Training Programme, and the British Columbia Scholars and Students Programmes (currently being established).

It is, however, important to note that, with exception of the first two awards listed above, all of these programmes bring students to Canada.

*Commonwealth developing country universities* Most universities do not have the resources to track the number of their students who have studied in developing countries of the Commonwealth since 1980. Only two universities were able to provide figures of, respectively, 22 students and 37 students for the period in question.

The mechanisms used by Commonwealth developing countries to inform Canadian students and attract them to their universities could be greatly improved. Ten respondents rated the effectiveness of Commonwealth developing country information on their educational institutions as not satisfactory; only one rated it as adequate.

Respondents did demonstrate an awareness of foreign university programmes by suggesting a range of other sources of information: *Commonwealth Universities Yearbook*, *Awards to Commonwealth Universities*, non-governmental organisations such as CUSO and WUSC, development centres, embassies, professors and other academic staff, and university resource centres.

*Recommendations* Comments on the opportunities and obstacles faced by a Canadian student considering study in a Commonwealth developing country were heavily weighted on the negative end of the scale, and recommendations put forth were major and involved considerable cost. The 16 respondents to this question underlined the lack of financial support available, the shortage of information on the programmes (and in particular, the equivalences for diplomas obtained), and the absence of dialogue and communication. In addition to a general lack of awareness of the developing countries in question, specific concerns (such as the absence of any welcoming structure or medical insurance) were put forth.

The recommendations provided by respondents to find ways to effectively overcome these obstacles included:

- exploring the European programmes mentioned earlier for elements that might apply to the Commonwealth developing countries
- developing graduate field research programmes in Commonwealth developing countries in order to enable Canadian students to engage in field research
- encouraging the Commonwealth Secretariat to establish a 2:1 matching fund for each student wishing to study in the Commonwealth developing countries

### *For overseas study: An organisational conspectus*

Of the three awards organisations consulted, two are linked with Canadian resources, and one is linked directly with awarding agencies in Commonwealth developing countries. Of particular note are the numbers of applicants compared to the number of awards granted for the three organisations. Over a nine year period, 291 Canadian applications were received for the CSFP awards – 20 Canadians were recipients; 48 applied for CIDA Awards for Canadians between 1989 and 1992 – 26 awards were granted; while 80 to 100 candidates applied each year for IDRC awards in all developing countries between 1982 and 1991 – 64 awards were given for study in Commonwealth developing countries.

- (a) *Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan* The plan has been described by Callan and Steele in Chapter 8. It is the responsibility of the Canadian Secretariat to publicise these awards in Canadian universities. The Awards Division of AUCC has administered this programme on behalf of External Affairs and International Trade Canada since its inception. Under it, the Canadian Committee may nominate Canadians for Commonwealth scholarships offered by: Ghana, Hong Kong, India, Jamaica, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, and Trinidad and Tobago. Between 1981 and 1989, India had four awards each year for Canada, while the others offered between one and ten awards for all Commonwealth countries. In some cases, the awards are offered for research only towards a Canadian degree, the others are for postgraduate study towards a Master's or Ph.D. degree, with a minimum tenure of one year.

The only country with restrictions as to field of study is Trinidad and Tobago, where the award may only apply to Agriculture, Economics and Engineering.

The minimum value of awards includes the student's travel to and from the awarding country, a monthly living allowance and payment of all compulsory tuition fees. As this support is deemed inadequate in some countries which offer awards, the Government of Canada pays a supplementary living allowance of \$250 per month to award recipients.

Between 1981 and 1990, a total of 291 Canadian candidates applied for awards tenable in developing countries of the Commonwealth through the CSFP, 20 Canadians received awards, for study in the following countries: Ghana, Nigeria, Hong Kong, India, Sri Lanka and Malaysia (which no longer offers an award).

- (b) *CIDA Awards for Canadians* The Canadian Bureau for International Education has administered this programme on behalf of CIDA since 1989. Incorporated in 1966, the CBIE is a national, non-profit organisation comprising educational institutions and individuals working together to promote international education, international development and intercultural understanding. Its focus is on international students, both the non-Canadians studying in Canada and the Canadians studying abroad.

Up to 50 awards can be given each year for studying in over 100 developing countries. The programme covers the fields involved in this survey, with restrictions in Medicine and the exclusion of Technology and students may participate at the postgraduate level. The value of each award is \$25,000 per year, and covers all related expenses in most cases.

From 1989 to 1992, 26 awardees travelled to Commonwealth developing countries, while a total of 48 Canadians had applied.

- (c) *DRC Young Canadian Researcher awards* The International Development Research Centre was established in 1970 as an autonomous public corporation, with the mandate to stimulate and support research responding to the priorities of developing countries. The award programme was created in 1982 as a means of encouraging Canadian graduate students (primarily Ph.D. candidates) to become involved in international development research, and strengthening links between Canadian universities and developing country research institutions. The programme

covers only the overseas field research, and is available to graduate students who intend to conduct their thesis field research in a developing country on a topic of relevance to IDRC. Eligible fields of study include:

- At the Ph.D. level: Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Sciences, Communications/Media, Earth and Engineering Sciences, Health Sciences, Information Sciences, Social Sciences
- At the Master's level: Communications/Media, Health Sciences, Information Sciences, Environmental Policy

Award tenure corresponds to the period of field research in the developing country; in general, a minimum of three months and a maximum of 12 months, which may be extended to a maximum of 24 months for Ph.D. students whose field research requires more than 12 months. Awards cover a maximum of \$20,000, or \$40,000 for those Ph.D. students whose research requires more than 12 months. This is considered adequate in most cases.

Between 1982 and 1991, 64 awardees travelled to Commonwealth developing countries, while some 80–100 candidates apply for IDRC awards each year for all developing countries. One of the selection criteria for these awards is the relevance of the candidate's research to IDRC's priorities. Given that IDRC supports research in developing countries, applications involving research in the newly industrialising countries such as Hong Kong and Singapore would not be considered a high priority.

The awards organisations expressed views on:

(a) *Administration:*

- too much time is needed to obtain a research permit in certain countries

(b) *Communications:*

- not enough information is provided in Canadian universities
- little awareness on the part of Canadian students of overseas programmes and their funding was inevitably a concern, since there seemed to be a lack of resources in Canada and overseas stays were often inordinately costly. The Canadian CSFP administrator, as an intermediary between awarding agencies in Commonwealth developing countries and Canadian students voiced the following concerns:

- the amount of funding is insufficient for the purpose

- there is very little communication for the awarding agency following the announcement of the award

The three agencies also passed on complaints that they have received from their awardees (most of which will also be found in the following section on the student questionnaires), such as the difficult living conditions, the inefficiencies of the awarding agencies and the university authorities, and the insufficiency of funds.

## *The student viewpoint*

*Personal motivation* The reasons provided for the decision to study in a Commonwealth developing country were extremely individual, and seem more related to the personality of the participant rather than to the efforts of any one institution (Canadian or overseas) to attract students.

Reasons provided included: encouragement of professors and friends; previous work with a non-governmental organisation; personal contacts in a developing country; personal interests in a developing country issue, for example, Eastern religion and Sanskrit religious literature in India, the effect of Chinese political and economic changes on Hong Kong, the political and ideological history of the liberation war in Zimbabwe. Nevertheless, information received on available bursaries seems to have sparked the initial interests in overseas study.

Study abroad seems more attractive to students at the graduate level, perhaps because the available awards favour Master's and Ph.D. studies. Of the respondents (all of whom had a Bachelor's degree), almost half had a Master's degree. During their stay overseas, six were Ph.D. candidates and seven followed a Master's programme (although only three completed it). While all the fields of study except Engineering drew candidates, Humanities seems to be the most popular field.

*Financial support* Without external financial assistance, very few Canadian students would be able to pursue studies overseas. The funds provided were considered adequate by respondents. Most were the beneficiaries of awards from one or another of the three awards organisations highlighted in this study (CSFP, CIDA and IDRC).

However, a few other sources were cited: the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, the Indo-Canadian Shastri Institute, McMaster University, the Quebec Government, the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship and Canadian Crossroads International. The fact that only

one of these appeared in the list of potential sources put forth in the institutional questionnaires indicates that ILOs are not as well informed as they might be in this area, and that perhaps an annual compilation of a complete list of sources might form part of future plans increasing overseas study opportunities. Sponsorship funds and fee subsidies do not figure very highly on the list of sources of financial support. Here again is an opportunity for exploring whether this is due to unavailability or simply lack of awareness.

*The stay abroad* Perhaps the most revealing and encouraging piece of data is that most students (15 of the 21 respondents) accomplished their academic goals. Although the sample was so small, this does suggest that, despite all of the obstacles listed by students and institutions, students do by and large achieve what they set out to do during their stay abroad.

Most students travelled to a Commonwealth developing country in order to conduct research as an integral part of their home institution's programme. While study was often a component of their stay, it was rarely their primary purpose.

A fair number of participants were working towards a degree at the host institution, indicating that the fear that a foreign degree would not be recognised in Canada is not as widespread as might originally have been thought. Work tours, study tours and cultural exchanges are not frequent, undoubtedly due to the lack of available funds and the possibility of participating in such programmes through other channels. For most students, their time spent abroad ranged from one to two years and was considered sufficient.

*Assessment of administrative and academic structures* Information on the receiving country and university is not readily available in Canada. That access to such basic information is difficult to obtain no doubt discourages many potential candidates early in the application process. There is a great variation in the students' evaluations of the host institutions, but for the most part, the assessments were on the low end of the scale (average to below average). That the universities received such low ratings calls for further investigation and analysis.

*Students' comments* Overall, the students were impressed with the awards administrators and/or organisations and pleased with their overseas experience.

Their recommendations are, for the most part, quite realistic, and focus on the availability of information and advice, as well as the application process itself. It seems that the provision of some documentation would go a long way towards solving many of the students' concerns,

without involving tremendous costs. The suggestions can be divided into two categories:

(a) While in Canada:

- more information on the host country and institution, available bursaries, and programmes
- greater awareness of Canadian equivalences for overseas study
- streamlining the bureaucratic mechanisms of the application processes
- improving links between the Canadian awards organisations and the host institutions
- more time between the announcement of the award/acceptance into host country programme and departure date/beginning of classes
- learning a foreign language

(b) While in the host country:

- staying in better contact with the Canadian High Commission
- being welcomed upon arrival in the host country, and receiving information on registration at the host university
- better accommodation
- reducing government controls in the host country

A sentiment of insecurity was voiced by many of the respondents, often linked to difficult living conditions. Women respondents, in particular, mentioned cultural differences and fear of travelling alone. These issues cannot be permanently solved by one organisation; only increased internationalisation (such as through these programmes) will help minimise them. There are, however, a few measures that might be taken to ease students' living conditions and increase security for women.

## *Conclusion*

This pilot study undertook to survey the perceptions of Canadian university administrators of programmes which support study in a Commonwealth developing country, as well as the experiences of Canadian students in those countries. While the response rate cannot be considered scientific, the answers and comments are probably representative of the situation. When these answers and comments from all types of respondent universities, awards organisations and students – several common themes emerge: communications, funding and administration.

### *Communications*

- lack of information of host countries and universities, on programmes and bursaries, on equivalences of degrees, and on programmes of study overseas
- communication problems with host countries
- a need for increased communication with the authorities (Canadian High Commission, award organisation, host institution)
- insufficient understanding, on the part of the host country, of Canadian students' needs

### *Funding*

- lack of resources in Canada
- high cost of stays abroad
- insufficient amount of funding provided by Commonwealth developing country awards

### *Administration*

- insufficient time between announcement of award and departure of student (often only two weeks)
- too much time required to obtain field research permit in host country
- lengthy and heavy administrative process in Canada and in host country
- inadequate accommodation in host countries, and questionable medical facilities
- lack of follow-up by awarding agencies and host universities

Each host country, of course, has its strengths and weaknesses, and therefore the above comments cannot be applied across-the-board to all cases of overseas study.

In general, the universities emphasise internationalisation and cultural links, as well as the need for more bursaries. The awards organisations also call attention to the need for more funding, but are concerned by the lack of information available as well. Finally, the students are preoccupied by the recognition of their overseas studies in Canada, as well as the need for more security.

On a more positive note, the students have highlighted the satisfaction of their overseas stays, and the advantages, in Commonwealth countries, of being able to study within a familiar academic structure. For their part, the universities have underlined their interests in

establishing and maintaining links with universities in Commonwealth developing countries. These should be the starting points for any expansion of student mobility to Commonwealth developing countries.

If this issue is to be pursued, researchers must go back to these three groups involved, in order to obtain a broader spectrum of responses, as well more detailed information and recommendations on many of the aspects touched upon this preliminary study. Only then will it be possible to prepare a strategy that will bring about improvements to all levels involved, from the host universities and institutions, to the awards organisations which are acting as the intermediary in many cases, right down to the crucial role of the ILOs as providers of information and advice. The importance of this last group cannot be stressed enough, for if the students are not receiving sufficient or accurate information and advice as they begin the application process, they will become discouraged, lose interest and discontinue the process.

While many of the changes recommended will require financial input, this alone will not ensure the success of the exchange programmes – human resource input is just as important to this process.

The next phase, that of expanding upon the initial research that has been analysed here, requires sufficient time to generate and evaluate the information, as well as the funds necessary to conduct an in-depth survey. As other writers in this book have also said, it is only once there is a solid foundation of data that the process of expansion and improvement may be undertaken and that the governments, awarding bodies and institutions can evolve realistic policies.

*Note* The AUCC is the national organisation representing 89 Canadian universities and university-level colleges, mandated to promote the interest of higher education since 1969.

**PART FIVE**  
**MOBILITY IN PRACTICE:**  
**CASE STUDIES AND**  
**EXPERIMENTS**

---

- 10 Academic Exchange Schemes in Malaysia** **175**  
*Leong Yin Ching*  
Preliminary  
The Malaysian educational system: Context for cases  
An overview of foreign students in Malaysian universities,  
1986-90  
Influences on the flow of students from abroad to Malaysia  
Academic exchange schemes  
Support structures  
Conclusion
- 11 Two Contrasting African Cases** **190**  
**Kenya and Zimbabwe**  
*Parvin Walji and K Peter Dzvimbo*  
KENYA  
The universities of Kenya and foreign student intake  
Exchange programmes  
Some exchange schemes  
Viable models of academic exchange  
ZIMBABWE  
A late start  
National and institutional policy on foreign students

Linkages with foreign universities

Attitudes of university administrators towards student exchange

Conclusion

**12 World Class Institutions and Student Mobility**

**The Indian Institutes of Technology**

**207**

*Jayalakshmi Indiresan*

Preliminary

The technical education system in India

Policy for training foreign students in technical education

Enhancing the inflow of foreign students

Reflections

**13 Open to Talent**

**Higher Education in Singapore**

**218**

*S Gopinathan*

Preliminary

Tertiary education in Singapore

Student flow issues: The Singapore context

Foreign students at Singapore's tertiary institutions

Conclusion

# 10

## *Academic Exchange Schemes in Malaysia*

---

Leong Yin Ching

### *Preliminary*

Earlier chapters have drawn attention to the principles underlying the globalisation of higher education, some of the policies and issues relevant to student exchange and some of the factors favouring or inhibiting it. The main perspectives have been those of universities of the South, while Section Four surveyed North-South student flows from the angle of countries and institutions in the North. This section returns to higher education institutions in the South and moves from analysis of student flows and reasons behind them to specific case studies. The following chapters highlight experiments and schemes designed to enhance student exchange. Malaysia has been chosen as the first example because of its successful record in very carefully planned, small-scale exchange programmes. This success is the more notable because, in contrast to many other Commonwealth universities, Malaysian higher education is mostly not conducted in English (English language was seen as a selling point by Canadian students).

### *The Malaysian educational system: Context for the cases*

The system of formal education in Malaysia basically comprises four levels, namely primary, secondary (lower and upper), post-secondary or Form VI and tertiary. Normally, primary schooling begins at the age of six and tertiary education system commences at the age of 19.

Children in Malaysia undergo six years of primary schooling (which

is free though not compulsory), either in the national schools, using the Malay language (Bahasa Malaysia) or in Chinese-language or Tamil-language schools. On completion of primary schooling, pupils are promoted automatically to the lower secondary level, with pupils from the national primary schools moving directly into Form I, while those from Chinese-medium and Tamil-medium schools make the transition through a year of 'remove class' where they concentrate on improving their proficiency in Bahasa Malaysia. Following three years of lower secondary schooling, students take (from 1993) the Lower Secondary Evaluation (*Penilaian Menengah Rendah*). Based on their performance in this examination, students either proceed to two years of upper secondary education (in the academic, vocational or technical streams) or terminate their schooling. At the end of two years of upper secondary education, students take the Malaysian Certificate of Education (*Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia/SPM*) or the Malaysian Certificate of Vocational Education (*Sijil Pelajaran Vokasional Malaysia/SPVM*).

Students who wish to pursue university education proceed to Form VI. Following the two years' course, students sit for the Malaysian Higher School Certificate (*Sijil Tinggi Persekolahan Malaysia/STPM*) examination. There are alternative educational opportunities for students who do not wish to pursue a university education. Those with SPM or STPM may seek college level education in public or private institutions.

Higher education refers to all courses of study above Form VI which leads to the award of a degree, diploma or certificate. In the Malaysian context, such courses of study are largely provided by universities and college-level institutions under the control of the Ministry of Education. Private institutions are playing an increasing role in providing education at this level, but they have been excluded from the discussion in this chapter.

The first university in Malaysia, the University of Malaya (*Universiti Malaya*), was established in Kuala Lumpur in 1962, five years after independence, but its origins can be traced to the establishment of King Edward VI College of Medicine in 1905 and Raffles College in 1929. These colleges were amalgamated to form the nucleus of the University of Malaya in Singapore in 1949. In 1959, two divisions were established by the University, one in Kuala Lumpur and another in Singapore, the former becoming the University of Malaya in 1962, and the latter being renamed the University of Singapore, now the National University of Singapore.

With the achievement of independence in 1957, the Government

began to focus on the development of tertiary education to meet the manpower needs of the country. In 1962, the Higher Education Planning Committee was formed and its recommendations, incorporated in a report in 1967 (Malaysia, 1967) served as guidelines for the expansion of higher education for the period 1967-85. In line with the policy of enhancing integration among students in institutions of higher learning, a committee was formed to study campus life at the University of Malaya. In 1971, the Campus or Majid Report contained recommendations which aimed at rectifying the ethnic imbalance among university student population and enhancing the educational opportunities of *Bumiputeras* (Malays and other indigenous people) at the university level. These recommendations, with far reaching implications for the social mobility of the urban and, in particular, rural Malays through education, were adopted not only by the authorities of the University of Malaya but also by those responsible for the administration of the country's other universities established in 1969 and after.

Policy changes were also made with the adoption of the *Universities and University Colleges Act 1971*, which made the Ministry of Education responsible for the general direction of university education and the administration of the Act itself. Furthermore, government control was provided by the 1975 Amendment to the Act when additional heads of Government departments or their representatives were appointed to serve as council members of universities. This provision enabled the government to ensure that universities conformed to national policies and decisions made were co-ordinated.

University education has expanded very rapidly since 1969. Five new universities, together with a number of branch campuses, were established. University of Science Malaysia (*Universiti Sains Malaysia*), National University of Malaysia (*Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia*), University of Agriculture Malaysia (*Universiti Pertanian Malaysia*) and University of Technology Malaysia (*Universiti Teknologi Malaysia*) were founded in 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972 respectively, Northern University Malaysia (*Universiti Utara Malaysia*) was established in 1984. In addition, the government assisted in the founding of the International Islamic University (*Universiti Islam Antarabangsa*) in 1982.

To a significant extent, Bahasa Malaysia has replaced English as the medium of instruction in institutions of higher learning funded by the government. This has been accomplished in a series of planned phases whereby large numbers of staff and students have been provided with facilities to learn the language.

At the tertiary level, the importance of university education is

evident from the budget allocation it receives. Expenditure on university education has risen from M\$33.6 million (£1 = M\$5.0) in 1970 to M\$1,497 million in 1990, registering a thirty-fold increase. The proportion of total educational expenditure received by universities increased substantially from 7.1 per cent in 1970 to 26.3 per cent in 1990. Through financial grants and allocations, the government provides over 90 per cent of the income of local universities; hence its control of higher education in the country.

### *An overview of foreign students in Malaysian universities, 1986–90*

Malaysia has been a sending rather than a host country. In 1985, it was estimated that about 60,000 Malaysian students were enrolled in overseas tertiary educational institutions. Although there has been a decline (to about 52,000 in 1990), because of fee increases, higher living and travel costs, and local private institutions' offer of twinning arrangements with overseas universities, the number of students abroad remains very substantial.

In contrast, the number of foreign students in the seven Malaysian universities is insignificant. In any one of the years between 1986/87 and 1989/90 foreign students numbered no more than 466, or 0.8 per cent of the university population in the country. The largest single receiving institution was the International Islamic University. Unlike the others, which are funded almost entirely by the government of Malaysia, the International Islamic University is supported not only by Malaysia but also by co-sponsors abroad, namely the OIC, Bangladesh, Egypt, Libya, Maldives, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Turkey. This may explain, in part, the higher intake of foreign students from the co-sponsoring countries. Furthermore, almost all foreign undergraduates sponsored by the Malaysian government under the Malaysian Technical Co-operation Programme are sent to the International Islamic University. Following that institution, the other two main hosts were the University of Agriculture, Malaysia and the University of Malaya.

Most of the incoming students pursue undergraduate or postgraduate studies, but there are two cohorts of non-graduating students. One group follow courses in a Malaysian campus for a period of time in part fulfilment of the degree requirements in the sending country. Examples are: foreign medical students on attachment to the Faculty of Medicine as part of their elective programme; and overseas students following

Bahasa Malaysia courses at the Language Centre, to improve their language skills. The other group comprises overseas postgraduate candidates carrying out research or fieldwork.

What subjects attract foreigners studying in Malaysia for a qualification? Undergraduates were bunched together in Law (140, more than half at the International Islamic University) and Social Sciences and Humanities (91). Smaller numbers appeared for Science (26), Economics, Public and Business Administration (24) and Islamic Studies (20). The figures relate to the four years between 1986 and 1990. No foreign undergraduates were enrolled in disciplines such as Computer Science, Accounting and Quantitative Studies. Foreign postgraduates are more likely to be registered for a Master's than a doctoral programme and a relatively high proportion (15 to 19 per cent between 1986 and 1990) were working in Agriculture and related subjects.

The flow of foreign *undergraduates* is mainly from the member countries of ASEAN, mainly Singapore (22.1 per cent of the total ASEAN cohort), Brunei (15.3 per cent), Indonesia (8.4 per cent), Thailand (4.7 per cent) and Philippines (2.3 per cent). The ASEAN students made up over half of the foreign undergraduates in the years to 1986 to 1990. The rest of the intake is mainly from other developing countries in Asia and Africa, with an annual average of 3.4 per cent from Japan, China and Hong Kong and of only 1.8 per cent from the post-industrial countries. Foreign *postgraduates* are mainly concentrated in the University of Malaya, probably because, as the oldest established institution it has placed greater emphasis on postgraduate work in the development process, with its Institute of Advanced Studies. As with foreign undergraduates, the largest number of foreign postgraduates (44.9 per cent on average) came from the ASEAN countries. Japanese and Korean postgraduates made up another 13.6 per cent, while the UK, Australia, Canada, USA, France and Germany were countries of origin for another 11.5 per cent. The numbers of *non-graduating students* remain small – the highest recorded in the years under review was 56 in 1989–90.

### ***Influences on the flow of students from abroad to Malaysia***

The overview of foreign students in Malaysian universities indicates that the number involved is too small to have much of an impact on the university population. This low inflow of students from abroad may be influenced by factors such as university admissions policy, the local

demand for higher education, language issue, provision of learning and teaching facilities, particularly at the postgraduate level, availability of accommodation and forging of academic exchange schemes.

Admission to Malaysian universities is based on a number of criteria, among which are academic achievement and ethnic origin. The pursuit of an ethnicity biased admissions policy to ensure that university enrolment reflects the ethnic composition of the population, not only by the university as a whole but also by faculty, in view of the government's policy to channel Bumiputeras to courses in science and technology. Preference for admission to Malaysian universities is first given to Malaysian citizens, followed by individuals with permanent resident status and foreigners. Furthermore, foreign applicants from countries such as Israel, South Africa, Cuba and until recently, China are hardly given any consideration in view of Malaysia's stand against the practices of apartheid and communism.

The demand for places in higher education on the part of young Malaysians is also a factor which inhibits the intake of foreign students into Malaysian campuses. This insatiable appetite for higher education is reflected in the higher percentage of rejected applications with the necessary qualifications for admission to institutions of higher learning. The rejection rate varied from 65 per cent in 1981 to 81 per cent in 1985 at the undergraduate level (Vijesuriar, 1988). Higher education is desirable because of its financial rewards at the personal level. It also bestows social status and prestige on the individual. From the viewpoint of society, higher education is perceived as the major tool in the process of restructuring society towards achieving greater economic and social balances between ethnic groups.

Another prominent factor which influences the flow of foreign students from abroad is the use of Bahasa Malaysia as the medium of instruction in the national education system, beginning with Standard I in 1970. This means that a foreign student is required to have an adequate knowledge of Bahasa Malaysia to be able to follow the lectures and other course requirements. The language problem is, however, surmountable. Facilities are available in the Language Centres to equip the foreign student with a working knowledge of Bahasa Malaysia. In the Language Centre at the University of Malaya, for example, two types of Bahasa Malaysia courses are available. While the first type consists of classes organised over a full academic year, the second type involves an intensive course during the University's vacation. The intensive course is of a duration of six weeks and lectures are given four hours per day over a period of five days per week.

Classes in the intensive course are organised at the beginning, intermediate and advanced levels.

At the postgraduate level, however, some of the courses are conducted in English with the approval of the Ministry of Education. This option of using Bahasa Malaysia or English is also extended to the writing of theses or dissertations as part fulfilment of the Master's or Ph.D. programme. The use of the English language at the postgraduate level could have accounted for the higher proportion of foreign post-graduates.

Malaysian universities are relatively new, and the newest among them would require time and resources to establish their teaching, research and publication programmes to meet initially the needs of Malaysians. The Northern University Malaysia, for example, does not have any foreign students among its population. With regard to the more established local universities, there is a need to publicise the disciplines or areas of study in which they have the expertise and resources to cater not only to Malaysians but also to foreign students and scholars. Even though Bahasa Malaysia is the official language, efforts could be made to publish university calendars, handbooks and guide-books in English for dissemination to countries overseas. Early chapters in this book have made it plain that lack of information to foreign students and scholars is a limiting factor in their choice of universities for overseas studies and research.

Another limitation, which has also been mentioned earlier, is the lack of student and staff accommodation, especially for those with families. Foreign students need to adjust to the socio-cultural way of life of Malaysians, including their culinary tastes. Living in colleges leads to mutual learning in interaction and socio-cultural experiences are as important as academic interchanges. In the University of Agriculture Malaysia, some foreign students are housed with local undergraduates on a shared-room basis. Others find accommodation outside the university, an arrangement which may not provide adequate opportunities for socio-cultural exchanges.

Mechanisms like Commonwealth scholarship and fellowship plans, teacher exchanges and links between institutions play an important role in promoting intra-Commonwealth student flows. In the 1960s and 1970s, Malaysia made use of these mechanisms to train its urgently needed middle and high-level skilled manpower to meet its ambitious development plans. It was only in the 1980s that Malaysia began to reciprocate. Student flows from abroad are now seen to provide the opportunity for Malaysians to interact with students, scholars and

researchers from different parts of the world. Interaction of this kind leads to a better understanding of people of different political ideologies, socio-economic backgrounds and cultural values. Hence the interest in some reverse flow. The country has now begun to forge academic exchange programmes and link schemes that would reverse the flow and promote the intake of foreign students and scholars to Malaysian universities, albeit the pace is a gradual one.

The rest of this chapter gives a description of these schemes.

### *Academic exchange schemes*

Some academic exchange schemes are the product (or by-product) of cultural and bilateral negotiations and subsequent agreements between individual developed and developing countries and Malaysia. These bilateral schemes are further enhanced by additional scholarships, awards and fellowships granted by various international and regional agencies. Other exchange schemes are negotiated between individual universities in Malaysia and overseas institutions of higher learning. Schemes discussed are those found in the University of Malaya, University of Agriculture Malaysia and the International Islamic University. Besides exchange schemes for students, a brief account is given of link schemes which facilitate the movement of teaching staff of overseas universities to Malaysian campuses. Supporting structures (immigration and work facilities) and services (fee waivers and subsidies, accommodation and counselling services) are discussed.

Malaysia provides technical assistance to developing countries under the *Malaysian Technical Co-operation Programme* (MTCP). Its emphasis is on the development of human resources through training and the sharing of Malaysian experience and expertise in the development process. Between 1986 and 1990, technical assistance has been given to 46 countries and the amount disbursed is M\$29 million. In emphasising human resource development, MTCP makes available to applicants both undergraduate and postgraduate courses in Malaysian universities. At the undergraduate level, a majority of the candidates are sent to the International Islamic University. The emphasis, however, is on postgraduate studies involving Master's and doctorate courses. By the end of 1988, 1,318 trainees were awarded fellowships to undertake academic and practical training in local universities and training institutions. A total of five universities and 17 public agencies and training institutions were involved in the programme.

Under the MTCP programme, all tuition fees are paid for.

Candidates are given living allowances (M\$450–M\$650 monthly), while other allowances are for textbooks (M\$200–M\$250 per annum), thesis (M\$450–M\$650 throughout the course), practical training (M\$10 per diem at places outside a radius of 25km from the training institution concerned) and travel (round-trip economy class air travel, once at the beginning and once at the end of the course, and M\$200 per annum for travelling within Malaysia). A family allowance equivalent to 30.0 per cent of the monthly maintenance allowance may be given to participants who are permitted to bring their families. Expenses for medical and dental treatment in government hospitals and clinics are borne by the Malaysian government. Payment of allowances is made by the Training and Career Development Division, Public Services Department, Malaysia through the training institution concerned.

The MTCP is generous in its sponsorship of foreign undergraduate and postgraduate students from developing countries to Malaysian universities. The period of sponsorship is for the duration of the course, which varies from two to three years. Some of the areas of study offered to meet the development needs of sending countries are Economics, Public Administration, Business Administration, Law, Agriculture and Applied Science. The continuation of awards is based on satisfactory progress made by the candidates. The candidates are required to return to their home countries on completion of their studies.

*Student exchange schemes* University of Malaya Interviews with the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Malaya and the Deans of selected faculties with foreign students among its population showed that keen support has been given to the idea of internationalising higher education, particularly at the postgraduate level. Hopes were expressed that the intake of foreign students could be increased. The Vice-Chancellor's personal opinion was that at least five per cent of the student population as a whole should be foreigners, to provide a visible impact. Others voiced the opinion that some faculties had the capacity to accommodate between 10 and 20 per cent of foreign students at the postgraduate level. It is therefore of interest to report on the schemes through which foreign students are enrolled at the University of Malaya. The objective is to examine existing schemes of exchange and highlight components which have contributed to their success.

The intake of foreign students for the 1990–91 session is used to illustrate the schemes through which they have been enrolled at the University of Malaya. Of the total of 99 foreign students pursuing Masters and Ph.D. degrees on a full-time basis, 39.4 per cent are non-graduating students at the undergraduate level, four per cent are

undertaking first degree courses, four per cent are non-graduating research students at the postgraduate level and three per cent are researchers with academic staff status. More than two-thirds of the foreign students are self-financing, 13.1 per cent are sponsored by national and international agencies, 11 per cent are recipients of government scholarships, 3.1 per cent are on a link scheme and the remaining 3.1 per cent are sponsored by the MTCP.

Of particular interest is the 3.1 per cent of foreign students who have been enrolled in the University of Malaya through a link scheme as non-graduating students at the undergraduate level in the 1990-91 session. This link scheme between the University of Hull and the University of Malaya was established in 1989. Specifically, the link is between the Centre for South-East Asian Studies at the University of Hull and the University of Malaya's Department of South-East Asian Studies of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences together with the Department of Malay Language of its Language Centre. While nine British students participated in the programme abroad in 1990 (six in the University of Science Malaysia and three in the University of Malaya) 18 British students spent a year abroad in 1991 (eight in the University of Science Malaysia and 10 in the University of Malaya).

The BA Special Degree in South-East Asian Studies and Language, conferred by the University of Hull, is a three-year programme. Besides courses on South-East Asian History, Politics, Economics and Culture, undergraduates are required to follow the course 'Basic Malay' in their first year and 'Malay Language' in their second year. At the end of the second year, the undergraduates spend a study year abroad in Malaysia to improve their Malay and gather materials for a written project.

Although a formal evaluation of the link scheme has yet to be carried out, its implementation has been considered a success by the academic staff concerned. A number of factors has contributed. First, the eligibility of undergraduates in the University of Hull to apply for financial grants minimises the costs of living abroad. Secondly, the undergraduates have considerable knowledge of the Malay language prior to their arrival in Malaysia, having followed classes in Malay for a two-year period in Hull. This knowledge is further enhanced in the Malay proficiency course organised by the Language Centre at the University of Malay. Here, the undergraduates from Hull attend Malay classes with the local students and class-size is kept to a maximum of 15 to allow for individual attention. Besides the lecture approach, the audio-laboratory teaching method is used. Efforts are also made to house the British

undergraduates in residential halls where they can interact with the local students and be exposed to the Malaysian way of life. During the vacation, the undergraduates visit different parts of the country to observe how Malaysian society operates, as well as to collect materials for their written projects.

The successful implementation of the link scheme for students seems to have prompted the Head of the Department of South-East Asian Studies at the University of Malaya to visit the centre in Hull, in February 1991, to discuss an exchange programme involving academic staff members. The focus is to be on collaborative research and writing projects between the two departments of South-East Asian studies and negotiation was still in progress at the time of writing. As a first step, a general multi-disciplinary teaching text on South-East Asia has been planned.

Another scheme links the Faculty of Medicine, University of Malaya with overseas medical schools. The medical curriculum, in general, provides for elective subjects from the fourth year of the course, one of which requires the student to undertake a project at a medical school overseas while on attachment for a period for four to eight weeks. Although the undergraduates come from medical schools in countries such as the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, Germany and India, they are, in the main, Malaysian students studying medicine overseas who have opted for an attachment to the Faculty of Medicine, University of Malaya.

A memorandum of understanding on an academic exchange programme between the Rouen Graduate School of Business and the University of Malaya has been drawn up. The University of Malaya will send undergraduate and postgraduate business students to the Rouen Graduate School of Business to undertake academic courses or carry out research projects supervised by the faculty there. To reciprocate, the Rouen Graduate School of Business will select and send postgraduate students to the Faculty of Economics and Administration to attend the Masters of Business Administration programme. Both parties will assess the performance of students and submit marks or grades for academic courses taken. The exchange student will pay tuition fees to the home institution only and the host institution will undertake to waive all fees for exchange students. The costs of transport, room and board during the period of stay at the host institution will, however, be borne by the exchange students. Efforts will be made to exchange faculty members between the two institutions. The terms of the exchange programme are to be reviewed at the end of the three years.

Foreign students are also found at the University of Malaya as part of a study or tour group. The duration of the visit may vary from a day to a week, depending on the objectives of the study tour. Normally, lectures or informal talks on Malaysia are organised to meet the needs and interests of the tour group. Countries which have sent their students to the University of Malaya as members of a tour group are Australia, Japan, Korea, Singapore, and Thailand.

*Student exchange schemes* University of Agriculture Malaysia A large majority of the foreign students at the University of Agriculture Malaysia are from the ASEAN countries and Africa. Almost 90 per cent of the foreign postgraduate students are the recipients of scholarships from the government or agencies such as WINROCK International, Southeast Asean Regional Centre for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture, International Centre for Living Aquatic Resources Management, International Development Research Centre, United States Agency for International Development, Japan International Co-operation Agency and the Malaysian Technical Co-operation Programme.

In an effort to foster linkages with other academic institutions, the University of Agriculture Malaysia has established co-operative graduate programmes. Under such an arrangement, joint graduate programmes between the University and other institutions, local or foreign, can be structured for graduate students. Students may carry out part of the graduate work at the collaborating university and complete the degree requirements at the University or vice-versa. The degree will be awarded by the institution which initiated the programme. An example of a co-operative graduate scheme is the operation of a consortium of universities made up of: the University of Agriculture Malaysia; Kasertsart University in Thailand; Institute of Bogor, Indonesia; Institute of Technology, Bandung, and University of Philippines at Los Banos. Under this scheme, a postgraduate student can follow courses in Kasertsart University and carry out research at the University of Agriculture Malaysia. The Deans of the graduate schools involved meet once a year to evaluate the co-operative graduate programme.

Depending on the availability of research funds, the University also provides graduate assistantship. The scheme, started in 1988, attempts to recruit foreign students to the University's research programme. Besides research, the graduate assistant gives six hours of tutorials weekly. Under the programme, the graduate assistants are given certain fee exemption and a monthly stipend of M\$800.

Officials of this university too expressed positive opinions on the need to internationalise the postgraduate programme further. At present, postgraduate studies are conducted in English. About 70 per cent of the staff have been trained in America and England. They have the local expertise in agriculture and related fields, especially in plantation crops.

*The International Islamic University* As already indicated, the International Islamic University has the highest proportion of non-Malaysians among the seven local universities. The university population includes students from 52 Muslim countries. The university has been urged to take in more non-Muslim students to promote greater understanding about Islam. Almost all foreign undergraduates sponsored by the Malaysian government under the MTCP are sent to the International Islamic University partly because the medium of instruction is English.

At present, there are no student exchange schemes at the International Islamic University. Foreign students who are not sponsored by their governments or agencies pay the university fees on their own. Two types of fees are charged, namely, full fees of US\$2,025 and subsidised fees of about US\$700. The subsidised fees are for foreign students from the developing countries.

Malaysians constitute a large majority of the academic staff of local universities. They make up 94.1 per cent (while foreigners constitute 5.9 per cent only) of the teaching staff of the University of Malaya, National University Malaysia, University of Agriculture Malaysia and the International Islamic University. Foreign lecturers are normally employed on a contract basis.

Although requests have been received by some of the local universities to initiate faculty exchange, formalised schemes are few in number. Practical problems relate to local staff situations such as shortage of lecturers in specific disciplines like Medicine and Engineering, and time scheduling of visits. These problems may have inhibited the development of staff exchange schemes.

The exchange programme between British and Malaysian universities organised through the Committee for International Co-operation in Higher Education (CICHE) is an example of a successful staff exchange programme. British and Malaysian academic staff work jointly on research and publication projects which have been identified by the Malaysian partners. The CICHE provides funds to cover travel, accommodation and subsistence costs for Malaysian staff members to visit Britain and vice-versa.

Another example is the special bilateral exchange programme between the Japan Society for the promotion of Science (JSPS) with South-east Asian countries. Its activities cover all the fields of Social Sciences and Humanities, and Natural and Applied Sciences, although the primary focus is on Basic Science. Co-operative research projects are undertaken between Japanese and Malaysian academic staff through the Vice-Chancellor's Council of National Universities in Malaysia.

### *Support structures*

Gaining admission to a Malaysian university of one's choice is but the first step in the preparation to leave the home country for Malaysia. There is the need to obtain visas and student passes. In the Malaysian context, it has been commented that:

... no one has been denied educational opportunities because of visa or immigration restrictions.

Clearance has to be obtained from the Ministry of Education, Malaysia, Ministry of Home Affairs and the Immigration Department Malaysia before the formal offer of a university place is conveyed to the foreign student. The clearance process normally takes between four and six months. As a result, about 90 per cent of the foreign students register with the host institution without a student pass. Meanwhile, a social visit pass is applied for, together with a letter of sponsorship. Where the student is sponsored by the government or an agency, the host institution stands as the local sponsor. Otherwise, the student has to obtain a local sponsor on his or her own.

In addition to a student pass, the foreign research student or staff has to obtain clearance from the Socio-Economic and Research Unit (SERU) of the Prime Minister's Department. Clearance is given when the research proposal submitted by the researcher is approved by SERU. Foreign undergraduates and postgraduates are not permitted to seek employment in the course of their stay in Malaysia. Thus they have to ensure that they have sufficient funds to complete the courses. Researchers are required to obtain work permits if they seek employment.

*Support services* A foreign student's period of study in the local universities can be maximised if there are sufficient support services, particularly at the initial stages of his stay in Malaysia. Some of these have been discussed earlier in this book. They include fee waivers, fee subsidies, accommodation and guidance and counselling sessions.

In Malaysia, a Vice-Chancellor can exercise his discretion in exempting a student from paying tuition fees. Normally, exemption from fees is granted under very special circumstances only. At the moment, tuition fees in Malaysian universities are comparatively low. This is because education costs at the tertiary level are heavily subsidised by the Malaysian government to enhance educational opportunity and accessibility.

Providing sufficient and adequate accommodation on campus for students and visitors remains a problem. In the University of Malaya, for example, the nine hostels within the campus and two hostels outside the campus provide accommodation for only half its total student population. *Rumah Universiti* (the University House) has accommodation for six visitors only. Additional hostels have been requested under the Sixth Malaysia Plan.

Another important service for both local and foreign students is the provision of guidance and counselling services. Such services are normally provided by the Student Affairs Department. The ratio of counsellors to students has to be improved for more effective consultation and counselling. At the University of Malaya, for example, the two counsellors have to cope with a student population of about 10,000.

## *Conclusion*

It appears that there is no basic policy with regard to the intake of foreign students into Malaysian universities on a national or an institutional basis. Perhaps, the number of foreign students in Malaysian universities has been, over the years, too low to warrant a statement of policy. At the same time, admitting foreign students based primarily on academic achievement but on an *ad hoc* basis may not contribute to the full realisation of benefits which could accrue from their presence in Malaysian universities.

It may well be that the best way forward is through the judicious expansion of special programmes of the types which have been described in this chapter. They have been notably successful and benefits have been perceived on both sides.

# 11

## *Two Contrasting African Cases* *Kenya and Zimbabwe*

---

Parvin Walji and Peter Dzvimbo

### **KENYA**

#### ***The universities of Kenya and foreign student intake***

Kenya has four fully-fledged public universities and two university colleges to cater for the demands for higher education in the country. These are:

- The University of Nairobi
- Moi University, Eldoret
- Kenyatta University
- Egerton University
- Jomo Kenyatta University College
- Maseno University College

There is also a growing number of private universities in the country. Overall enrolment in all six public institutions is approximately 40,000, of which 14,555 are at the University of Nairobi and 9,890 are at Kenyatta University. These two institutions also account for nearly all the postgraduate population.

Kenya hosts many overseas students in both her public and private universities. Data presented here is from the two major public universities, Nairobi and Kenyatta, and from two private institutions, Daystar University College and the United States International University – Africa (USIU).

In 1991, there were 466 students from abroad studying at these four institutions. They came from 53 different countries. Just over 40 per cent were from Kenya's neighbours: Ethiopia, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda. The total from post-industrial countries was 138, of which 66 per cent were from the USA. There are very few students from the rich countries of the Commonwealth. Almost two-thirds of foreign students were undergraduates and most of them were at the private universities, due to limitations of space at the public ones.

### *Exchange programmes*

Tables 11.1 and 11.2 at the end of the chapter show the participants in exchange programmes at Nairobi and Kenyatta Universities respectively. They show that there are no student exchanges with Commonwealth countries.

Practically all the exchange students at the two universities are Americans. All the students are undergraduates, usually in their second or third years, who come to Nairobi on a one-year exchange and return to their respective universities to complete their degrees. The largest number of students is from the University of California, with which the University of Nairobi has had an exchange programme for a long time. Kenyatta University has very few exchange students compared to Nairobi (Moi University does not have any exchange programmes). Unlike at the University of Nairobi, the exchange programme at Kenyatta is not directly with specific universities, but is through the International Students Exchange Programme which incorporates several US universities. Most of the students study Arts subjects, usually with an Africa focus, for example, African history, African political systems, African literature, African philosophy and Kiswahili. A few take up science subjects like Agriculture, Biology and Zoology. The credits earned by the students at Nairobi are usually recognised by their respective universities.

Daystar University College has an exchange programme with American colleges and universities through the American Consortium of Christian Universities and Colleges. However, the US International University does not have any exchange schemes. The main courses offered at Daystar include Business Administration, Communications, Education and Bible Studies, while the USIU offers mainly Business Administration, International Business Administration and Psychology.

Postgraduate students come under a variety of different sponsorships, such as the German Academic Exchange Service, the Common-

wealth Fund for Technical Co-operation (CFTC), the German Agency for Technical Co-operation (GTZ), the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA), the Canadian International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and British aid schemes administered by the British Council. Some are funded by their home government. At the University of Nairobi, the majority come to study at Master's level and two-thirds of them come from the five neighbouring countries of Sudan, Ethiopia, Tanzania, Uganda and Somalia. Only eight per cent of foreign postgraduates come from the post-industrial countries.

The main discipline of study at Master's level is Medicine (36 per cent), followed by Agriculture, Engineering and Business Administration. The Diplomacy training programme at the University is highly regarded internationally and a large number of students enrol. As mentioned already, the University of Nairobi has the largest proportion of postgraduate students in the country and virtually all the foreign postgraduates are found here. Kenyatta University has very few foreign postgraduates (under five) while Moi and Egerton Universities do not appear to have any.

### *Some exchange schemes*

The University of Nairobi has several link and exchange programmes with foreign institutions, ranging from direct exchange of students to links which facilitate institutional capacity building. Such programmes have been established on the premise that higher education should have an international dimension and that academic interchange facilitates cross-cultural exchange of knowledge and ideas and promotes understanding. The major schemes operating at the university are described below.

- 1 *Student exchange* This involves a direct exchange of students between universities. The University of Nairobi has exchange programmes with four American universities, namely the University of California, Pennsylvania State University, the University of Massachusetts and Kalamazoo Undergraduate College, and also with Soka University in Japan. (It should be pointed out that Kenyatta University has a similar scheme with US universities through the International Student Exchange Programme – ISEP – in Washington.) Of these, the oldest and most effective programme has been with campuses of the University of California, having started during the 1960s. The exchange with

Penn State and Massachusetts is over five years old and that with Soka University dates from 1988.

According to the agreements with the American universities the main features of the schemes are:

- 1 The exchange is between undergraduate students from the American universities and postgraduates from University of Nairobi. The number of students participating in the exchange is stated in the agreements.
- 2 The American students enrol for courses they have selected in consultation with their academic advisors for a period of one academic year (equivalent to two semesters). The same applies to Nairobi. Participating students have to be selected by their respective institutions and have to meet the admissions requirements of the host institutions.
- 3 The US students are given recognised credits for the courses taken and these are credited to their degree when they return to complete their studies.
- 4 The foreign students normally take courses in Anthropology, Sociology, Kiswahili, History/Archaeology, Economics and any other courses with an African focus.
- 5 Each host institution absorbs all tuition, registration and any other education fees for the guest students enrolled. In other words, tuition fees for each student are waived by the respective universities. However, because of the high fees charged to foreign students at American universities, while Nairobi charges much lower fees, the exchange has not been equitable, particularly with the University of California. For example the ratio was eight undergraduates to one postgraduate. But the new agreements with Penn State and Massachusetts are more equitable.
- 6 The University of Nairobi provides accommodation in the University Halls of Residence for the American students. The Nairobi students have to look for adequate accommodation which they pay for from their maintenance stipends.
- 7 All participating students are responsible for their travel and personal expenses including health and medical insurance.
- 8 The University of California provides one member of the faculty to serve as liaison officer of the programme and as a teaching member of the faculty of the University of Nairobi. Nairobi provides housing and other staff benefits for the Liaison Professor.

The resident Liaison Professor looks after the welfare of the American exchange students. There is no equivalent counterpart from Nairobi at the University of California.

The agreement with Soka University has similar features, except that, besides waiving tuition, Soka also provides the airfare and accommodation for students from Nairobi.

*Institutional links* Besides the student exchange programmes, the University of Nairobi has established numerous institutional links with various universities and organisations. These links are usually multi-purpose, involving capacity-building, staff exchange, research collaboration, etc, and are important for strengthening the university. They include:

*Links for collaboration in research and teaching* These are usually initiated at the departmental level and involve collaborative research activities, faculty exchange, donation of equipment and the training of staff and technicians. Often these links are not as vigorous and productive as exchange programmes between universities, since they are not centrally controlled and need a lot of commitment on the part of the departments. Departments in the University of Nairobi have such links with counterparts in Canada, Britain, Europe, America and Israel.

*Links with foreign national organisations or parastatal agencies,* for example, German Academic Exchange, SASAKAWA (Japan). These provide financial support, particularly in the form of scholarships to staff and graduate students. The link with the German agency (known as DAAD) has several components; it gives scholarships to Kenyan students to pursue graduate studies locally; it provides fellowships for short-term study in Germany enabling students to pursue split-site Ph.D. degrees; it includes possibility of exchange of faculty members between Nairobi and Germany; and it has contributed to strengthening departments through supplying equipment, training personnel and providing academic staff. According to the Academic Registrar, this is seen as a very successful and beneficial link.

*Bilateral agreements directly with governments, mainly of developing countries* Graduate students from these countries come for training in Diplomacy, Medicine, Engineering, Agriculture and Population Studies, and Nairobi can send students to these countries. The funding is between governments and comes to the University through the Ministry.

*Affiliations* These involve links with a consortium of universities (mainly American) which come together for research purposes. It

benefits staff in terms of research, publications and dissemination of ideas.

Exchanges are also organised through *international multilateral agencies* like the World Bank, World Health Organisation (WHO), International Atomic Energy Agency, World Meteorological Organisation, etc. Such organisations sponsor graduate students especially from African countries, fund training of staff and technicians for short-term courses, sponsor staff to attend conferences, thus helping towards capacity building in institutions. One example of this is the Diplomacy Training Centre at the University already mentioned.

It must be pointed out that regional links and exchanges between African countries are weaker than previously. The Inter University Council for East Africa covers student and staff exchange. In the past there was a strong reciprocal exchange between Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. Also, through the Association of African Universities, the University of Nairobi had agreements with several African universities namely, Malawi, Zambia, Botswana, Swaziland, whereby their students were trained at the university in Medicine, Dental Surgery, Engineering and Agriculture. When, however, the issue of reciprocity was raised, there were problems and the programmes could not continue. Moreover, with regard to enhancing regional exchange, many of the African universities do not have the resources or the infrastructure to accommodate students from outside. Also, there is the problem of instability in some of the countries. It is unlikely that students from Kenya would find it attractive to study under such conditions. There are exchanges with African countries, for example the University of Burundi has been sending students to study Veterinary Medicine and Kiswahili, while Kenyan students go to study French. But there are no strong exchange programmes with African countries.

The student exchange schemes with the American universities are successful, although some problems need to be streamlined. Of the American programmes, the one with Pennsylvania State University is the most successful because:

- 1 There is reciprocity in terms of overcoming inherent weakness. For example, Penn State does not have a very strong African studies programme while Nairobi needs strong graduate American students and postgraduate Kenyan students which gives maximum relative advantage to each institution.
- 2 There is waiver of tuition and accommodation costs on both sides. This helps overcome the high costs of education and foreign

exchange problems for Kenyan students.

- 3 The exchange students are very carefully selected high performers from each institution, which ensures that standards are maintained.
- 4 There is credit recognition, which is of great concern to students. The American students get credit for the courses done in Nairobi, which are recognised for their degrees, while Kenyan students get degrees from a recognised American university.
- 5 Pennsylvania has been able to solicit for funds in good time. It is able to do this because of projecting ahead of time and budgeting fully.
- 6 There is well-established communication between the two institutions so that each knows the financial position with regard to students.
- 7 The University of Nairobi students are offered teaching assistantship which is highly beneficial financially and in terms of staff development and exposure for the students.
- 8 The programme is reciprocal and mutually beneficial to both partners.

As mentioned previously, the scheme with DAAD is also highly successful. This is because:

- 1 It is a well consolidated and institutionalised programme.
- 2 It has been consistent in managing the programme in its long term objectives which are clearly stated and beneficial to the University and in following up the progress of those being trained.
- 3 It is very specific in the fields of study it sponsors, mainly developed oriented studies.
- 4 The scholarships offered are substantial taking into account the high costs of education and economic impediments in developing countries.
- 5 It has contributed to capacity building through training a large number of people locally in relevant fields, as well as giving exposure to overseas training. German students are also able to train at Nairobi on DAAD scholarships.

### *Viable models of academic exchange*

The descriptions above demonstrate the commitment of the universities and government of Kenya to the principle of internationalisation in

education. The University of Nairobi and its peers believe that universities must have the maximum international exposure through:

- 1 Interaction at academic staff level through : (a) staff exchange quota, having inter-staff training programmes and (b) through conferences which provide a good forum for the exchange of ideas, research and learning and promote knowledge. The importance Kenya attaches to this component is manifested by the existence of the Dean's Committee at the university which is funded by the Treasury at the sum of £600,000 per annum. This committee approves and gives grants to scholars for the main purpose of attending conferences and for research.
- 2 Student exchanges in order to broaden and diversify classroom contacts and enable students from different cultural contexts to live together, thus creating friendship and understanding. Since knowledge is universal, exchange programmes benefit students especially through exploiting the relative advantages of each institution. For example, Kenya can offer training in development anthropology and African studies to students from western countries which, in turn, are strong in technological training needed by Kenyan students. Thus, academic exchange can be mutually beneficial to all partners and is very valuable.

They are aware of Kenya's particular advantages for attracting foreign students, its agreeable environment, and reputation for economic and political stability, institutional strengths such as a handful of unique courses (for example the Diplomacy training) and the long experience of the University of Nairobi in particular in administering exchange programmes. They are also well aware of the needs for strengthening capacity and support structures.

Any academic exchange scheme between two institutions should be equitable and mutually beneficial to both parties. Academic exchange implies cross-personalisation between two countries where students and staff are moving for technological, socio-economic and cultural exposure. It is of necessity two-sided. It is however clear from the report that there are no student exchange schemes between Kenya and other Commonwealth countries. The movement of students is one-way, namely, from Kenya to mainly the industrialised countries like Britain and Canada. It is equally important for students from these countries to get exposure to the socio-economic problems of Third World countries.

The experience of the University of Nairobi with academic exchange

schemes has shown that the 'California Model,' that is, the model used with the American universities, has proved extremely viable. The features that make the 'California model' a viable one are:

*It saves on foreign exchange* It is well established that the prohibitive education and living costs in western countries, together with foreign exchange difficulties make it almost impossible for Kenyan students to study abroad. However, the barter system of the 'Californian model', where an agreed number of students from each university are exchanged, makes the scheme highly feasible. When tuition and accommodation are waived, the costs, particularly for Kenyan students, are greatly reduced.

*Reciprocity* The traffic flow is two-way so that American students coming to Kenya benefit as much as Kenyan students going to America, from the exposure they get. Besides, they get recognised credits for the courses they take.

*Maximum relative advantage* The American students at the undergraduate level get training in African studies and other programmes in which the University of Nairobi is strong, while Kenyan students benefit from the strong graduate programmes and technological exposure in American universities.

The model is therefore reciprocal and mutually beneficial to both partners. Such a model of academic exchange is recommended for an interchange of students between the University of Nairobi and other Commonwealth countries and also for institutions elsewhere in the Commonwealth to take up and develop according to their own circumstances.

## ZIMBABWE

### *A late start*

The University of Zimbabwe is relatively young (originating in 1955) and has had problems in evolving international connections owing to a period of isolation before the country's independence in 1980. This means that it has not had the opportunity to form the strong external relationships over a time-span of decades as has the University of Nairobi (which is no older). It had, in the past, to maintain other principles of universality. Right from its inception, the University was committed to being a non-racial institution in a country where for years racial policies were the basis of the governance and administration of the state. It may thus seem a late starter on the international university

scene, but it has never deviated from the fundamental concepts of the universality of knowledge and of equality of access to it.

Since independence in 1980, it has been able to develop in a number of ways. From the University of Rhodesia, it became the University of Zimbabwe and the Faculties of Agriculture and of Commerce and Law were established to join the existing ones of Arts, Science and Social Studies. The Royal Charter was replaced in 1982 and in that same year, the Faculty of Veterinary Science was established with an intake of eighteen students. In 1988, the Faculty of Commerce and Law was split into two distinct Faculties, namely, the Faculty of Commerce and the Faculty of Law. Now, the University of Zimbabwe has ten faculties on one campus. Student enrolment increased from 68 in 1957 to 2,240 in 1980 and 9,300 in 1990. Now the student population is over 10,000. As of 31st December 1990 the University of Zimbabwe had 725 members of staff. It is at present finding it difficult to retain old staff and to attract new staff locally or abroad due to deteriorating conditions of work and competition from neighbouring universities. Staff shortages have a negative impact on the number of programmes that can be offered every year at the local university.

Perhaps this rapid expansion at a time of staff shortage has shaped Zimbabwe's rather different approach to the reception of foreign students and has led it to an interest in links where the student exchange component is played down.

### *National and institutional policy on foreign students*

At the national level, Zimbabwe does not yet have a well-articulated policy on the admission of foreign nationals from overseas or from elsewhere in Africa. The Ministry of Higher Education, which should initiate such a policy has not been able to do so because of the existence of the separate Ministry of National Scholarships which co-ordinates all external studies. The Ministry of National Scholarships in the President's Office, in conjunction with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, co-ordinates all scholarships for Zimbabweans to study abroad, student flows from abroad or the neighbouring countries. For such activities, it acts as a clearing house even for foreign scholars who either visit Zimbabwe as researchers or scholars teaching at local institutions.

As a member of various international organisations such as the Commonwealth, the Organisation of African Unity, the Non-aligned Movement and the Southern African Co-ordinating Conference

(SADCC) the Government of Zimbabwe accepts a small number of foreign nationals at these institutions of higher learning. To facilitate this co-operation, Zimbabwe has entered into a number of Cultural Exchange programmes with Commonwealth countries, (especially Australia and Canada), European Countries (especially the former Eastern Bloc) and a few Asian and African countries. As articulated by a senior official in the Ministry of Higher Education, Zimbabwe cannot afford to send its students abroad on cultural exchange programmes using its own scarce foreign reserves. Consequently there are more students from North America and Europe who study in Zimbabwe each year than there are Zimbabweans going abroad on government sponsorship. As such, more foreigners come to Zimbabwe than would be desirable from the Government's point of view in terms of maintaining a balance.

The major tertiary institutions of higher learning in Zimbabwe which attract a limited number of foreign students are:

- The University of Zimbabwe – degree and non degree programmes
- Ranch House College – short non degree programme
- Agricultural Colleges – non degree programmes
- The Harare and Bulawayo Polytechnics – non degree programmes
- Mutare Forestry College – non degree programmes
- Teachers' Colleges – non degree programmes

A few institutions in the private sector now offer short courses for students from neighbouring countries especially in the area of information processing and data capture. A few government departments such as Immigration, Education, Foreign Affairs, the Police, offer short courses to public servants from the neighbouring countries. Such training courses are usually the results of bilateral agreements between Zimbabwe and countries in the SADCC. Such programmes are at times financed by donor agencies such as ODA, SIDA or USAID. Mozambique and Namibia have benefited from such schemes, which have been financed by an outside donor for civil servants and officials from Eduardo Mondlane University.

The University of Zimbabwe has by far the largest number of foreign students, but because of the demand for university education from Zimbabweans, it can only offer relatively few places to foreign nationals. The general policy of the University is that it considers applications from foreign students, and may offer them admission if they

fulfil the entry requirements and provided that their admission will not deny a place to an eligible Zimbabwean applicant. In exceptional cases, where a suitably qualified foreign student applies for admission to a programme which is fully subscribed with Zimbabwean applicants, the University will seek a directive from the Ministry of Higher Education and may accept such an applicant if his/her application is endorsed from a Government to Government level. Foreign students who are admitted to the University of Zimbabwe pay double the tuition fees payable by the Zimbabweans. Tuition fees range from US\$140 per annum in Arts, Law and education to US\$560 in the Faculty of Medicine for full-time students. Residence fees range from US\$160 per annum to US\$600 in student housing provided by the university on campus or in flats rented by the University. All students pay similar residential fees for types of accommodation.

### *Linkages with foreign universities*

During the 1990–91 academic year, a number of departments at the University of Zimbabwe had links with universities in the United Kingdom, Canada, the USA, Europe and Africa. Apart from staff exchanges, these links are critical in staff development for staff from the University of Zimbabwe. The foreign university may also get an opportunity to send some of its students (if it should wish), especially at the graduate level, to spend some time at the University of Zimbabwe, conducting research in the country or even teaching. Foreign universities are also being used by University of Zimbabwe staff for their academic contacts for periods ranging from one month to a year. These contacts are regarded as essential in giving university staff an opportunity to avail themselves of current literature and developments in their academic fields. Such contacts constitute a major flow for staff from the University of Zimbabwe to other countries. A few University of Zimbabwe staff members get an opportunity to teach at foreign universities, but the majority of the staff who go on ‘contact’ or sabbatical leave abroad utilise that period for research.

The major links and contacts are listed in the Vice-Chancellor’s annual report.

In 1990–91, he listed the following:

- **UK** 21 links, involving 16 institutions, all of them facilitated through the British Council
- **Canada** six links, involving four institutions, facilitated by CIDA

- **Mainland Europe** 17 links, involving eight institutions, facilitated through the European Community
- **USA** 21 links, involving eight institutions, facilitated through USIS
- **Africa** four links, involving four institutions (no facilitator named)

It is quite clear that South-South co-operation is almost non-existent compared to the kind of linkages that exist between the University and universities from industrialised countries. This imbalance worries some lecturers and officials interviewed who fear that such relationships perpetuate intellectual dependency of the University on knowledge forms based on Western cultural traditions. This view was very prevalent among the younger members of staff in both the Humanities and the Sciences. At the government level, the Ministry of Higher Education came out strongly about their opposition to what one official terms the 'intellectual dependence of our university towards the North'.

The Research Council of Zimbabwe which processes research applications from foreign scholars also indicated that they get fewer applications from students and scholars from universities in developing nations. The bulk of their applications come from students and academics in the developed countries. However, there was a general agreement that there is reluctance on the part of universities from industrialised countries to initiate these kinds of linkages.

As far as increasing linkages is concerned, the major problems for the majority of the faculties at the University of Zimbabwe as revealed by those interviewed is the degree of flexibility in the type of courses offered and the availability of staff who can supervise students from other countries. The availability of donor funding also poses a major constraint for departments that would like to establish links especially with African universities. There are very few donors who are willing to finance linkages with the University of Zimbabwe, because of the general trend based on the view that social rate of returns to higher education are lower than the social rate of returns to primary and secondary education (see World Bank 1988). The situation is even exacerbated by the current Economic Structural Adjustment Programme (ESAP) which has been heavily influenced by the World Bank. Fewer financial resources have been allocated to the tertiary education sector by Government. This is a frustrating situation because most departments are eager to establish South-South linkages, so as to tackle similar problems within the higher education sector.

The institutional capacity of the entire University as far as student accommodation, know-how among administrators, laboratory facilities and the availability of reading materials in the small library that exists at the University of Zimbabwe is very limited. The situation is compounded by a diminishing financial base.

Not surprisingly, against this background, the number of foreign students admitted is quite small compared to Kenya and other countries discussed in this book.

### *Attitudes of university administrators towards student exchange*

In spite of all the difficulties, university and government officials were unanimous in their views on academic exchange at both the student and staff levels. On a very mundane level, staff at the University of Zimbabwe support the current linkage programmes because these have become an important source of equipment that the departments are unable to pay for themselves. On the teaching side, departments of faculties also use these linkages to develop their programmes with temporary foreign staff while their Zimbabwean colleagues are developing themselves at the foreign university, for example, those without doctorates may complete their degree. The Faculties of Veterinary Science, Medicine and Agriculture are good examples of how a university in the South can benefit from such linkages. The Faculty of Veterinary Science has been receiving Z\$0.5 million annually since 1986 for student/staff exchange and Z\$25 million for staff exchanges with Dutch universities. Final year Clinical Veterinary Science students spend six to ten weeks at a Dutch university. The Faculties of Agriculture and Medicine continue to get substantial aid from Michigan State University. A further example is the Department of Economics which has support from SIDA to establish long-term relationships with Swedish universities for staff development and purchase of equipment. No students are, however, involved.

With a few exceptions such as the arrangement whereby students of French spend some time in France, students do not seem to be benefiting from these links. Staff benefit because links provide them with the chance to spend time at foreign universities, conducting research and interacting with colleagues in their academic field. Observably students from the foreign universities may also benefit, since they can afford Zimbabwe fees and also get credit for a year spent at the University.

## *Conclusion*

Zimbabwe seems to be in a particularly difficult position compared to most of the other countries discussed in this book. It has a small capacity to absorb foreign students because it cannot cope with the demand for tertiary education. There is also a sense that the real need is more opportunities for Zimbabwean students.

If the country is to play an important role in academic exchange with other countries, it needs assistance in building its institutional capacity.

**TABLE 11.1 Exchange programme students at the University of Nairobi by country, institution and discipline, 1988-91**

<i>Academic Year</i>	<i>Country/Distribution</i>	<i>Number of Students</i>		
		<i>Arts</i>	<i>Science</i>	<i>Total</i>
1988-89	<b>USA</b>			
	Pennsylvania State U.	2	1	3
	U. of Massachusetts	5	0	5
	U. of California	14	3	17
1989-90	<b>USA</b>			
	Pennsylvania State U.	2	2	4
	U. of Massachusetts	7	0	7
	U. of California	14	6	20
	Kalamazoo College	4	04	
1990-91	<b>USA</b>			
	Pennsylvania State U.	4	3	7
	U. of Massachusetts	8	1	9
	U. of California	16	6	22
	Kalamazoo College	8	0	8
	<b>JAPAN</b>			
	Soka University	1	0	1
	<b>TOTAL</b>	85	22	107

*Source:* Admissions Dept, University of Nairobi

**TABLE 11.2 Exchange programme students at Kenyatta University by institution 1988–91**

<i>Academic Year</i>	<i>Institution (all USA)</i>	<i>Number of Students</i>
1988–98	U. of Mississippi	1
	Wittenberg U.	1
	Old Dominion U.	1
	U. of Idaho	1
1989–90	Miami University, Ohio	1
	Western Washington U.	1
	U. of South Carolina	1
1990–91	U. of Pennsylvania	1
	Howard Univ.	1
	Ball State U.	1
	Appalachian State U.	1
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>

*Source:* Assistant Registrar's Office, Kenyatta University

# 12

## *World Class Institutions and Student Mobility*

### *The Indian Institutes of Technology*

---

Jayalakshmi Indiresan

#### *Preliminary*

A very thorough study of academic exchange and student mobility in general higher education in India is given in Chapter 6. An equally thorough parallel study was made of student mobility in the technological institutions in India and this chapter presents some extracts from it. The interest of the Indian Institutes of Technology is in their high prestige, so that their position as exemplars would be of special importance, both in India and in other Commonwealth countries. This chapter focuses on that aspect of the study. Two institutions were selected for investigation: the Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi, a 'national institute of excellence' and the University of Roorkee, the oldest technical institution in India. The latter is also mentioned in Chapter 6.

#### *The technical education system in India*

India has a large system of technical education with over 350 institutions offering degree level courses, and nearly 500 polytechnics offering diploma level courses. These are spread all over the country. Restricting ourselves to the higher level institutions, offering undergraduate and postgraduate courses, we need to be aware that there is a wide variation in the nature of these institutions, in such a large system. Though there is no formal accreditation provision in the country, these institutions can be broadly classified into five major categories. These are:

- 1 The National Institutes
- 2 Technological Universities
- 3 Regional Engineering Colleges
- 4 State Level Government Engineering Colleges
- 5 'Capitation Fee' Colleges

The National Institutes include the five Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs) which have been established by an act of parliament as institutions of excellence. These can be compared to the best institutions anywhere in the world in terms of course offerings, infrastructural facilities, faculty, R&D contribution, etc and offer very high quality technical education. These are fully residential institutions, set up in large campuses with excellent facilities. There are five technical universities which also offer very high quality technical education. These are also residential in nature with very good campuses and other amenities. Seventeen regional engineering colleges have been set up with support from provincial governments to meet the requirements of technical education of the region. These too are residential and have reasonably good facilities and do offer quality education.

The other engineering colleges are located all over the country and affiliated to the respective universities in the region. While some of these colleges are good, the quality of education imparted in others leaves much to be desired, because of the lack of infrastructure facilities, poor quality of faculty, etc. To maintain and monitor the quality of Engineering Colleges, the All India Council of Technical Education (AICTE) has now been given statutory powers to give or withhold recognition to colleges that do not meet the prescribed norms. Of the 337 colleges listed in 1990, only 206 have been approved by the AICTE and the other 131 institutions are listed as unapproved.

The quality of the various institutions can be assessed, based on some indicators. The amount invested in the training of each student provides a ready indicator of the quality. It has been estimated that the IITs invest about Rs. 350,000 on the training of each undergraduate student. Similarly, the University of Roorkee has estimated that it costs about Rs. 250,000 per student trained in the university. The AICTE has set up a norm of at least Rs. 50,000 as cost per student. It has been reported that some of the unapproved institutions spend less than Rs 20,000 per student.

Another indicator of the quality of institutions is the demand for admission. The high quality institutions conduct their own entrance examination. The Joint Entrance Examination (JEE) for admission to the

IITs is taken by about 90,000 students for the 1,500 places available. Similarly, the entrance examination conducted by University of Roorkee is taken by over 70,000 students for the 2,000 places available. The regional engineering college admissions are also based on entrance examinations. Admission to the unapproved colleges are often based on other than academic criteria. In the year 1990, the intake of students in the 206 approved colleges was 34,290 and the intake in the 131 'unapproved' colleges was estimated at 32,300. It is significant that 'unapproved' colleges admit as many students as the approved ones and on an average have a larger intake but much fewer facilities.

### *Policy for training foreign students in technical education*

The Report of the Review Committee on Postgraduate Education and Research in Engineering and Technology, June 1990 says:

4.22.1 India has a leading role to play in the new concept of 'Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries' (TCDC). Apart from putting large numbers of Indian scientists, engineers and technologists at the disposal of many other developing countries, India is giving training facilities for thousands of overseas students. While most of the advanced countries have clear cut policies for training overseas students, India has not yet formulated any such policy. Consequently several problems have arisen.

4.22.2 There is increasing pressure on India from many countries for training facilities in engineering and technology, especially at advanced levels. Even some of the advanced countries have come forward to fund the training of students from Third World countries in India. These developments have added a new dimension to the whole problem of training overseas students. It is in the interest of India to formulate a coherent 'country training policy' for training overseas students. While doing so, the special needs and requirements of the countries concerned should also be taken into consideration.

This is evidence of an awareness in India about the leading role that the country could play in technical co-operation, through training students from other developing countries. There is an appreciable demand for such training opportunities. Enrolment of foreign nationals in various technical institutions has, however, been going on for the past several

years without any clear policy guidelines and there is an urgent need for such a policy.

Discussions with various authorities at the two institutions and other organisations indicate an absence of any written or unwritten policy. Admissions for foreign students are guided by the overall objective of the Government of India of providing co-operation and assistance under the broad Technical Co-operation schemes. There is, however, said to be a guideline that the total number of foreign students in technical education shall not exceed 10 per cent of the total intake of students. In comparison, Ahmad and Basu in the research which they report in Chapter 6, were informed that the guideline for Indian higher education as a whole is five per cent foreigners in the total student intake.

IIT-Delhi has a limited number of undergraduate places for foreign nationals, including students from both developed and developing countries. Recently, policy directives have been given to admit only students from the developing countries. Since, however, the overall objective of admitting foreign students is to build good international relations, it should, in principle, be a good idea to encourage students from all countries.

### *Enhancing the inflow of foreign students*

The Commonwealth Secretariat is specially interested in enhancing the inflow of foreign students from both developed and developing countries to other developing countries like India. To elicit the views of concerned persons, they were asked whether India should encourage more students to come for higher technical education and what advantages they perceived in this. Some of the answers highlight issues already discussed earlier in this book, but a brief report of them is given here.

There is a general consensus that technical institutions in the country should enrol more foreign students. It is felt that the presence of foreign students in the campuses contributes to better international understanding. Students get to know various cultures and this broadens their horizons and perceptions. Students learn to live with each other and this is an enriching experience. Foreign nationals develop a certain attachment and favourable attitude towards their host country. They make valuable ambassadors in promoting goodwill towards their host country. They feel proud of being the products of good technical education received in this country. Their stay here influences their under-

standing of India and its thinking. When these students get back to their countries, they do well and when they reach positions of decision making they are very supportive of India and Indian technology capabilities. As one student put it, he would recommend that his country should look up to India for getting technical know-how, have joint technical projects with India and buy Indian engineering products.

Another student reported that if he were to join a university in his own country, he would recommend that more students go to India for higher technical education. He felt that a student from a developing country studying in another developing country gets a better exposure to the problems which are common to developing countries and as such would benefit more by being trained in India. Another very significant advantage pointed out was the arrest of a 'brain drain'. When students from developing countries go to developed countries, they get carried away by the affluence and opportunities there and never return to their own country. But, this does not happen when they go to another developing country.

The experience of the University of Roorkee is that many students trained there do keep in touch with the University. Further, the successful training of a large number of students from Nepal, Ethiopia, Indonesia and Iran has created continuing interest and other countries like Nigeria have shown interest in sending their students. Though UOR is set in a small town, senior diplomats from these countries keep visiting the University to express their satisfaction and explore further opportunities for collaboration. Thus, the receiving institutions gain in their status and image by having foreign nationals studying in their campuses.

There is a positive attitude about the long term intangible benefits that can accrue to the country and to specific institutions whose reputation is enhanced in admitting foreign students. It is, however, agreed that it would be inadvisable to increase their numbers beyond five per cent of total intake, certainly not beyond 10 per cent. Also the admissions should be distributed over a number of countries, instead of having large numbers from a single country. The experiments of having large batches under bilateral arrangements have not been very satisfactory. Such groups of students do not integrate with the local students and lose the benefit of international experience.

It must be observed that, though admission letters were issued to fill all the seventeen places reserved for foreign students in IIT, Delhi, only eight finally registered. It would be worthwhile obtaining data about the full utilisation of the 450 places allocated in the 30 different

institutions and find out what inhibits candidates from taking up offers from high-prestige places of learning.

Discussions with foreign students brought out some of their positive perceptions of the advantages of studying in India. India, as a multi-cultural country has a lot of tolerance and acceptance of people from other cultures. This is a definite advantage in integration in campus life. It has also been observed that some foreign students do very well in sports activities. For example, at IIT Delhi in 1992, a student from Jordan was elected as sports secretary. Further, the rich cultural and historical heritage of India, its varied art and tourist value were also cited as attractions for coming to India. The most important factor however, is, that the cost of living and cost of education is very economical compared to other places. This brings out the issue of financing foreign students.

*Financing foreign students* As is well-known, Indian higher education is very highly subsidised by the government, especially technical education. Though the government has been resisting a differential fee structure for foreign students, the general consensus among educational administrators is that it is time that the government accepted the policy of differential fee and charged the actual economic cost of education to foreign students (as already noted in Chapter 6). Most of the developed countries have already implemented this differential fee structure for overseas students. Even rich countries are expected to raise about 70 per cent of their operating cost of education from student fees. There is a strong mood of questioning why India should subsidise the education of foreign students, especially those students who come from the rich Middle East, which accounts for a large number of enrolments in the technical institutions in India. Further, it is argued that charging the full economic cost to foreign students would generate additional resources for the institutions that can be ploughed back to improve institutional facilities, a point which was borne out by the research done by Dr Ahmad and Dr Basu (Chapter 6).

They have explained that a differential fee structure is already in existence. The so-called 'Capitation Colleges' are already charging a fee that covers the actual economic cost of technical education, not only to students from outside the country but also to Indian students who can pay for it. It is argued that these differential fees may be rationalised and the government supported institutions also be permitted to charge the actual economic cost. When foreign students are placed through organisations like the Ed-CIL, even in state supported institutions like UOR, actual economic cost is charged.

Discussing this issue with the foreign students brought out a totally different perspective. A large number of students come to India as 'self-financing' students because the cost of education is very economical compared to any other place. A differential fee structure would arrest the inflow of foreign students. Thus, there is a dichotomy between the thinking of some educational administrators who feel that the actual cost of education should be charged to the foreign students and the foreign students' desire that there should be no differential fees for foreign students.

Though India is a poor country, it offers very high quality technical education. It is suggested that either the sponsoring country should pay the full cost of the education or international agencies should provide substantial scholarships to meet the cost of education. For instance, the ADB has already instituted eight fellowships in IIT, Delhi.

One of the suggestions made is to consider the feasibility of having some link between the fees charged and the per capita income of the country from where the students come. An interesting formula that may be considered is to index fees with per capita income. This would take care of the paying capacity of foreign students from the rich and poor countries. In fact, that is virtually what is happening in the mutual exchange of students between IIT, Delhi and the University of Massachusetts. The American student pays the American fee and the Delhi students pay the Indian fee.

*Quality of foreign students* The genuine interest in admitting foreign students is balanced by considerable concern about the quality of students seeking admission. Neither the faculty nor administrators are interested in admitting poor quality students. A preference has been indicated for mature postgraduate students who come with a specific objective, preferably sponsored by an employer. It is felt, however, some selection procedure should be evolved so that there is check on the quality of student intake.

There is a wide variation in the standard of education and preparedness of the students who come from the various countries. Many faculties have observed that the undergraduate students in general are weak in the basic fundamentals of Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics. One reason could be that the standard of education in the high schools of these countries is not up to mark. The other reason could be that good quality students are not enrolling for studies here.

In this connection, a question arises whether it would be possible to match the quality of students to the standards of education imparted. In India, there is a wide variation in the standards of education provided

by the different types of technical institutions. The five IITs have a very high standard and are geared to the capabilities of the cream of the student population. These are admitted through a very difficult and highly competitive Joint Entrance Examination (JEE) conducted as a common examination for the five IITs.

It was reported that, as an experiment, the JEE papers were administered to students of California Institute of Technology, by one of the teachers. It was found that few could perform creditably. That was not because the students were not good, but because JEE requires a thorough preparation. Such a preparation itself gives the IIT students a head start. Because foreign students have not come through the drill of JEE, they begin with a serious handicap. They are unable to cope with IIT standards right from the very beginning. The situation is similar with regard to other prestigious technical universities like UOR.

The data on the performance of foreign students, as reported in the case study on IIT, Delhi, showed that a number of students left without completing their course. Discussion with foreign students revealed that some students left voluntarily because they were unable to cope with the high academic standards and pressures. There have also been instances where the students were forced to withdraw as the institute regulations did not permit students to continue in the course if they failed to make the required grades. The foreign students have been permitted a slow pace and they have often taken about six years to complete the course, whereas almost all the Indian students complete the same course in the prescribed minimum of four years.

In the UOR no separate analysis of the performance of foreign students was available. The observations of the faculty, however, were very similar to the experience of IIT, Delhi. It has also been observed that the self-financing students are comparatively less competent academically. These students are unable to cope with the studies and fail to complete the requirements. Terminating their registration creates human problems, as these students have spent all their money and they have nowhere to go.

There is a general feeling that the performance of foreign postgraduate students is better than that of foreign undergraduate students. Most of the latter have obtained their first degree from an Indian university. Often they are mature persons who are working in some organisation and have been sponsored for a specific purpose.

In discussion, foreign students accepted that they did find it difficult to cope with the high standard of education in the IITs and that they were not able to compete with Indian students. On the graduate

programme, the pressure is very high. They fail in the first semester itself, unable to keep up with the academic pressure which starts from day one. This totally demoralises them and the academic handicap becomes cumulative, as there is no time to make up for the deficiency. Though remedial programmes are offered, they find it difficult to manage simultaneously both the regular assignments and the remedial programme. Academic failure leads to many other problems. These students do not mix freely with the more competent Indian students, and feel isolated. Further, this has a negative psychological impact affecting their self-concept. Sometimes, this leads to discipline problems.

Poor command of the English language, which is the medium of instruction in these technical institutions, is another problem which compounds the issue.

Some suggestions have been made for handling this problem. One obvious solution is providing remedial or bridge courses for these students. The questions are where, when and who would provide the remedial programme? Discussions with IIT and Roorkee faculty indicate that they are neither interested, nor have the time nor the motivation to provide such a service. It is reported that some students do take help from outside agencies at an exorbitant cost. It would be worthwhile examining the feasibility of identifying an external agency who could provide this service.

There are very high quality prestigious schools in India which prepare the students for engineering education. Foreign students might benefit by enrolling in these schools for a year. During this time, they could improve both their subject and language proficiency. Setting up remedial coaching laboratories using educational technology and language laboratories might help to bridge the gap to some extent. Alternatively the foreign students could be given a slow paced programme giving them more time to complete their courses.

In any case, as other writers in this book have stressed, proper counselling about the differential standards of education in the various institutions in the country is important. Given the choice, foreign students would like to study in high-prestige institutions as these are recognised as institutions of excellence all over the world and have a better market value. Yet, in their own interest, it is better to direct them to an institution where they will have a good chance of completing the course successfully. The choice is between better assurance of completion in an institution with less demanding standards and the risk of non-completion in a more demanding one. In either case, it would be better

to select, at the beginning itself, the right type of students.

*Selection of foreign students* For the group admission of foreign students, the UOR conducted its own examinations at the countries concerned and 'selected' the best of those who took the examination. As regards the Government of India cultural exchange sponsored students, and self-financing students, the institutions in the country have no say in the quality of students being admitted. The equivalence of the qualifying examination in the respective countries is verified to check against the entry requirement, but the experience is that this does not give any indication about the actual level of competence of individual students. It has been suggested that India should conduct its own examination to screen the students. Foreign students agreed that this would give them an indication of the standard required and they would come prepared. The logistics of conducting an examination outside the country appear formidable, however. As an alternative, these students may be asked to take internationally recognised standard tests like SAT, GRE, GMAT, etc, and admissions may be based on such scores.

Another issue relating to the selection of foreign students pertains to the procedure adopted. This has already been discussed in Chapter 6. It may be noted here that where an MOU exists between identified institutions, the admission process is smooth. Clear guidelines, criteria and procedures are laid down in the MOUs and this makes the process of admission easy. For decentralised admission to succeed, the capabilities of institutions in India for foreign students should first be identified. Specific institution building schemes should be instituted to enhance the capacity to train foreign students.

The IITs and other apex institutions have the required capacity and competence. The problems lie lower down the vast and varied system of technical higher education, where inadequacies are already experienced by Indian students. If the apex institutions are to relate to the rest of the system, there is a clear need for capacity-strengthening in the colleges, to serve both Indian and any foreign students. The components of a coherent strategy for developing capacity have been identified earlier in this book.

## *Reflections*

India's Institutes of Technology and Technical Universities comprise a unique asset within the nation's higher education, which is of demonstrable benefit to its scientific and economic development. They are also

an asset to world scholarship and are in a very particular way India's contribution to an international commonwealth of scholars. They should thus give India an advantage when it comes to international student mobility. Foreign graduates of these institutions should certainly be able to enhance India's reputation, both generally and in the field of higher education, and the goodwill mentioned earlier should certainly be generated by them.

The study of student mobility in India's technological institutions showed that there is still under utilisation of available potential for training foreign students. The top institutions have, in general, a favourable disposition towards admitting them. At the same time, there is considerable concern about the quality of candidates who currently present themselves for admission. Ways and means have to be found for attracting good quality students and thus matching the calibre of students coming in to the standard of higher education imparted.

The starting point would be a clear policy, both governmental and institutional. Strategies on admission procedures, finance and information must also be put in place, along lines suggested in earlier chapters. *Information* is essential if potential applicants are to have an awareness of what India has to offer in high-class technological education. Only when awareness spreads, will scholarship opportunities be fully taken up by foreign students and will the foreigners who come to the IITs and the technological universities will be able to compete with their Indian counterparts and provide challenge and stimulus to both fellow students and teachers.

Only when this happens will India begin to capitalise on a major asset in Commonwealth higher education and will the Commonwealth itself reap benefit. Because of these institutions' importance is it too visionary to suggest the possibility of a Commonwealth Institute of Technology, to be set up in India along the lines of the Asian Institute of Technology in Bangkok? Such an Institute would gain from being part of the IIT network, but would perhaps be in a stronger position to cater to the needs of international students.

# 13

## *Open to Talent*

### *Higher Education in Singapore*

---

S Gopinathan

#### *Preliminary*

It is appropriate to close this book with a picture of student mobility in Singapore, since the meeting which generated this book was held there. Singapore also presents a unique case. It was noted in Part Three that Nigeria is almost alone in having an explicit government policy on foreign students. For that government and for most other writers in this book, the policy drives are the perceived international nature of universities and the goals of national foreign policy. In the case of Singapore, there is a third drive, related to home policy as well, since it is in its own interest, in its very unusual position and circumstances, to be open to talent.

#### *Tertiary education in Singapore*

As Singapore is an ex-British colony, its education system, and especially tertiary education system, has distinct British characteristics. However, in the more recent past, and especially with the establishment of the Nanyang Technological University, more American links and features, like the modular system, are becoming evident. Tertiary education exists at two levels, viz: the two universities; and the four polytechnics; with a number of private sector institutions that offer a combination of diploma and degree courses - the latter normally offered in collaboration with overseas universities, which award the degrees. No degree courses are offered at the polytechnics, but some 500 places are available at the universities for high-achieving polytechnic students.

*The National University of Singapore*, Singapore's oldest university, was established as the University of Malaya in 1949 to serve both Malaya and Singapore (see also Chapter 10). Out of the University of Malaya grew University of Singapore, established in 1962 to serve Singapore and which grew rapidly into a comprehensive university in the 1970s and 1980s. In 1980 following the recommendations of the Dainton Report (1980), the university merged with Nanyang University, a small Chinese-medium institution, to form the National University of Singapore. NUS teaches the largest number of courses and has currently an enrolment of about 17,000.

It has traditionally been, by virtue of its history, the major tertiary institution receiving foreign students, both at undergraduate and post-graduate level. Its rapid expansion also fuelled an influx of expatriate faculty and research and development scientists who work at the specialised research institutes, such as the Institute of Systems Science.

*The Nanyang Technological Institute* was established in 1981, at a time of rapid economic growth and when Singapore's need for highly trained manpower, especially in the engineering and business fields, was most acute. It was originally intended that it would evolve into a technological university but when the need for a second comprehensive university became apparent in the late eighties the Nanyang Technological University, based on a 'hybrid US model', was established in 1991. At the time of its establishment, the Institute of Education, Singapore's premier teacher education institution, was upgraded to the National Institute of Education and incorporated within NTU. NTU has a student enrolment of about 10,000.

The four *polytechnics*, The Singapore Polytechnic (1959), Ngee Ann Polytechnic (1963), Temasek Polytechnic (1990) and Nanyang Polytechnic (1992) concentrate on meeting Singapore's need for technician and diploma-level manpower, especially in the engineering and business fields. The polytechnics offer a wide variety of courses, for example, land surveying, polymers, courses in commerce, in health-related areas, in design and fashion and computer studies. Total polytechnic enrolment stood at 17,106 in 1991. In contrast to the universities, the polytechnics offer part-time courses for working adults, have close links with employers and industry and are generally seen as being more flexible and vocation-oriented. All the polytechnics seek to be seen as credible training and education institutions and all have various links with polytechnics and universities abroad to provide for specialised courses.

*Private sector institutions* In the light of recent Government

statements promising greater diversification of tertiary education we should take note as well of the Singapore Institute of Management (SIM). SIM is an independent, self-financing management organisation founded in 1964, with the aim of developing managerial skills and talent to contribute to expansion and strengthening of the economy. In 1989, SIM offered four Master's, two Bachelor's degrees and 15 Diploma and Certificate programmes, with a total enrolment in these programmes of 8,108. The Master's programmes were conducted with Brunel/Henley (500 students), George Washington (23), Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (27) and Rutgers (16). The last three programmes were launched in 1989. The Bachelor's degree programmes, which are organised with the University of London and the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, have a total enrolment of 805 students in both the full and part-time modes. A new Diploma in Economics programme awarded by the University of London was launched in 1989. Offered in full-time and part-time modes, it provides 'A' level students who successfully complete the one-year programme in Singapore direct second year admission to the University of London's BSc programme.

The Singapore Institute of Management has also been identified as the organisation to link up with the United Kingdom's Open University to offer distance learning degree programmes in Singapore. Three programmes will be offered beginning 1994, viz: BA (English Language and Literature); BSc (Mathematics), and BSc (Computer Science). Annual intakes of 500 are planned and the OUDP is expected to have eventually an enrolment of about 6,000 students. One of the conditions of the agreement imposed by the Open University is, however, said to be that no non-Singapore residents be admitted to the programme.

Yet another example of privately operated tertiary education in Singapore is provided by the six or so private education centres who offer, between them, almost 1,000 places to students who wish to read for a Bachelor of Law degree from the University of London (External). The duration is three years and those who wish to practise must then go to the UK to prepare and sit for the Bar examinations set by the Council of Legal Education. The basic qualification is either two 'A' level passes or three 'O' levels plus a pass in the Associated Examining Board examination. The cost of tuition is comparable to NUS but costs go up when Bar preparation is included.

## *Student flow issues: The Singapore context*

Before we look at specific aspects of issues related to student mobility it is necessary to understand something of the context within which tertiary institutions operate. The first is that Singapore - bereft of natural resources - has, since independence, paid great attention to human resource development. Educational investment has been high and the policy has been one of steady growth without compromising on quality, particularly regarding entry requirements. At the University of Singapore, for instance, student enrolment (excluding post-graduate) rose from 1,641 in 1961 to 9,078 in 1980 and higher still to 16,714 in 1989. The general philosophy of the government has been to avoid over-rapid expansion and to align enrolment patterns to perceived manpower needs. This policy, combined with high economic growth has resulted in a strong tertiary education system, well-resourced and credible, both at home and in the region.

The public demand for post-secondary qualifications has, however, put an increasing pressure on the government to provide yet more places. A number of reasons can be cited. Standards have risen in secondary education and more students are now deemed to be capable of profiting from tertiary education. Increasing affluence, and still favourable rates-of-return to post-secondary and specialised qualifications, add to the demand. And if places are not available locally, more and more parents are willing to invest in study abroad. About 10,000 Singapore students are said to be studying for degrees abroad.

A third aspect worth noting is that Singapore has traditionally been a major *regional* source of opportunities in higher education. Nanyang University, for instance, was established to provide Chinese-medium tertiary education throughout South-East Asia. Because both Malaya and Singapore were under British rule, there has traditionally been a flow of students between the two countries; the University of Malaya was originally intended to serve both countries. What has kept up the flow of Malaysian Chinese students in the present has been the Malaysian government's policy of affirmative action in favour of Malays to redress ethnic imbalances, and the decision to promote the use of Bahasa Malaysia in tertiary education (see Chapter 10).

Finally, there is the publicly stated policy in Singapore that since Singapore, due to its small population, has a small talent pool, it needs to remain open to talent from outside Singapore. Four objectives have been identified for allowing foreign students to study in Singapore's universities:

- 1 That this will add to the talent pool and augment expertise since some of these students will choose to work in Singapore.
- 2 That, even if such students return to their countries, they will take with them a good impression of Singapore, its ethos and ideals, and generate goodwill for Singapore.
- 3 Singapore students benefit from interacting with foreign students since this enables them to broaden their intellectual and social horizons.
- 4 Future political and economic co-operation can be enhanced since the political leadership is likely to be drawn from the tertiary education elite.

At present there are attempts to recruit qualified persons from the People's Republic of China, Taiwan, Hong Kong and India to add to Singapore's pool of expertise. Allied to this is the view that Singapore's economy is global-oriented and will become increasingly so. Talent shortage and economic imperatives thus impel Singapore to remain open to foreign students. Accordingly, the current policy is to set aside up to 20 per cent of first year places at the universities for non-Singaporean students. Though this policy has been clearly stated and defended, it is not without its detractors. The complaint has been principally that:

... foreign students deprive Singaporeans of places in the 2 universities, driving some of them abroad to study. (*Straits Times* 2/6/1991)

Others feel that the supposed benefits may be overstated, and outweigh the disadvantages arising from admitting foreign students.

### ***Foreign students at Singapore's tertiary institutions***

We noted earlier that the Singapore government had set aside a quota of 20 per cent of first year places for foreign entrants at the two universities. In practice, this figure has never been reached. According to a *Straits Times* report 2/6/1991 about 17 per cent of students at the NTU are non-Singaporeans while at NUS the figures vary from four per cent in the Arts and Social Science faculty to 14 per cent in the Engineering faculty. The largest number of undergraduate places is taken up by students from Malaysia, with a few from the other ASEAN countries. Students from the People's Republic of China and from South Asian

countries, notably India, are found mostly in postgraduate programmes. At NUS, foreign students from Hong Kong and Australia are found in the medical-clinical programmes, and there are undergraduates as well from Mauritius. The figure for the polytechnics is smaller, around five per cent of total intake at the Singapore Polytechnic. At Temasek Polytechnic the figure is 3.6 per cent with the largest number coming from Malaysia.

All respondents to my questionnaire on student mobility were agreed that the *socio-political and educational contexts* were supportive of enhanced student flows. All referred to the reasons advanced by the government in encouraging foreign student flows. It was noted that individual faculties had introduced a limited number of schemes for exchange students. When asked what might be considered a deterrent to student mobility, two issues/aspects were identified, both of which are also prominent in other Commonwealth countries, according to the evidence of earlier contributors to this book. It was noted that tertiary institutions in Singapore tended to have a rigid course structure and therefore found it difficult to assess equivalences of courses and programmes taken at other overseas universities; exemptions for courses taken at other institutions were therefore difficult to obtain. A second difficulty arose from the commitment to provide Singaporean students with experience of hostel life, though it was recognised that foreign students were most in need of reasonably-priced accommodation, especially if they came from poorer countries. Though some hostel places were in fact set aside for them, it was difficult in practice to meet all their requirements.

*Sensitive aspects of policy* As was to be expected, the perception that deserving Singapore students would be denied places as a result of admitting foreign students, and that this would create difficulties for the university, ranked high. A second concern had to do with the financial cost of admitting foreign students to the universities. Though in practice foreign students pay a higher rate of fees, this would not meet the full cost of a tertiary education and the problems of using taxpayers' money to subsidise the costs of foreign student study in Singapore was noted. It was also observed in one submission that although the foreign student was often a high achiever in his/her home context, not all of them were able to cope with the rigorous academic programme in Singapore's institutions, so that Singapore's experience matches that of the Indian Institutes of Technology reported by Dr Indiresan in Chapter 12.

Sometimes, this had to do with the students' command of English,

Singapore's tertiary medium of instruction, sometimes with study and work practices – two to three hour written end-of-year examinations, which are common in Singapore's universities, are daunting challenges to many foreign students – and the inability to overcome quickly the disorientation that comes with living and competing in a different academic and social milieu. As in India, failures or referrals among foreign students posed administrative and academic problems for the university authorities, and made it difficult to make a case for steady expansion. Finally, it was also pointed out that as many students considered Singapore a good study destination, and the Singapore government would be pleased to have the best of them work in Singapore after graduation, there was a clear recognition on the part of both government and university officials that the 'recruitment' of foreign students into Singapore's institutions was a sensitive matter, since other governments rightly feared a 'brain drain'.

An interesting feature of the Singapore situation with regard to foreign students is the mechanism by which such students are admitted. Singapore actively seeks well-qualified foreign students to enter its tertiary institutions, since official policy is thereby to widen Singapore's talent pool. This is clearest where postgraduate students are concerned. Singapore sees its future economic prosperity to lie in a knowledge-based economy with a strong indigenous R & D component.

Thus a national goal is to increase the number of research scientists and engineers from 29 out of every 10,000 workers to 40. Singapore, at the moment anyway, does not have the numbers to reach this goal and must recruit abroad. One mechanism is the offer of places in postgraduate programmes at the two universities. There is active recruitment for and encouragement of qualified students to study in Singapore, some of whom are funded by a five-year S\$158 million Manpower Development Programme. This plan includes 100 Industrial Fellowships a year, awarded for Master's and Doctorate studies. The other avenue is through the award competitive government scholarships for ASEAN and Hong Kong students to study at secondary and sixth form levels and upon successful completion of studies to apply to local universities. Both these programmes are likely to continue for some time to come and can be seen as positive, state-level mechanisms to increase student mobility.

As it is to be expected, institutions, in line with government rationales, welcomed the prospect of having foreign students in their midst; they recognised, in particular, the acute challenge faced at the postgraduate level if the government's ambitious targets were to be met. As

we noted earlier, since the permitted level of 20 per cent had not been met, there was excess capacity available in terms of foreign students. It is likely, however, that universities will wish to be more accommodating only if standards are not compromised; by their very nature university places are intensely competed for.

Tertiary education officials are clear that admission would only be possible if the quality of the foreign student is 'much superior to the local average'. The establishment of two new polytechnics in the last three years will mean an eventual increase in places and thus further expansion of foreign student intake in these institutions should be possible. According to one respondent, at the university level, foreign students are less likely to benefit if they move into Humanities and Social Science courses, and more likely to benefit in the Engineering, Computer Science, and Business Studies courses, for instance. This view was based on the belief that equipment and facilities were superior in Singapore's tertiary institutions in these areas; besides, it would appear that more university places were available in these areas.

All respondents recognised that the student from abroad, often ill at ease in a foreign social and academic environment, needed assistance and guidance. At the institutional level, it was noted that there was a need to ensure successful integration and programme completion if the objectives of foreign student mobility were to be met. It was pointed out by one respondent that while institutions tended to concentrate on assessing the prospective foreign student's academic qualifications little attention was paid to the student's ability to adapt, an ability that would be crucial to academic success. In particular, female students from less urbanised countries faced a daunting challenge in adjustment and adaptation. Many of the other concerns expressed by staff of institutions on the reception of foreign students were similar to those reported from other countries in earlier chapters. Some which only emerged from the Singapore study are given below.

Respondents expressed a need for more systematic institutional development of infrastructure to cope with the needs and problems of foreign students. One suggestion was for the establishment of a *Foreign Student Advisory Service* as a separate autonomous unit. Such a unit, and the autonomy this would provide would enable planning and services to be organised in a pro-active manner and lead to better integration of foreign students.

There was also recognition that flexible, short-term attachments or even exchange schemes would be desirable. It was posited that the crucial variables in the success of these programmes were *duration of*

*attachment*, with one academic year considered ideal, the availability of hostel accommodation to encourage better student-student interactions, strong official recognition at the institutional level and a good degree of staff interest and involvement.

In addition, attention was given to the role of academic staff in promoting both student mobility and the cause of student mobility. It was noted that there was often no incentive for staff to deal with foreign students, and some staff might feel the demands of catering to the needs of foreign students took up too much time. Time-off on workload would be a feasible option. However, the point ought to be made to academics that they are part of a global scholarly network with an obligation therefore to promote the cause of student mobility. Also, academic staff were more likely to travel abroad on sabbatical and on conferences than university administrators or student liaison officers and thus were in a better position to judge quality and standards and indeed, at the postgraduate level, to act as recruiters of students. Academic staff are a potential valuable resource and policy making to improve student mobility should include a bigger role for them.

The financial burden on foreign students was emphasised and institutions have no power to vary fee regimes or provide subsidies. Current practice at the universities was to charge ASEAN foreign students one and a half times the home student fees and non-ASEAN students three times more. There is, however, a *Study Loan Scheme* available to foreign students at NUS, which provides an interest-free loan, repayable by instalment over a maximum period of five years. The amount of the loan varies from S\$300 to S\$12,300 in a year.

## *Conclusion*

Singapore is one of the few countries that has made an explicit official statement about the benefits of having foreign students intermix with its national student population, and indeed set a number/percentage that could be admitted. Yet, while foreign students are welcomed, and indeed many foreign students view Singapore as a good place to study, the quota is in all respects unfulfilled (although the gap between the quota and numbers recruited is less than that reported for other countries studied in this book). This underlines the point that without a properly developed infrastructure and agreed procedures, which must involve not just university authorities but also other state institutions such as immigration, the ideal of increased student mobility cannot be successfully met.

Singapore's experience and success in attracting students from Malaysia also points to a potentially sensitive aspect of student flows. The literature often suggests or treats student flows as non-problematic in terms of nationality. Very often the benefits of cross-border study are emphasised but the flow of students from less developed to more developed countries in the South raises fears of a brain drain. This issue will have to be dealt with sensitively if relations are not to be muddled.

Another major aspect of the Singapore experience is that of the 'problem' of credit recognition or equivalences. One of the reasons why students seek to study abroad is the perception that standards are higher and therefore international recognition of degrees earned is more assured. But high standards in the host country are often jealously guarded and a lack of knowledge and/or perception of lower standards in the sending countries then acts as a barrier to increased mobility. At the very least there should be Commonwealth Secretariat initiatives to make standards more widely known and objectively to establish equivalences.

Finally, the issue of language standards must be addressed. It is often assumed that the use of the medium of English in tertiary education eases student flows within the Commonwealth. That it certainly does, but the bland observation hides problems related to levels of language competence appropriate to tertiary studies. In our experience, some foreign students find the challenge of writing demanding examination papers within time constraints difficult. Attention therefore needs to be paid to this issue to ensure successful completion of programmes.

Three positive features in the Singapore socio-educational environment promise a better environment for increased student mobility. Increasingly, the government is pushing the idea of a global orientation for Singapore's economy and citizens. Large Singapore companies are being urged to set up offices abroad and Singaporeans in professional occupations like law are being urged to set up abroad. Increased attention is being paid to subjects like European Studies at the University, and the teaching of foreign languages at the school and tertiary level. This opening to the foreign will further improve the conditions for increased student flows. Secondly, as a result of indigenous pressure and needs, post-secondary education and post-graduate education is being expanded. Such expansion also improves prospects for increased student mobility. Finally, both universities are expanding hostel facilities, which should also help the cause of mobility.

# APPENDICES

---

## **1 Summary statistical tables on student mobility**

- 1 All international students abroad, 1989
- 2 Main Commonwealth senders of students to US 1990, with student numbers
- 3 Intra-Commonwealth student mobility flows to four main host countries
- 4 Percentage change in numbers of students from abroad hosted by Australia, Britain, Canada and New Zealand 1980–1990 and 1988–1990
- 5 Number of postgraduate and undergraduate overseas students in higher education in UK, 1990
- 6 Increase in Commonwealth students in Australia, Britain and Canada 1988–1990

## **2 Commonwealth Universities Study Abroad Consortium**

Explanation

CUSAC agreement

Points to be taken into account in drafting agreements:

CUSAC guidelines

# *Appendix 1*

## *Summary Statistical Tables on Student Mobility*

---

Originally prepared by Geoffrey Coyne for meeting of Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility and Higher Education co-operation with representatives of Commonwealth Governments, June 17-19, 1992.

**TABLE 1: All international students abroad 1989**

<i>Host Counties</i>	<i>Commonwealth Students</i>		<i>Non-Commonwealth Students</i>		<i>Total</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Commonwealth	72,600	32	91,200	11	163,800	15
USA	117,900	51	269,000	31	386,900	36
EC (excluding UK, Greece, Lux.)	16,700	7	311,100	36	327,800	30
Other	22,300	10	185,100	22	207,400	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>229,500</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>856,400</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1085,900</b>	<b>100</b>

*Sources:* Unesco, Institute of International Education, New York, British Council, Commonwealth Secretariat.

**TABLE 2: Main Commonwealth senders of students to US 1990, with student numbers**

	1984	1990	
India	14,600	28,900	+ 14,300
Canada	15,400	18,400	
Malaysia	21,700	13,600	- 8,100
Hong Kong	10,100	12,600	
Pakistan	4,800	7,700	
Britain	6,000	7,300	
Singapore	3,800	4,500	
Nigeria	18,400	3,700	- 14,700
Bangladesh	2,000	2,500	
Jamaica	2,200	2,500	
Other Commonwealth	18,300	20,800	+ 2,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>117,300</b>	<b>122,500</b>	<b>+ 5,200</b>

**TABLE 3: Intra-Commonwealth student mobility flows to four main countries (nos in '000s)**

	1980				1984			
	<i>Com. Wealth</i>	<i>Non Com. Wealth</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>% CW</i>	<i>Com. Wealth</i>	<i>Non Com. Wealth</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>% CW</i>
Australia	6.4	1.0	7.4	86	11.0	1.9	13.0	85
Britain	41.3	34.4	75.7	55	28.2	28.1	56.3	50
Canada	19.1	17.4	36.5	52	23.9	18.3	42.2	57
New Zealand	1.8	0.3	2.1	86	1.9	0.4	2.3	83
Total, 4 Countries	68.6	53.1	121.7	56	65.0	48.7	113.8	57
	1988				1990			
	<i>Com. Wealth</i>	<i>Non Com. Wealth</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>% CW</i>	<i>Com. Wealth</i>	<i>Non Com. Wealth</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>% CW</i>
Australia	11.5	4.2	15.7	73	16.3	8.4	24.7	66
Britain	31.5	38.4	69.9	45	36.3	48.3	84.6	43
Canada	17.5	25.0	42.5	41	22.9	37.1	60.6	38
New Zealand	2.0	1.7	3.7	54	1.5	1.4	2.9	52
Total, 4 Countries	62.5	69.3	131.8	47	77.0	95.2	172.8	45

Note: Britain's percentage share

	<i>Commonwealth</i>	<i>Non Commonwealth</i>	<i>Total</i>
1980	60	65	62
1984	43	88	49
1988	50	55	53
1990	47	50	49

**TABLE 4: Percentage change in numbers of students from abroad by Australia, Britain, Canada and New Zealand, 1980 to 1990 and 1988 to 1990**

Host Country	1980 to 1990			1988 to 1990		
	Common-wealth	Non Common-wealth	Total	Common-wealth	Non Common-wealth	Total
Australia	154.7	740.0	233.8	41.7	100.0	57.3
Britain	- 12.1	+ 40.4	+ 11.8	15.2	25.8	21.0
Canada	19.9	113.2	66.0	30.9	48.4	42.6
New Zealand	+ 366.7	- 16.7	+ 38.1	- 25.0	- 17.6	- 21.6
Total 4 Countries	12.2	80.4	42.0	23.2	38.2	31.1

**TABLE 5: Number of postgraduate and undergraduate overseas students in higher education in UK, 1990**

A = wealthier countries, B = poorer countries

	Postgrad.	Under grad.	Total	% Postgrad. 1990	% 1986
(A) Australia, Canada, New Zealand	1,247	542	1,789	70	(73)
(A) Malaysia, Hong Kong, Singapore, Brunei	3,021	14,160	17,181	18	(15)
(B) India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Maldives	2,060	1,307	3,367	61	(59)
Africa 16 countries	2,734	3,609	6,343	43	(47)
(B) 4 West Africa	930	646	1,576	59	
(B) 12 East and South Africa	1,754	2,495	4,249	41	
(A) Mauritius and Seychelles	50	468	518	10	
(B) Caribbean	276	550	826	33	(27)
(A) Mediterranean	312	1,832	2,144	15	(14)
(A) South Atlantic	-	18	18	-	-
(B) Pacific	48	23	71	68	(58)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9,698</b>	<b>22,041</b>	<b>31,739</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>(32)</b>
of which A	4,630	17,020	21,650		
B	5,068	5,821	10,089		

**TABLE 6: Increase in Commonwealth students in Australia, Britain and Canada 1988-1990**

	<i>Australia</i>		<i>Britain</i>		<i>Canada</i>		<i>Total 3 countries</i>			
	1988	1990	1988	1990	1988	1990	1988	1990	<i>Increase</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Major East &amp; South-East Asia Senders</b>									<i>1988-90</i>	<i>inc.</i>
Malaysia	7,850	8,104	6,181	7,682	1,627	1,819	15,658	17,605	+1,947	12.4
Hong Kong	1,569	4,045	7,106	7,537	7,400	9,199	16,075	20,781	+4,706	29.3
Singapore	1,051	2,241	1,992	2,448	1,210	1,307	4,253	5,996	+1,743	41.0
	10,470 (91%)	14,390 (88%)	15,279 (49%)	17,667 (49%)	10,237 (59%)	12,325 (54%)	35,986 (60%)	44,382 (59%)	+8,396 (56%)	23.3
<b>Other High and Middle Income</b>										
Cyprus	n.s.	n.s.	1,554	1,939	n.s.	n.s.	1,544	1,939	+395	25.6
Australia										
Britain	266	294	1,441	1,847	1,305	1,776	3,212	3,917	+705	21.9
Canada										
	266 (2%)	294 (2%)	2,995 (9%)	3,786 (10%)	1,305 (7%)	1,776 (8%)	4,756 (8%)	5,856 (8%)	+1,100 (7%)	23.1
	<i>Australia</i>		<i>Britain</i>		<i>Canada</i>		<i>Total 3 countries</i>			
	1988	1990	1988	1990	1988	1990	1988	1990	<i>Increase</i>	<i>%</i>
									<i>1988-90</i>	<i>inc.</i>
<b>Special Factors</b>										
Pakistan & Namibia	Non-CW	n.s.	Non-CW	1,418	Non-CW	n.s.	Non-CW	1,418	+1,418	
Sri Lanka	137	428	619	725	213	1,432	969	2,587	+1,618	167.0
	137 (1%)	428 (3%)	619 (2%)	2,143 (7%)	213 (1%)	1,432 (6%)	969 (2%)	4,005 (5%)	3,036 (20%)	313.3
Total of all countries	10,873 (95%)	15,112 (93%)	19,077 (61%)	23,596 (65%)	11,755 (67%)	15,641 (68%)	41,711 (69%)	54,243 (72%)	12,532 (84%)	30.0
All other Commonwealth countries	621 (6%)	1,207 (7%)	12,453 (39%)	12,673 (35%)	5,695 (33%)	7,233 (32%)	18,763 (31%)	21,219* (28%)	2,456 (16%)	13.1
Total Commonwealth Students	11,494	16,319	31,530	36,269	17,450	22,874	60,474	75,462	14,988	24.8

\* Of which approximately one third in 1990 accounted for by India (3,367) Kenya (2,065) Nigeria (1,273)

## *Appendix 2*

### *Commonwealth Universities Study Abroad Consortium*

---

#### *Explanation*

After studying the Singapore workshop's draft report (1992), the Commonwealth Standing Committee in Student Mobility and Higher Education Co-operation at its meeting in June 1992 endorsed a suggestion that a consortium of Commonwealth universities be set up, to promote pilot student mobility projects.

The Consortium has drawn 28 Commonwealth universities into initial membership and a steering committee came together in New Delhi in April 1993 to discuss ways of putting projects into effect. It was agreed that the best start would be through separate agreements by pairs of member universities.

As noted in Chapter 1, the official launch of CUSAC was on 10 August, 1993. On this occasion the Vice-Chancellors of the member universities signed the agreement which follows:

#### *CUSAC agreement*

Member universities of the Consortium agree to provide opportunities for their students to study in other member universities as a part of their course, and to initiate joint programmes for this purpose.

They agree to accept the following obligations, as appropriate:

#### **Obligations of home (sending) universities**

- 1 To select students for participation in the programme, ensuring adequate qualifying standards in consultation with the host university.

- 2 To provide the host university with a full academic record for each participating student.
- 3 To accept approved programmes of work completed satisfactorily abroad for full credit towards its own awards.
- 4 To negotiate with the host institution on tuition and accommodation arrangements and to ensure payment if required.
- 5 To make every effort to assist participating students meet any additional cost of studying in the host university.
- 6 To prepare their students for the period of study overseas, and to inform them before they go of the arrangements agreed for academic credit, for finance and for accommodation.

#### **Obligations of host (receiving) universities**

- 1 To prepare full information about the university and the country, including academic programmes and living conditions.
- 2 To provide when required, information about the costs of tuition and living.
- 3 To facilitate entry into the country for study purposes.
- 4 To make arrangements for reception on arrival.
- 5 To design a suitable programme of study for each student or group of students, in consultation as necessary with their home institutions.
- 6 To provide, as necessary, supplementary tutorial assistance for students on the programme.
- 7 To provide a full record of academic attainment at the end of a student's programme.
- 8 To ensure the availability of satisfactory living accommodation either on or off campus.
- 9 To provide continuing advice and support on health and general welfare throughout the period of study, and to designate an adviser on these and other matters.

#### ***CUSAC guidelines***

At its meeting in New Delhi in April, 1993, the Consortium Steering Committee agreed on the following list of points to be taken into account in the preparation of agreements, each of which will, however, have to be drafted in the light of the specific circumstances and needs of the universities concerned.

## **A Academic**

- 1 Duration of study (semester, academic year?), with exact dates
- 2 Numbers and levels of students involved
- 3 Arrangements for participating students
- 4 Arrangements for agreeing study programmes
- 5 Credit to be given by home university for work in host university
- 6 Preparation needed for students in home university
- 7 Methods of assessment by host university: form of transcript to be provided

## **B Finance**

- 1 Full cost to the host university to be worked out, and the manner in which it is to be covered.
- 2 Total costs, including 'tuition' and 'living', to be worked out, making clear which are to be covered by each university, and which by the student.
- 3 Clear and equitable rules for any financial assistance to students.

## **C Welfare**

A student living and working in a strange country may face special problems, and the institution has a responsibility to take care of these as far as it can, just as it would for any guest. This should be assigned to designated individuals, who may be the same as the administrative liaison officer, or one of the student wardens or counsellors if these exist. It is also desirable to involve, as far as possible, interested faculty and community members; these may be prepared to join some sort of a programme of activities and a range of services from abroad. Particular issues that should be taken care of include:

### **1 Arrival**

A student coming from overseas should normally be met at the airport on first arrival. At the very least, he or she should have, before leaving the home country, clear and full instructions on how to get to the university, who to contact there and what to do if they are not met. Telephone numbers of university contact points should be included in the 'joining instructions'.

### **2 Living accommodation and food**

This can be one of the most difficult issues, both for the students and for the university. It is generally desirable for the student from abroad to be given priority allocation in whatever residential accommodation for national students there may be, since one of

the purposes of being there is to mix with them. Nevertheless, it will sometimes be necessary to arrange private accommodation. Careful consideration will have to be given to cultural differences, and it may be desirable to provide briefing for both students and their hosts. Provision for different dietary habits is particularly important. It must be recognised that there are likely to be housing and feeding problems for foreign students which are even greater than those of national students, and these have to be dealt with by the host university as best it can.

### 3 Behaviour

It may be useful to prepare some guidance material for foreign students on the cultural norms of the country, where these are likely to differ from those at home. Such differences should be realistically described, but not exaggerated; they may be particularly important for women in some cases.

### 4 Orientation

Soon after the beginning of the session a special orientation and hospitality programme should be arranged for students from abroad. Both national students and faculty members should be involved, especially those who have themselves studied abroad. It is important in the first few weeks for the community to appear particularly welcoming. Written guidance should be provided on such matters as:

- travel, transport, telephone and postal facilities
- cultural practices, for example, tipping, dress, relations with the opposite sex
- banking and shopping facilities
- location of religious centres
- campus organisation and services
- employment regulations
- health precautions

### 5 Health

Students from abroad should be encouraged to make full use of whatever university medical facilities exist. It is better for new arrivals in tropics to seek too much rather than too little medical advice. Some written guidance on local health precautions will also be useful. There may also be provision for some special health problems which require additional private treatment either locally, or even, in extreme cases, back home. If it is possible to insure against this in their home countries before leaving, students should be encouraged, or perhaps compelled, to do so. Home

universities should advise hosts of any special health problems of individual students.

**6 Community involvement**

Students' experience of the country should not be confined to the campus. Steps should be taken to arrange joint activities with the community outside the university, including if possible expeditions to other parts of the country. Opportunities may be sought to involve students in projects of benefit to the local community, such as assisting in local schools; students will feel better about their experience if they are able to offer something in return.

**7 Counselling**

Even where there is no general counselling service in the university, it must be recognised that foreign students, many of whom may be living away from their own countries for the first time, may encounter special difficulties with their studies and with their lives. They will have no families and, at least at first, no friends to turn to for help. It is up to the university, as a caring host, to offer a substitute to whom students can turn for immediate counselling on any problem.

# REFERENCES

---

- Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU), 1988, *What can we do for our countries? The contribution of universities to national development*, Report of the proceedings of the fourteenth congress of Universities of the Commonwealth, Perth February 1988, ACU, London
- Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU), 1990a, *Awards for post-graduate study at Commonwealth universities, 1991–93*, ACU, London
- Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU), 1990b, *Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan. Thirtieth Annual Report*, for period ending 31 March 1990, Commonwealth Secretariat, London
- Atwell, Robert, 1992, 'Globalism or Localism: Must We Choose?' Association of International Educators Newsletter, March 1992
- Callan, Hilary and Steele, Kate, 1991, *Student flow and national policy in the European Community: A study conducted for the Commonwealth Secretariat*, Commonwealth Secretariat and UKCOSA, London
- Campus Report, 1971, Report of the committee appointed by the National Operations Council to study campus life of students of the University of Malaya, Government Printer, Kuala Lumpur
- Cardiff, Brendon, 1996, 'Education Policy and Regional Development', Background Paper for Conference on United States – European Community Co-operation in Education, Washington
- CERI (Centre for International Research and Innovation), 1990, *Innovation Exchange Activity on Higher Education and the Flow of Foreign Students*, mimeo, CERI, Paris
- Commission of the European Communities, 1990a, 'Higher Education in the European Community: The Challenges of 1992', EC Conference on Higher Education, Siena, 1992
- Commission of the European Communities, 1990b, 'Higher Education and 1992: Planning for the Year 2000. Conclusions', EC Conference on Higher Education and 1992, Siena

- Commission of the European Communities, 1991a, *Memorandum on Higher Education in the European Community*, EC, Brussels
- Commission of the European Communities, 1991b, *Task Force Daily Bulletin*, Commission of the EC, May, 1991, Brussels
- Commonwealth Secretariat, 1989a, *Progress Through Co-operation: Sixth Report of the Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility and Higher Education Co-operation*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London
- Commonwealth Secretariat, 1989b, *Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan, Tracer Study: Final Report*, ACU and Commonwealth Secretariat, London
- Commonwealth Secretariat, 1991, *Eleventh Conference of Commonwealth Education Ministers*, held in Barbados, October 1991, Commonwealth Secretariat, London
- Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility, 1983, *Report, February 1983*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London
- Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility and Higher Education Co-operation, 1992, *Favourable Fees for Commonwealth Students: The Final Frustration*, Seventh Report of the Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility and Higher Education Co-operation, June 1992, Commonwealth Secretariat, London
- Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility and Higher Education Co-operation, 1992, *Draft Report on Academic Interchange and Institution-Building*, National University of Singapore, 7–10 April 1992, Commonwealth Secretariat, London
- Commonwealth Universities Study Abroad Consortium, (CUSAC), *Summary Report of Steering Meeting*, April 1993, Delhi, Commonwealth Secretariat, London
- Coombe, Carol, 1989, *International Development Programmes in Higher Education*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London
- Dainton, Sir Frederick, 1980, *Report on University Education in Singapore*, Government Printer, Singapore
- Dines, Elizabeth, 1991, 'New Directions in International Education.' Paper presented at the IDP National Conference on International Education, September, 1991, Canberra
- Fortier, Celine, 1990, 'Les étudiants canadiens de niveau post secondaire à l'étranger', Paper prepared for the 58th congress of the Association canadienne-française pour l'avancement des sciences (ACFAS), Quebec, May 1990, Ottawa, Demographics Division, Statistics, Canada
- Garnaut, Ross, 1989, *Australia and the North East Asia Ascendancy*, AGPS, Canberra
- Hefferon, Deborah D, 1990, Commentary on the Report of the Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Study (CAFLIS): 'International Competence: A Key To America's Future', *NAFSA Newsletter*, December/January 1991

- IIE (Institute of International Education), Annual publication *Open Doors*, IIE Books, New York
- King, Kenneth, 1985, *North-South Collaboration in Higher Education: Academic Links Between Britain and the Developing World*, University of Edinburgh Centre for African Studies, Occasional Paper, Edinburgh
- Malaysia, 1967, *Report of the Higher Education Planning Committee*, Government Printer, Kuala Lumpur
- Review Committee on Postgraduate Education and Research in Engineering and Technology, 1990, *Report* June 1990, Ministry of Education and Culture, Government of India, New Delhi
- Saywell, William, 1991, 'The Internationalization of Universities' in AUCC International Division, *University Partnerships in A Changing World*. Proceedings of a conference held in Vancouver, British Columbia, September 20-21, 1990, AUCC, Ottawa
- Shive, Glen, 1991, 'Open Doors Data from IIE, 1989-90. Foreign Students and Scholars in America' Presentation to the IDP Workshop, September 11-13, 1991, Canberra, ACT, Australia, IIE United Center, 95 Queensway, Hong Kong
- Smith, Stuart L, et al *Report of the Commission of Enquiry on Canadian University Education*, under the direction of Commissioner, Stuart L Smith, AUCC, Ottawa
- Tillman, George, 1988, (revised), *Commonwealth Student Flows in an International Perspective: Update and Model for Future Monitoring*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London
- UNDP, 1992, *Human Development Report*, Oxford University Press
- Unesco, 1991, *Statistical Yearbook 1991*, Unesco, Paris
- USAID (United States Agency for International Development), 1986, *Open Doors: 1983-84 Report on International Education Exchange*, USAID, Washington DC
- UWI (University of the West Indies), 1990, *Unlocking the Potential of a Region*, UWI, Kingston, Jamaica
- UWI (University of the West Indies), Office of Academic Affairs, 1991, *UWI Co-operative Programmes With Higher Education Institutes: Guidelines for Future Development*, November 91, UWI, Kingston, Jamaica
- Vijesuriar, R, 1988, *Guide to Higher Learning in Malaysia*, Pather Publishing, Kuala Lumpur
- Williams, Lynn, 1990, *Country Studies in Student Mobility: Britain*, London, Commonwealth Secretariat
- World Bank, 1988, *Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: Policies for Adjustment, Revitalisation and Expansion*, World Bank, Washington DC
- World Bank, 1990, *Caribbean Region: Current Economic Situation, Regional Issues and Capital Flows*, World Bank, Washington, DC

# LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

---

- Dr Karuna Chanana Ahmad  
Zakir Husain Centre for Educational Studies,  
School of Social Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India
- Prof A Jones Akinpelu  
Provost, College of Education, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria
- Dr Ancilla Armstrong  
Human Resources Development Officer, Caribbean Development Bank, St  
Michael, Barbados
- Professor Lalage Bown  
Professor Emeritus, University of Glasgow, Scotland  
Associate, International Centre for Education in Development, University of  
Warwick, England
- Dr Aparna Basu  
Professor of History, University of Delhi, India
- Ms Hilary Callan  
Executive Director, European Association for International Education,  
Amsterdam, Netherlands
- Dr Elizabeth Dines  
Academic Registrar, University of Adelaide, Australia
- Dr K Peter Dzvimbo  
Dean, Faculty of Education, University of Zimbabwe, Harare, Zimbabwe
- Dr S Gopinathan  
Division of Policy and Management Studies, National Institute of Education,  
Nanyang Technological University, Republic of Singapore
- Dr J E Greene  
Pro-Vice-Chancellor, University of the West Indies
- Dr Jayalakshmi Indiresan  
Senior Fellow, National Institute of Educational Planning and  
Administration, New Delhi, India

**Associate Professor Leong Yin Ching**  
Head, Social Studies Department, Faculty of Education, University of  
Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

**Dr Jasbir S Singh**  
Chief Project Officer (Higher Education), Education Programme,  
Commonwealth Secretariat, London, UK

**Ms Kate Steele**  
Independent Researcher on higher education

**Dr Parvin Walji**  
Senior Lecturer, Department of Sociology, University of Nairobi, Nairobi,  
Kenya

Within the universities of the Commonwealth there has always been a sense of a common educational and research tradition.

A workshop was held in Singapore in April 1992 to outline the strategies and mechanisms for developing, maintaining and expanding student flows into the universities and polytechnics of the Commonwealth South and for the extension of South-South exchange. Material from the Singapore papers is here brought together in a readable form, providing:

- an historical background to the new initiatives
- a thorough analysis of the major policy issues
- a set of case studies

**Professor Lalage Bown** worked for over 30 years in African universities and has written extensively on adult education, higher education and development issues. From 1981 to 1992 she was Professor and Director of Adult and Continuing Education at the University of Glasgow and she currently holds an honorary position at the International Centre for Education in Development at the University of Warwick.

Professor Bown is a member of the Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility and Higher Education Co-operation, and was for a number of years a Board member of the British Council. She has also been President both of the British Comparative and International Education Society and of the UK Development Studies Association.

Printed and published by  
The Commonwealth Secretariat

May be purchased from  
Education Department  
Human Resource Development Division  
Commonwealth Secretariat  
Marlborough House  
London SW1Y 5HX

ISBN 0 85092 402 2

