

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE GLOBAL MARKET: OPPORTUNITIES AND THREATS*

Navin Singh

This work is produced by The Connexions Project and licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution License †

Abstract

The world is marked by the twin processes of economic and cultural globalization in an era of information technology. The identities of all societies are evolving as social and political boundaries are shrinking day-by-day. As a result of significant economic and political changes, cross-cultural contact is at an all-time high in human history. Over the past three decades, however, significant social, political and technological changes appear to have seriously revamped policies, set new paradigms, and shifted philosophies that contribute to the dramatic alteration of the educational landscape. This globalized world is controlled by a triple deity— money, markets, and media - that have seamlessly entrenched themselves in how “education is imparted” around the globe. This infiltration - has affected practices, practitioners, and programs. This paper presents the changing landscape of higher education in the global market, in terms of opportunities and threats to higher education institutes and universities around the world.



NOTE: This manuscript has been peer-reviewed, accepted, and endorsed by the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) as a significant contribution to the scholarship and practice of education administration. In addition to publication in the Connexions Content Commons, this module is published in the *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*,¹ Volume 6, Number 2 (April - June, 2011), ISSN 2155-9635. Formatted and edited in Connexions by Theodore Creighton and Brad Bizzell, Virginia Tech, and Janet Tareilo, Stephen F. Austin State University.

1 Sumario en español

El mundo es marcado por los procesos gemelos de globalización económica y cultural en una era de informática. Las identidades de todas las sociedades evolucionan como las fronteras sociales y políticas se encogen

*Version 1.1: Apr 8, 2011 7:20 am GMT-5

†<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>

¹<http://www.ncpeapublications.org>

día por día. A consecuencia de cambios significativos, económicos y políticos, contacto transcultural está en un punto alto nunca igualado en la historia humana. Sobre el por delante de tres décadas cambios sin embargo significativos, sociales, políticos y tecnológicos parecen haber renovado gravemente las políticas, nuevos paradigmas fijos, y las filosofías cambiadas que contribuyen a la modificación dramática del paisaje educativo. Este mundo globalizado es controlado por una deidad triple— dinero, los mercados, y los medios - que se ha atrincherado a sí mismo continuamente en cómo "la educación es impartida" alrededor del globo. Esta infiltración - ha afectado las prácticas, los facultativos, y los programas. Este papel presenta el paisaje cambiante de educación superior en el mercado global, en función de oportunidades y amenazas a institutos de educación superior y universidades alrededor del mundo.

NOTE: Esta es una traducción por computadora de la página web original. Se suministra como información general y no debe considerarse completa ni exacta.

2 Introduction

The term globalization is rarely far from the front pages of newspapers these days. However, it evokes mixed feelings, based upon whether it is being praised by the business community for expansion of world markets, or condemned by those who blame it for widening gap between rich and poor nations and people around the world. According to Fareed Zakaria (2009), "Today when people think about globalization, they still think of it mostly in terms of the huge amount of cash-currency traders swap about \$2trillion a day-that sloshes around the globe, rewarding some countries and punishing others" (p. 23).

Nevertheless, globalization is not merely the business transactions, and military and political agreements -: rather it is the shared consciousness of being part of a global family that brings nations, peoples, and societies together. The consciousness has evolved from the shrinking of political and geographical boundaries day-by-day, transnational movements of people and commodities, inter-mingling of cultures, and the expansion of communication and technology. But at the same time, it is also fueled by sharing of knowledge, skills and educational practices.

In this regard, Levin (2001) argues that open capitalism and global multi-national corporations project a perception that the world is becoming a shared social place by technological and economic advances. The world has become so interlinked that there is a common consensus among educationists and policy makers that it is having an everlasting impact on our educational missions and goals. In his own words:

2.1

It may be that consciousness of a global society, culture, and economy and global interdependence are the cornerstones of globalization, and these consciousness and interdependency have saliency in knowledge based enterprises ... there is a certain inevitability that higher education institutions, because of their cultural, social, and economic roles, are caught up in and affected by globalization. (Levin, 2001, p. 9)

While others believe that capitalist interests of First-World countries are in dire need of skilled labor forces to increase their economic gains. Thus they seek to meet their human resources supply and demand by increasing the educational level of marginalized Third-World countries. They argue that the false perception is that these peoples' socio-economic conditions are being improved due to the process of globalization (Burbles & Torres, 2000; Whites, 2008). However, in reality, the educational agenda of First-World countries is not to empower the people and to improve their living conditions but to fulfill their need to continue economic gains in terms of abundant work-forces poor countries.

It is worthwhile to refer to Bigelow and Peterson (2002) who state that "It is impossible to separate our teaching about wretched conditions of workers around the world from all the factors that produced the desperation that forces people to seek work in those conditions" (p. 3). The vast majority of educational scholars contend that the political ideology of neo-liberalism is the social force behind current globalization (King, 1995; Levin, 2001; White, 2008). As White (2008) writes:

2.2

Neo-liberalism is a self-serving socio-economic ideology advanced by an elitist class of First-World international power brokers in order to advance their specific capitalist interests. These interests do not seek authentic global cooperation and collaboration for the good of all humankind but use globalists language as a linguistic camouflage to conceal their real motives. (p. 133)

As a result of globalization, there is a massive demand for higher education around the world. According to Varghese (2009), “The growing employment opportunities and the increased skills needed to compete in the global labor market are important reasons for the expansion of the sector (higher education)” (p. 5). In this regard, he further cites UNESCO Institute for Statistics - 2007 report, according to which between 1991 and 2005, the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education worldwide more than doubled from 68 to 137.9 million students (Varghese, 2009, p. 8).

Nonetheless, some view globalization as a form of linguistic genocide. For them, English speaking countries, the United States, Canada, Britain, Australia and New Zealand are in economic gains through the global spread of English language. It is English language education and education using English as the language of instruction are a big business for English-speaking countries, such as the United States, Britain, Canada, and Australia (Kaplan, 2001). Students around the world are moving to the English-speaking countries in order to study English language and seek academic degrees. British ELT (English Language Teaching) industries, such as textbook publishing, standardized exams, private language schools earn a considerable amount of money worldwide (Gray, 2002).

3 Commodification and the Corporate Takeover of Education

Globalization has impacted upon the nature of the agencies that school, children, young people and adults, all are dealing with their daily lives with the expansion of media and technology. It means that the educational endeavor has been affected by processes of globalization that are threatening the autonomy of national educational systems and the sovereignty of the nation-state as the ultimate ruler in democratic societies. But at the same time, globalization is also perpetuating major changes in the fundamental conditions of an educational system premised on fitting into a community, a community characterized by proximity and familiarity (Burbules & Torres, 2000). The ever evolving social and political situations are exerting immense pressure on traditional universities and higher institutes for paradigmatic reforms in the focus of higher education. Hence, the objective of education is no longer simply to transmit a body of knowledge, but to equip students with knowledge and skills for problem-solving, synthesizing ideas, and more importantly global competencies, in terms of current affairs and trends around the world.

At first glance, it would seem that national governments still have considerable freedom to intervene in their education systems. While there is some direct intervention in the governance of national educational systems by trans-national agencies such as the IMF and World Bank, the impact of globalization is most felt through the extent to which politics everywhere are now essentially market-driven (Leys, 2001). The initiation, or acceleration, of the commodification of public services was a logical result of government’s increasingly deferential attitude towards market forces in the era of the globalized economy. A good deal of what was needed [for the conversion of non-market spheres into profitable fields for investment] was accomplished by market forces themselves, with only periodic interventions by the state, which then appeared as rational responses to previous changes (Leys, 2001, p. 214). In other words, the impact of globalization is less about the direct way in which specific policy choices are made, as the shaping and reshaping of social relations within all countries.

In the 1980s and early 1990s this was initially carried forward by the rise of managerialism in many western education systems. Those in authority were encouraged and trained to see themselves as managers, and to reframe the problems of education as exercises in delivering the right outcomes. There has also been the wholesale strengthening of the market in many education systems (Baburajan, 2011; Kapur, 2010; Li, (2010); Maharaj, 2011). Nevertheless, Stewart (1992) warns that the real danger is unthinking adoption of the private sector model for the development of an approach to management in the public services in general

or to the social services in particular based on their distinctive purposes, conditions and tasks (p. 27). In other words, the emphasis is less on community and equity, and rather more on individual advancement and the need to satisfy investors and influential consumers. Education has come to resemble a private, rather than public, good.

It is worthy of noting that as might be expected, such marketization and commodification have led to a significant privatization of education in a number of countries. In the United States, for example, schooling, higher education and training have been seen as lucrative markets to be in. Giroux (2000) reports that education market represented around \$600 billion in revenue for corporate interests. Over 1000 state schools have been contracted out to private companies. However, we need to understand the nature of the forces that have pushed governments into adopting such policies and it is here that we can see the process of globalization directly at work (Monbiot 2001).

4 Globalization and Higher Education

Globalization is a growing challenge to higher education institutions worldwide since it has brought not only opportunities but also threats to higher education institutions and universities. Higher education institutions often see themselves as being shaped from outside by globalization, even as victims of global pressures and forces. Yet higher education institutions, especially research universities, are among the main agents of global convergence. There is little doubt about the fact that over the past quarter century we have seen a massive expansion in higher education worldwide, and especially in developing countries, as a result of shifting demographics, changing economic and social structures, and evolving new realities (e.g., socio-economic, political, and cultural). Consequently, higher education is a rapidly growing service sector, enrolling more than 80 million students worldwide and employing about 3.5 million people (Kapur, 2010, p. 306). The emergence of new education providers such as, multi-national companies, corporate universities, and media companies are the results of the globalized world. New forms of delivering education including distance, virtual, and face-to-face mode are getting popular. There is a greater diversification of qualifications and certificates are visible. As a result, increasing mobility of students, programs, providers, and projects across national borders, are common phenomena all across the globe.

In the IAU survey, Knight (2003) reported that there were five most important aspects of internationalization by higher education institutions: student mobility, cultural identity, faculty mobility, curriculum, and development projects. The findings for Asian universities indicated that student mobility was an important aspect of internationalization. Upon deeper investigation, it was qualified that Asian universities were more interested in welcoming/recruiting students than sending their students abroad or establishing exchanges with other institutions.

Contrary to this, Ashika Maharaj (2011) argues that globalization has increased the trend of temporarily traveling faculty and academicians in abroad for research and teaching. So it is obvious that globalization is not only breaking down barriers and connecting institutions across the world, by making universities more visible, but it is also facilitating knowledge flows, values global learning, by creating new opportunities for advanced graduates and faculty across universities and higher education institutes around the world. This means that higher education is the core to the emerging global systems of knowledge and culture. In the words of Kim and Zhu (2010), “The need for higher education has become crucial in the age of globalization, as knowledge-based workforces have become an essential ingredient to acquire and maintain a competitive edge in the marketplace” (p. 165).

However, higher education is viewed mostly as the property of elites and business class people. Even most national governments take higher education as a source of their national revenue. As Spring (2009) contends, “What is strikingly new is the conceptualization of trade in educational services as a source of income to be included in the financial planning of nations, educational institutions, and for-profit multinational corporations” (p. 83). A similar view is presented by Duderstadt, Taggart and Weber (2008), as they wrote:

In a knowledge-driven economy, many governments are increasingly viewing higher education primarily as a private benefit to students and other patrons of the university rather than a public good benefiting all of society, shifting the value position from that of government responsibility for supporting the educational

needs of society to university responsibility for addressing the economic needs of government—an interesting reversal of traditional responsibilities and roles. (p. 274)

In the Task Force report (2000) of the World Bank on higher education in developing countries, it is stated that:

4.1

The task force believes that, in the knowledge economy, highly trained specialists and broadly educated generalists will be at a premium, and both will need to be educated more flexibly so that they continue to learn as their environment develops. (p. 14)

However, in the same report, it is also stated that:

4.2

Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise does not offer a universal blueprint for reforming higher education systems, but it does provide a starting point for action. While the benefits of higher education continue to rise, the costs of being left behind are also growing. Higher education is no longer a luxury: it is essential to national social and economic development (p. 14).

For developing countries, the reality of low gross domestic product; inadequate funding for education; and the dominance, dependence, and vulnerability in international relations put a limit on the aspects of internationalization efforts in higher education (Maharaj, 2011; Todaro, 2001). Referring to the changing trends in higher education of the developing countries, Kapur (2010) writes:

4.3

Although the number of students from developing countries seeking education abroad has sharply increased in recent years, the phenomena itself is not new. What is newer, however, is the reverse: foreign higher institutions, establishing programs in developing countries under a variety of arrangements ranging from cross-border franchised agreements, twinning arrangements, joint programs, validation programs, subcontracting and distance learning activities. (p. 327)

Of course, globalization is not the only factor behind the changes that are affecting education all over the world. Nevertheless, internationalization efforts do pose more emphasis on lifelong learning which in turn increases demand for post-secondary education, and increasing amount of private investment in higher education. In this respect, Brustein (2009) argues that in this highly globalized world, higher education faces rapidly changing economic, political, and national security realities and challenges. For him, it is imperative to produce globally competent graduates, who should be competent in a combination of critical thinking skills, technical expertise, and global awareness of and adaptability to diverse cultures, perceptions, and approaches; familiarity with the major trends of global change and the issues; and the capacity for effective communication across cultural and linguistic boundaries in the world (Brustein, 2009).

5 Higher Education in the Global Market

The global market in educational services is estimated by Merrill Lynch to be worth outside of the United States \$ 111 billion a year with a “potential consumer base of 32 million students.” In 2006 the Chronicle of Higher Education reported that for-profit colleges were the fastest-growing sector in higher education with the eighth largest corporations having a combined market value of about \$ 26 billion (Spring, 2009, p. 88). According to USGOA’s report (2009), there are a number of approaches being applied to reach and attract overseas students, including marketing their higher education to the international community much as a business that would promote a product. For example, many countries promote their higher education systems through national branding, using logos and slogans, such as Australia’s “Study in Australia” and the United Kingdom’s “Education UK” marketing campaigns.

Many countries have also stepped up to improve the quality of the study abroad experiences. For example, China, has invested significant resources to modernize its schools and added additional academic programs to accommodate its workforce needs (USGOA, 2009). Since 1989 (After the Tiananmen Square Massacre), China's higher education began to transform from tuition-free (with some living allowances to students) to tuition-based. By 1997, tuition became mandatory in all colleges in China, by 2002, the average tuition per student had reached 46 percent of per capita gross domestic product, almost the same ratio for private colleges and universities in the United States (Li, 2010, p. 301). Nonetheless, it is understandable that the globalization of the economy and its concomitant demands on the workforce requires a different education that enhances the ability of learners to access, assess, adopt, and apply knowledge at their work place.

In his book "The Post American World," Fareed Zakaria (2009) argues that higher education is America's best industry. Eight of the top ten universities in the world are in the United States and America invests 2.6 percent of its GDP in higher education, compared with 1.2 percent in Europe and 1.1 percent in Japan (cited in Singh & Papa, 2010). In the academic year 2000-2001, 548,000 international students in the United States contributed 11 billion dollars to U.S. economy (Economist Global Agenda, 2002, May 21). The data of the U.S. Department of Commerce indicated that higher education is the fifth-largest service sector "export" for the United States (Economist Global Agenda, 2002, May 21). The amount would be much higher if the additional contribution of "literally thousands of United States citizens-mostly young-teaching English to speakers of most of the world's other languages is added" (Kaplan, 2001, p. 4). Of the almost 2.8 million international tertiary students studying worldwide, the United States of America and the United Kingdom host the largest numbers of foreign students, accounting for 21.2 and 12.0 percent of total international students, respectively, in 2006. Education services ranks as the third largest export category earner for the year 2007-08. Overall, international students, and the associated visitation from friends and family contributed \$12.6 billion in value-added to the Australian economy and generates 0.29 in full-time equivalent (FTE) workers (Access Economics, 2009).

According to the latest report on enrollments in academic year 2008/09 based on a comprehensive survey of approximately 3,000 accredited U.S higher education institutions of all types and sizes:

5.1

International students all time high in numbers 671,616 contributed \$17.8 billion to the U.S. economy, 65% of all international students receive the majority of their funds from personal and family sources and 70% of all international students' primary funding comes from sources outside of the United States. (Open Doors Report, 2009, cited in Singh & Papa, 2010)

This trend is continued as reported by Open Doors (2010), international students contribute nearly \$20 billion to the U.S. economy, and according to the U.S. Department of Commerce, higher education is among the United States' top service sector exports, as international students are one of the main source of revenues not just to the host campuses but also to local economies of the host states (Open Doors, 2010, November, 15).

In 2008, international students in Canada spent in excess of \$6.5 billion on tuition, accommodation and discretionary spending; created over 83,000 jobs; and generated more than \$291 million in government revenue. Altogether there were 178,227 long-term (staying for at least six months) international students in Canada in 2008, generating more than \$5.5 billion to the Canadian economy. Nearly 40 percent of that revenue came from two countries-China and South Korea. As of December 2008 there were 42,154 Chinese and 27,440 South Korean citizens in Canada undertaking a formal education. Ontario and BC hosted nearly two thirds of the international students in Canada (65,833 and 50,221 respectively) while Quebec was a distant third with only 28,010 (Economic Impact of International Education in Canada, 2009, p. III). It is amazing to know that the total amount that international students spent in Canada (\$6.5 billion) is greater than export of coniferous lumber (\$5.1 billion), and even greater than export of coal (\$6.07 billion) to all other countries (Economic Impact of International Education in Canada, 2009, p. III).

6 Opportunities and Threats in Higher Education

Over the years, there is a significant increase in the number of students in higher education, as more and more people are moving out of acute poverty situations all across the globe. According to some estimations, the number of students seeking university degrees will roughly double over the next two decades to as high as 250 million, with most of this growth in the developing world. The education investments demanded by the global knowledge economy are straining the economies of both developed and developing regions. Developing nations are overwhelmed by the higher education needs of expanding young populations at a time when even secondary education is only available to a small fraction of their populations (Duderstadt, Taggart & Weber, 2008, p. 274). On the other hand, in the wake of globalization, many developing countries have set ambitious targets, for example, China had a goal of expanding vocational education so that at least 50 percent of the enrolments in secondary education would be in vocational education in the near future; India has a similar target of reaching 25 percent; and Bangladesh 20 percent (Tilak 2002).

In a more global setting higher education institutions have more plural sources of finance and they need autonomy and academic freedom to be globally effective. American universities, though now severely challenged, are still perceived as being in the top rung of the higher education ladder. Australian universities currently have the perception of being strong contenders with their blend of relevant programs and high quality research. European universities are evidently regrouping to capture a better place in the global market (Baburajan, 2011).

The shift of the focus of education has changed in terms of the structural adjustments in policies of the IMF, and the World Bank, and other international lending organizations for underdeveloped and low-income countries. These organizations push their hidden agenda, such as cuts in government expenditures, market liberalization, currency devaluations, reductions of government subsidies, price controls, and most importantly the privatization of public services such as health and education. In this regard, Brustein (2009) argues that the benefit of a systemic approach to internationalization of education is that it allows us to comprehend how one decision, activity, custom, or structure can either inhibit or spur significant changes in the overall process.

On the other hand, increased privatization of higher education in the name of capitalist democratization has attracted many corporate entities and private sectors, with the prospect of commercializing universities and higher education institutes. With reference to American universities' expansion programs to overseas, Clotfelter (2010) contends that the market for higher education, like those for a multitude of other goods and services, is growing at much faster rates abroad than at home. As a result, American universities have set up overseas programs in recent years. For example, Cornell Medical College's branch in Qatar, opened in 2002, graduated its first class in 2008. It was the first time an American medical school had awarded degree overseas (p. 16). In this respect, he further contends that following the same path, other American universities are expanding their outreach to overseas by establishing networking and partnerships with local universities and colleges. In this respect, Duke University proposed to establish partnerships and branch campuses in five different locations – Dubai, London, New Delhi, Shanghai, and St. Petersburg – where it plans to offer an MBA plus other professional degrees in what they are calling the “first global business school” (Clotfelter, 2010, pp. 16-17).

However, it is important to note that due to high competition in the global market for grabbing more students, many world universities expansion programs have not been lasted longer in abroad. In this regard, Baburajan (2011) gives some examples of international universities which could not survive in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and forced closure. As he states, “Many universities including some of the high-profiled universities (e.g., The university of Southern Queensland in Dubai and George Masson University in Ras Al Khiamah) could not survive in the hyper-competitive higher education market in the UAE” (p. 33).

As a result of globalization, traditional higher education institutes are facing many challenges to cope with the new emerging education providers. There many new forces are emerging in the field of higher education in the global market. For instance, in 2007, Singapore's National Institute of Education (NIE) hosted an international conference of university deans from Denmark's University of Aarhus, Beijing Normal University, University of London, University of Melbourne, Seoul national University, Ontario Institute of

Studies in Education, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The goal of this international network is described as “The alliance acts as think tank to influence the sector globally, drawing together existing expertise and research. In doing so, it aims to influence governments, international agencies, funding bodies and the public at large to enhance the profile and quality of education internationally”.

On the other hand, the countries like India, China, and Russia which have rich educational heritages and infrastructures are graduating millions more students each year than the United States. Consequently, there is a growing desperation and concerns for the changing trends of higher education in the United States. Since past advantages of most public and private universities in the US are rapidly eroding, as the country loses its scientific and technological base in a globalized world. For instance, the former General Electric’s CEO, Jeffrey Immelt once observed by referring to the changing trends in higher education, “more people graduated in the United States in 2006 with sports-exercise degrees than electrical-engineering degrees, so, if we want to be the massage capital of the world, we’re well on our way” (cited in Zakaria, 2009, p. 187). Recently, this type of concern is being reiterated by many, as Clotfelter (2010) argues that America’s position of leadership in the world has been challenged in many ways, specifically in the fields of science and technology. As he writes:

6.1

Through the decades of neglect, the United States had fallen behind in science and engineering, leaving the country in a weakened position to compete in knowledge-intensive industries. . .the continued dominance of American research universities as vulnerable, as the dramatic advances in communication. . .diminishing the importance of physical proximity. . .lessening the advantage of established institutions (Clotfelter, 2010, p. x).

A similar concern was warranted by the National Academy of Science in its report in 2007 for the decline of science and technology. As the referenced report stated:

6.2

Having reviewed trends in the United States and abroad, the committee is deeply concerned that the scientific and technological building blocks critical to our economic leadership are eroding at a time when many other nations are gathering strength. . .[W]e are worried about the future prosperity of the United States. Although many people assume that the United States will always be a world leader in science and technology, this may not continue to be the case as inasmuch as great minds and ideas exist throughout the world. We fear the abruptness with which a lead in science and technology can be lost—and the difficulty of recovering a lead one lost if indeed it can be regained at all. (p. 3)

These types of concerns have lately become more alarming when it was reported that most faculty members of American universities are still living in their dream world and in utopia, since they become more insular and sluggish to move with the pace of the new world. Most of them take their knowledge and skills for granted and they do not feel any urgent need to learn from others either academically or professionally. According to a research, which was done to see, if there were any improvements in mobility of the US scholars to abroad, over the last two decades, the result was very disappointing. It is important to note that in 1992, a Carnegie Foundation survey of faculty in 14 countries was reported that the US faculty members were least mobile as they found more insular in comparison to their non-US colleagues.

In a recent research report of Seton Hall University, (the data were collected in 2007 as a follow-up survey to 1992 Carnegie study) it was reported that only 33 percent of US faculty collaborating with international colleagues in research activities. Whereas, US faculty came last among 14 countries for their publications in a foreign country (7 percent), the percentage of courses taught abroad (17 percent) and as co-authored publications with foreign colleagues (5 percent) only (O’ Hara, 2009, p. 38). It seems that US faculty members do not feel any need to collaborate with their international colleagues, may be due to their complacencies that they are the best in the world, or may be due to their false pride that others are emulating them. That is why they do not feel any need to learn others perspectives and realize new realities of this globalized world,

where cooperation is the social norms. In other words, there is no room for being complacent and insular if you want to be globally competitive.

Although American universities still do have their dominance in higher education, they are receiving severe threats to their existing dominance from various universities and institutes from around the world. In recent times, Australian universities are attracting a large number of students from the emerging nations, as they present a blend of relevant programs and high quality research. According to Koleth (2010), “India replaced China as the top source country for overseas students in Australia, with the number of student visa holders from India increasing by 44.6 per cent between June 2008 and June 2009” (p. 12). However, over the last two years, a series of racial attacks were made on Indian students in different parts of Australia, in which more than five Indian students were killed and hundreds were injured. As a result, there is a significant reduction in the number of Indian and South Asian students in Australian universities. In this regard, Koleth (2010) observes, “the welfare of international students in Australia came to a head in May 2009 when reports of violence against Indian international students triggered protests in Melbourne and Sydney . . . these events attracted much public attention, both domestically and abroad” (p. 5). By underscoring the significance of international students for Australia, Koleth (2010) further observes:

6.3

Reports of violence against Indian international students prompted intense diplomatic efforts to salvage Australia’s reputation as a destination for international students. The Government’s response included the launch of taskforces on international student safety and wellbeing, the development of a National International Student Strategy by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) and reviews of international student education in Australia. (p. 12)

The above stated statements are the evidence of impact of globalization in higher education, in this case for Australian universities and its higher institutes. These statements also imply that how significant is the mobility of international students in the global market. The continued racial attacks on Indian students in Australia, has brought a new hope for European universities as they are regrouping and revamping to their programs to capture a better place in the global market. In this regard, it is worthwhile to note that after Bologna Process, many significant changes have occurred in most universities of Europe, more specifically, the changes are being made in assuring the quality of higher education, all across Europe. Clotfelter (2010) argues that through the Bologna process, Europe is setting about to reform its system of higher education by homogenizing various countries’ degrees programs and creating a system of ally making European courses of study be more compatible to those in American colleges and universities (p. 20). In this regard, Ofer Malamud (2010) writes:

6.4

In many ways, the Bologna reforms make the European system more compatible with Anglo-Saxon systems of higher education around the world and in much of Asia and Latin America. This may help Europe to compete on the global market and attract more foreign students from around the world. Since Europe and the United States tap a common pool of foreign students, the Bologna reforms could lead to further declines in the shares of foreign students in America. (pp. 227-228)

While, Borghans and Corvers (2010) contend, “over the past two decades there has been a significant increase in the mobility of students in Europe, student mobility has increased between European countries as well as between Europe, the United States, and the rest of the world” (p. 231). They also argue that compared to the past, European researchers publish more in foreign journals, and there is more international travel, more migration, and a strong increase in international cooperation research as research has become much more internationally oriented (Borghans & Corvers, 2010, p. 231). In this respect, it is relevant to refer to a report to the European Parliament in 2008 that underscores the critical role of scholar mobility on the advancement of knowledge through greater integration and cross-border coordination of research investments and activities to increase Europe’s competitiveness and its attractiveness as a place to invest in research and innovation. The referenced report states:

6.5

Globalization is accelerating, and this has an impact on the way we produce, share and use knowledge. Major global challenges such as climate change, poverty, infectious disease, threats to energy, food and water supply, security of the citizen, networks security and the digital divide highlight the need for effective global S&T cooperation to promote sustainable development. (European Parliament Report, 2008, p. 2)

The impact of globalization is also evident in China's current push in higher education. For Li (2010), in the era of globalization, higher education in most countries is not isolated. This is especially the case for China as it becomes more integrated into the world, after the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre. As she argues that, "because of the large number of Chinese students and scholars studying abroad, the development of higher education in china will also inevitably affect universities in other countries" (Li, 2010, p. 301).

Similarly, Zakaria (2009) states that by recognizing the country needs a better-trained workforce in order to move up the economic value chain, the central government of China has committed itself to boosting scholarship and other types of aid in 2008 to \$2.7 billion, up from \$240 million in 2006. Officials have plans to expand overall government spending on education, which was a merely 2.8 percent of GDP in 2006 to 4 percent by 2010, a large portion of which will be devoted to small number of globally competitive elite institutions (Zakaria, 2009, cited in Singh & Papa, 2010). In recent years, the Chinese government and universities have shown greater openness in higher education, and they are willing to partner with world-class universities around the world in order to promote their own standards of schools and universities in the global market (Li, 2010). Li (2010) contends, "The combination of competition and cooperation between universities in China and in other countries is most likely the model for the future, and such a model should have a positive impact on higher education in the world" (p. 303).

Recently, like China, higher education is also getting a priority in India's educational reforms and its innovative measures for the development of the nation. As the Founder Vice Chancellor of Delhi Technological University, P. B. Sharma (2011) emphasizes the need for innovation and adoption of best practices from the world class institutions, and to revamp India's higher education to respond to the challenges of new knowledge age. As he writes:

6.6

India's emergence as one of the largest economies of the world, largely owes to the impressive growth of science, technology and management education. . .the sound foundation of science and technology education provided by Indian Universities and institutions of engineering and technology has given the necessary preparedness to Indian Scientists, Engineers and Technocrats to tackle the challenges of globally competitive industry and work environment (Sharma, 2011, pp. 1-2).

In other words, in order to maintain the rate of growth and the quality of higher education, in his speech to the nation on the 60th Independence Day, the Prime Minister of India proposed the establishment of new eight Indian Institute of Technologies (IITs), seven Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs) and five Indian Institutes of Science, Education and Research (IISERs) and 30 Central Universities (Clotfelter, 2010; Swar & Pandey, 2008). For Clotfelter (2010), "Even if recently announced plans to launch new institutes in technology and management come to pass, however, India's institutions of higher education appear likely to continue to keep lagging behind the educational achievements of its best students" (p. 22). Similarly, many believe that India is one of the largest higher education systems in the world, is facing the crisis of university of the poor, with continued expansion, deteriorating standards, limited resources, and political involvement (Kapur, 2010; Swar & Pandey, 2008).

Contrary to this, Gordon Brown (2010) presents a picture of a vibrant India, as he writes:

6.7

Start in Delhi, with the scale of the University of Delhi and its 400, 000 students and then think of the ambitions for Indian education: a twenty-year plan for one thousand more universities. . .Go to Bangalore, and you will see why some are predicting that India, not China, will become the world's fastest-growing

economies. Companies based there looked less like factories than campuses where engineers and computer scientists of the future are developing their skills. . . The Infosys campus training center (where fifty thousand young people are trained every year) is itself like a modern American city, with its lecture theaters, café culture, and cinemas. The company states that in 2007, when they took on forty thousand new recruits, over 1.25 million young people applied to join the company, it has increased its workforce from 10,000 in 2000 to over 100,000 today. (pp. 163-164)

On the other hand, Devesh Kapur (2010) contends, “The prevailing view regarding higher education in India is discouraging: by most quality indicators, Indian bachelor’s master’s, and PhD programs are lagging behind domestic demand in terms of required quality of graduates” (p. 309). In this respect, Kapur (2010) cites an address by the Indian Prime Minister, Manmohan Singh at the 150th Anniversary of University of Bombay (Mumbai) on June 22, 2007, as the Prime Minister said:

6.8

The Indian university system “is, in many parts, in a state of disrepair. . . In almost half the districts [340] in the country, higher education enrollments are abysmally low, almost two-third of our universities and 90 percent of our colleges are rated as below average on quality parameters. . . Its erstwhile Human Resources Development (HRD) Minister (who is responsible for higher education), called higher education the “sick child of education” (cited in Kapur, 2010, p. 309)

Nevertheless, Kapur (2010) also acknowledges the achievement of Indian higher education, in the field of science and technology, as he states, “India produced three times more graduates than the United States, in a year 2006” (p. 309). In this respect, it is important to note that education in general and higher education in particular is still not getting enough focus in India, where the number of students in higher education could be triple from the existing numbers of today within the coming decades.

According to the Institute for the Study of International Migration’s Foreign Students Coming to America (2007) report, India has tripled the number of post secondary institutions (from 6000 to 18000) between 1990 and 2006. Asia-Pacific in-country training has increased from 9-19% and among middle income countries from 16-27% - growth in college-aged populations should translate into greater numbers of potential international students. It is projected that India’s college age population to grow from 125 to 139 million between 2005 and 2015 (Economic Impact of International Education in Canada, 2009, p. 8).

Considering the growing demand of higher education in India in the coming decades, it can be suggested that there is an urgent need for visionary agenda, inspirational leaderships and rigorous planning at different levels to revamp higher education system in India. Ironic enough, India does not seem to take its higher education system very seriously. This can better be understood from a recent development, when the Indian Prime Minister has allocated additional charge of Communication and Telecom portfolio to his HRD minister, who bears the sole responsibility for the entire education system of India, including its higher education. It may surprise many of you that India, which has so much potentiality for higher education, does not have a separate ministry to deal with higher education system of the nation.

In this regard, it is worthwhile to cite Clotfelter (2010), who has very eloquently portrayed the grim situations of higher education institutes and universities in the Asian countries, and I think his portrayal is the best match for India’s higher education. Clotfelter (2010) writes:

6.9

There is no area of the world to rival the large countries of Asia when it comes to potential for future development in university research and training. However, with exception of Japan, Asia has so far failed to develop universities on a par with scholarly accomplishments of its native sons and daughters. It remains a huge and alluring question just when the region will produce world-class universities (p. 21).

Recently, the Indian Parliament has approved the Foreign Education Providers (Regulatory Bill, 2010) that allows foreign universities to open their branches or have networking with local universities of India. So this new law could be a milestone for higher education in India, as many more foreign universities to

enter the education market. However, this new law also raises some concerns among Indian politicians, as many believe that there would be no control, over export and import of higher education, and the private institutions, from overseas would open branches in India, exchange of degrees and certificates that would go on without any restrictions. Some of policy makers argue that Indian Universities are already at loss, as a large number of Indian students are studying abroad in the U.S., Australia and the U. K., whereas, a very small number of foreign students are seeking admissions in Indian Universities (Singh & Papa, 2010).

Here, it is worthwhile to note that the concerns of Indian policymakers are genuine for Indian students, especially after the recent case of Tri-Valley University of California, and the ways the US authorities treated the Indian students, by attaching radio-tags on them. This incident has created a huge international embarrassment for both Indian and the US authorities. When the pictures of Indian students with radio-tags were everywhere, from electronic media to social- network media, the Indian government strongly condemned the ill-treatment with Indian students by the US and raised the issue of human rights violations of its citizens before the US authorities. India asked the US authorities to treat the Indian students as per the basic principles of human rights and international standards. The issue of Tri-Valley University is still not resolved, as referring to the Indian Foreign Secretary, the NDTV (2011) reported that “The Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs, William Burns has assured Indian Foreign Secretary, Nirupama Rao, during a meeting, that the US Government would provide a “fair solution” to hundreds of Indian students whose academic career were at stake following closer of the Tri-Valley University” (NDTV, February 16, 2011).

In this regard, it is worthwhile to note that for smooth functioning of higher education, in cross-border settings, a need for code of conduct and a regulatory framework at deferent levels is emphasized by some scholars. For instance, Varghese (2009) writes:

6.10

There is a need to develop regulatory frameworks at the national, regional and international levels for the operation of private and transnational providers. The Code of Good Practice in the Provision of Transnational Education, which was established by the Council of Europe in cooperation with UNESCO and adopted by the Lisbon Convention, is an example of regional regulations for Europe. (p. 25)

7 Conclusion

In the past three decades, significant economic and political changes have occurred all across the globe. Of course, globalization is not the only factor behind the changes that are affecting higher education, and likewise it is not the only factor that motivates the local interest groups that formulate policies and programs. Nevertheless, globalization has posed some challenges that never been experienced before in higher education. It is challenging to educate humankind for future global citizenship, where global cooperation is the social norm. Therefore, the emergence of globalization is making educators’ task more challenging than ever it was.

The growing demand of higher education throughout the world is widely viewed as a major contributing factor to the emergence of a globalized world. With the advent of internet and social networking, students from all nook and corners of the world are moving beyond their social and political borders for quality higher education. Students all around the world seem to be motivated for quality higher education as they believe that they need to prepare for larger participation in the national and international economy and polity, owing to the concept of a globalized world. Only quality higher education can prepare them to cope with pace of the world and be globally competitive workforce and citizens. Considering the increased competitions in the global market of today’s world, some serious concerns have been raised about how to foster leadership competencies of educational leaders so that they would be able to cope with challenges of the new academic world (Tang, Yin, & Min, 2011).

Hence, it can be inferred that in this fast evolving world, globalization has brought not only opportunities but also has posed some real threats to higher institutions and traditional universities worldwide. It is imperative for higher institutes and universities that they come out-of-the-box their attitudes and to

prepare for the new challenges of the 21st century. In other words, it is the demand of the time that higher education institutes and universities around the world develop collaboration and cooperation, establish networking and partnerships, organize faculty exchange programs, and more importantly foster and embrace multidimensional scholarships to produce educational leaders with global competencies.

In the end, I would like to cite Varghese (2009) who has rightly emphasized the need for better collaboration and cooperation among universities around the world to cope with the demand of higher education in the coming decades, to conclude this article. As he writes:

7.1

Many of the knowledge economies have not been in a position to produce the skills required. Even countries with the largest network of higher education institutions, such as China, India, and the USA, could not produce highly skilled workers in sufficient quantity to meet their domestic demand and the global market demand, especially in the knowledge-intensive segments of the economy. (Varghese, 2009, p. 11)

8 References

- Access Economics Report (2009, April 16). The Australian education sector and the economic contribution of international students. Australian Council for Private Education and Training. Retrieved December 10, 2009 from <http://www.accesseconomics.com.au/index.php>.
- Baburajan, P. K. (2011, January-June). Impact of globalization of higher education in the UAE. *Delhi Business Review*, 12(1), 29-35.
- Bigelow, B. & Peterson, B. (Eds.). (2002). *Rethinking globalization: Teaching for justice in an unjust world*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools Press.
- Borghans, L., & Corvers, F. (2010). The Americanization of European higher education and research. In C. T. Clotfelter. (Ed.). *American universities in a global market*. National Bureau of Economic Research Conference Report (pp. 231-268). National Bureau of Economic Research, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Brown, G. (2010). *Beyond the crash: Overcoming the first crisis of globalization*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Brustein W. (2009). It takes an entire institution: A blueprint for the global university. In R. Lewin. *Handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship* (pp. 249-265). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Burbules, N. C. & Torres, C. A. (2000) *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives*, London: Routledge.
- Clotfelter, C. T. (Ed.). (2010). *American universities in a global market*. National Bureau of Economic Research Conference Report. National Bureau of Economic Research, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Commission of the European Communities. (2008). *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: A Strategic European framework for international science and technology cooperation*. COM (2008) 588. Brussels: European Commission Directorate-General for Research. Retrieved February 14, 2011 from http://ec.europa.eu/research/press/2008/pdf/com_2008_588_en.pdf.
- Duderstadt, J. Taggart, J. & Weber, L. (Eds.) (2008). The globalization of higher education. In Weber, L & Duderstadt, J. J. (Eds). *The globalization of higher education* (pp 273-290). Glion Colloquium: Glion, Switzerland.
- Economic Impact of International Education in Canada (2009, August 24). A report presented to Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada. Roslyn Kunin & Associates, Inc. Retrieved September, 25, 2010 from: http://www.international.gc.ca/education/assets/pdfs/RKA_IntEd_Report_eng.pdf.
- Economist Global Agenda. (2002, May 21). The world's educator. *Economist.com*. Retrieved May 24, 2002, from <http://www.economist.com>.

- Epstein, H. E. (2002). Globalization of education. *Encyclopedia of Education*. Retrieved March 04, 2009 from Encyclopedia.com: <http://www.encyclopedia.com>.
- Featherstone, M. (1996). Localism, globalism, and cultural identity. In R. Wilson & W. Dissanayake (Eds.), *Global/Local: Cultural production and the transnational imaginary* (pp. 46 -78). Durham: NC: Duke University Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (2000). *Stealing innocence. Corporate culture's war on children*. New York: Palgrave.
- Gray, J. (2002). *False dawn. The delusions of global capitalism*, London: Granta.
- Hall, S. (1997). The local and the global: Globalization and ethnicity. In A. D. King (Ed.), *Culture, globalization and the world-system: Contemporary conditions for the representation of identity* (pp. 19-39). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kaplan, R. B. (2001). English-the accidental language of science. In U. Ammon (Ed.), *The dominance of English as a language of science* (pp. 3-26). Berlin: Moutown de Gruyter.
- Kapur, D. (2010). Indian higher education. In C. T. Clotfelter. (Ed.). *American universities in a global market. National Bureau of Economic Research Conference Report* (pp. 305-334). National Bureau of Economic Research, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kim, E. H., & Zhu, M. (2010). Universities as firms: The case of US overseas programs. In C. T. Clotfelter. (Ed.). *American universities in a global market. National Bureau of Economic Research Conference Report* (pp. 163-204). National Bureau of Economic Research, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Knight, J. (2003). *Internationalization of higher education practices and priorities: 2003 IAU Survey Report*. International Association of Universities. Paris, France. Retrieved March 15, 2010 from www.iau-aiu.net/internationalization/pdf/Internationalisation-en.pdf.
- Koleth, E. (2010, 18 June). Overseas students: immigration policy changes 1997–May 2010. Parliament of Australia, Department of Parliamentary Services. Retrieved December 7, 2010 from <http://www.aph.gov.au/library/pul>
- Levin, J. S. (2001). *Globalizing the community college: Strategies for change in the 21st century*. New York: Palgrave Books.
- Leys, C. (2001) *Market-driven politics: Neoliberal democracy and the public interest*. London: Verso Books.
- Li, H. (2010). Higher education in China: Complement or competition to US universities. In C. T. Clotfelter. (Ed.). *American universities in a global market. National Bureau of Economic Research Conference Report* (pp. 269-304). National Bureau of Economic Research, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Maharaj, A. (2011 January-June). The impact of globalization on South African higher education institutions: Patterns of academic inflow into South African higher education system. *Delhi Business Review*, 12(1), 37-50.
- Malamud, O. (2010). The structure of European higher education in the wake Bologna reforms. In C. T. Clotfelter. (Ed.). *American universities in a global market. National Bureau of Economic Research Conference Report* (pp. 205-230). National Bureau of Economic Research, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Monbiot, G. (2001). *Captive state. The corporate takeover of Britain*. London: Pan. National Academy of Science (NAS). (2007). *Rising above the gathering storm. Energizing and employing America for a brighter economic future*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Retrieved February 15, 2011 from <http://www.sandia.gov/NINE/documents/RisingAbove.pdf>.
- NDTV (2011). *Tri-Valley case: US assures India a fair solution for students*. Retrieved February 16, 2011 from <http://www.ndtv.com>.
- Open Doors Report. (2009, November 16). Institute of International Education. Retrieved March 4, 2010, from www.opendoors.iienetwork.org.
- Open Doors Report. (2010, November 15). Institute of International Education. Retrieved December 7, 2010, from <http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors>.
- O' Hara, S. (2009). Internationalizing the academy: The impact of scholar mobility. In R. Bhandari & S. Laughlin (Eds.), *Higher education on the move: New developments in global mobility* (pp. 29-47). Institute of International Education, New York.

- Sharma, P. B. (2011 January 4). Meeting the challenge of globalization of higher education in India. A paper presented at the XII International seminar on globalization of higher education: Challenges and opportunities, at New Delhi, India.
- Singh, N., & Papa, R. (2010). The impacts of globalization in higher education. *The International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation (IJELP)*, 5(2), 1-9.
- Spring, H. J. (2009). *Globalization of education: An introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Swar, N. B., & Pandey, S. (2008). Impacts of globalization on higher education. *Gyanodaya: The Journal of Progressive Education*, 1(1), 50-59. Retrieved May 11, 2010 from www.indianjournals.com.
- Tang, H. V., Yin, M., & Min, J. C. H. (2011). A comparative study of educational leadership in Taiwan and the USA. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(1), 30-38.
- Tilak, B. G. J. (2002). Higher education under structural adjustment. In P. Banerjee, & F. Richter (Eds.), *Economic institutions in India* (pp. 289-341). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Todaro, M. P. (2001). *Economic development*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Tomlinson, J. (1999). *Globalization and culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- The World Bank (2000). *Higher education in developing countries: Peril and promise*. Report of the Task Force on Higher Education and Society.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2004). *Higher education in a globalized society*. Education Position Paper. Retrieved January 15, 2010 from <http://www.unesco.org/education/highereducation>
- United States Government Accountability Office (2009). *Higher education: Approaches to attract and fund international students in the United States and abroad*. A report submitted to the chairman, subcommittee on international organizations, human rights, and oversight, committee on foreign affairs, House of Representatives. United States Government Accountability Office, Washington, D.C. Retrieved September 15, 2010 from: <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09379.pdf>.
- Varghese, N. V. (2009). *Globalization, economic crisis and national strategies for higher education development*. International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris. Retrieved June 15, 2010 from <http://www.iiep.unesco.org>.
- White, R. S. (2008). Globalization and the context of future education. *Interchange*, 39(1), 131- 140.
- Zakaria, F. (2009). *The post-American world*. New York London: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.