

Indian community in Mexico, and to China's Guizhou Province.

The program mainly recruits fellows from among people with a sociodemographic and sociobiographic profile that fits the program's goals. The target group criteria of "exclusion" and certain regional and local contexts are well reflected in the profile of the fellows. About 90 percent of them are first-generation students with a poor socioeconomic background who had to overcome experience of social injustice to achieve their undergraduate studies. IFP supports the fellows through various voluntary and paid community services as well as related leadership activities in a broad range of areas including community-based organizations, social movements, and non-governmental organizations.

The program offers pre-placement training and support to study at more than 400 universities in some 40 countries. Surveys among fellows—most of them outside their countries for the first time—show that they highly value their postgraduate study experience and maintain contact with their home communities while building up a network that includes other IFP fellows. The graduation rate of IFP alumni is 85 percent, and so far 75 percent of them have returned to their home countries while most of the others continue their studies or go for further studies/training abroad.

FACTORS OF SUCCESS

The IFP can rely on a financial commitment made via the establishment of the International Fellowship Fund. The biggest postgraduate fellowship program ever, the program needed to establish structures and processes on a global scale that focus at the same time on local context. This achievement would probably have been impossible without a substantial and long-term financial commitment.

IFP has created a worldwide partnership of organizations around its central unit in New York. This partnership involves 20 organizations in the IFP countries or regions (e.g., the Association of African Universities, the Indonesian International Education Foundation, and the Economic and Social Research Foundation in Tanzania), international placement partners (e.g., the Institute of International Education, NUFFIC in the Netherlands, and the British Council) as well as strategic partnerships with certain universities. Global outreach and local presence are thus based on a network of organizations, building upon their expertise and contacts.

The IFP has not developed a detailed standard framework to carry out its target group criteria on a global scale. Instead, it has set up an intense and ongoing process of consultation in each country and region to discuss the nature of access to higher education and to identify target groups and communities that lack access. In this process certain cultural, social, and economic indicators of exclusion have been identified as priorities for country or subregion. Techniques were discussed and implemented for the outreach of the IFP to the respective target groups. Ongoing exchange on "lessons learned" and "good

practice" forms part and parcel of the challenging further development of this global/local program.

What IFP will achieve in the long run needs to be examined—for example, by studying the progress of the alumni and growing networks. The IFP's experiences and established practices will represent information of great interest concerning international student exchange and sustainable development on a global scale. ■

Internationalization Brings Important Benefits as Well as Risks

JANE KNIGHT

Jane Knight is adjunct professor at the Comparative, International and Development Education Centre, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. E-mail: janeknight@sympatico.ca.

While the process of internationalization affords many benefits to higher education, it is clear that there are serious risks associated with this complex and growing phenomenon. According to the results of the 2005 International Association of Universities (IAU) Survey there is overwhelming agreement (96 percent of responding institutions from 95 countries) that internationalization brings benefits to higher education. Yet, this consensus is qualified by the fact that 70 percent also believe there are substantial risks associated with the international dimension of higher education. (Information on the 2005 IAU Global Survey Report on the Internationalization of Higher Education: New Directions, New Challenges is available at iau@unesco.org.)

The top three risks associated with internationalization are commercialization and commodification of education programs, the increase in the number of foreign "degree mills" and low-quality providers, and brain drain. It is a sign of the times that each of these risks relates more to the cross-border aspects of internationalization than the campus-based activities. It is somewhat surprising that both developing and developed countries identified commercialization as the number-one risk over brain drain—a clear testimony to its importance.

It is also revealing that the loss of cultural or national identity, jeopardy of the quality of higher education, and the homogenization of curriculum were identified as the least important risks. When these results are compared to a similar 2003 IAU Internationalization Survey, brain drain was considered as the greatest risk. Thus, we are seeing a definite shift

over the last three years toward mounting concern about commercialization, commodification, and marketization trends. It is fascinating, but also of some concern, that about 60 percent of the institutions were not aware of the General Agreement on Trade in Services, which proves that GATS is not the primary catalyst for the distress about the commercialization of internationalization.

REGIONAL VIEWS OF RISKS

Eighty-one percent of the universities in Africa, versus only 58 percent of those in North America, indicated the importance and existence of risks related to internationalization. This is probably a sign that more African institutions are vulnerable to the threats of commercialization and low-quality cross-border providers than their counterparts in North America.

Latin America stands out from the rest of the regions as it ranks commodification and commercialization lower in importance than brain drain, elitism, and loss of cultural identity. This perception may be related to the fact that private education at the domestic level is a fundamental and long-term part of higher education provision, and to date for-profit cross-border education is not as prevalent in Latin American countries as in other regions of the world. In the Middle East, the loss of cultural identity is definitely the number-one risk attached to the process of internationalization. Increasing attention is being given to the importance of the international dimension of higher education in the Middle East. It will be revealing to see whether increased involvement in internationalization brings new and different threats to higher education in this region over the next three years when the IAU Internationalization Survey will again be distributed. This tri-annual survey meets the imperative need that we have a long-term perspective and regular monitoring of changes and challenges facing the international dimension of higher education institutions around the world.

BENEFITS ON STUDENT AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

The two most important benefits identified by higher education institutions are more internationally oriented staff/students and improved academic quality. The three least-important benefits according to these same institutions are national and international citizenship, revenue generation, and brain gain. To some, it may seem hard to believe that revenue generation is seen as such a low-priority benefit (and rationale). One might ask whether this was a “socially desirable response” on the part of the responding universities. While this is a fair question, a more accurate explanation may rest on the fact that institutions from 95 countries responded to this survey—58 were from developing and 37 from developed countries. When all responses are tallied, they show that income generation is still not a primary reason or a benefit associated with internationalization. Little evidence exists at this time that internationalization is seen primarily as a profit-making enterprise for the majority of universities around the world. While international-

ization is a top priority for some institutions, this policy perspective is limited to probably 8 or 10 out of the 95 countries.

Again, there are noteworthy differences among regions in terms of perceived benefits. Of interest is the high priority given to academic quality in both Africa and Latin America. The benefit to foster national and international citizenship is generally seen to be of low importance, but more institutions in North America see it as an important benefit than in any other region of the world. Revenue generation also has an overall low ranking, but more universities in Asia Pacific see it as both an important rationale and benefit. Brain gain ranks lowest for the majority of the regions, except the Middle East.

PERSPECTIVES ON BENEFITS IN DEVELOPING AND DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

A gap between developing and developed countries exists in terms of the importance attributed to the benefit of more internationally oriented students and staff. Developed countries see it as the number one benefit but developing countries rank it in fourth place. The developing countries put more emphasis on the benefits of academic quality, research, and curriculum, which are fundamental elements of any higher education institution. Developing countries may assume that these elements need to be firmly in place before it is possible to reap the benefits of more internationally oriented students and staff.

Interestingly enough, there is no difference in the low

Little evidence exists at this time that internationalization is seen primarily as a profit-making enterprise for the majority of universities around the world.

importance given to brain gain between developed and developing countries. One might have expected developed countries to see internationalization bringing more benefits in terms of bright foreign students and promising faculty members or researchers. There are active campaigns in developed countries to attract the best and brightest to augment national human resource capacity and to replace retiring and mobile faculty. Many experts believe that international brain drain/gain, a term that most educators are uncomfortable with, is one of the most critical issues for the next five years as the higher education sector faces demographic changes, increased labor mobility, and growing national competitiveness for knowledge production and distribution.

The findings from the IAU survey paint a relatively positive picture of the sustained importance attributed to internationalization and the increase in the number of institutions that have moved to a planned approach to internationalization. The picture is less encouraging at the national level as institutions believe that national governments are giving inadequate attention to international education and do not play the role that

they should in terms of national policy and funding to facilitate international research, mobility, and development projects. The benefits are clearly articulated but so are the risks. The future of internationalization faces many challenges as the trends of commercialization and commodification are seen to threaten the human development, research, and national capacity benefits of internationalization. ■

Entering International Markets: New Zealand's Problems

MA XIAOYING AND MALCOLM ABBOTT

Ma Xiaoying is lecturer in the English Department at the North China Electric Power University, in Beijing, China. E-mail: amxiaoying@126.com. Malcolm Abbott is a research associate at the Center for Research in International Education, 28A Linwood Avenue, Western Springs, Auckland, New Zealand. E-mail: mabbottnz@hotmail.com.

In recent years a number of universities have sought to take advantage of the increased willingness of students to study abroad. In the New Zealand case, the number of international students at the universities rose from 3,402 in 1998 to 28,195 in 2004. The total number of international students in New Zealand at all educational institutions rose from 26,021 in 1998 to peak at 115,197 in 2003. Since 2004, international student numbers have declined sharply in New Zealand, reducing an important export income for the country and forcing a number of universities to retrench staff.

The international student market is a potentially lucrative one but one that is also more unstable than that of most domestic markets. For the universities of New Zealand, the income from international students has proved to be rather unstable. Not only do universities face stiff competition in international markets, but they also face exchange rate risks that can affect their potential income.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS IN NEW ZEALAND

The presence of international students at New Zealand's educational institutions is not a recent phenomenon. From the 1950s until the late 1980s the country hosted a number of international students. Some of these students came to New Zealand under formal assistance schemes such as the Colombo Plan, while others came privately, mainly from Malaysia and Singapore. These students did not, however, pay full fees for their tuition, and it was only after changes in 1989 that educational institutions were able to recover costs fully.

Through the 1990s the eight universities in New Zealand

(all publicly owned) attempted to recruit full-fee-paying international students. At the same time vocational education, foundation studies, secondary schools, and English schools (both public and private) also began to attract international students. With slow growth in domestic student numbers and the New Zealand government keeping a fairly tight reign on grants to educational institutions, many of them sought to supplement their revenues by actively attracting international students.

International students are attracted to New Zealand because of the lower cost of living in that country compared to Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom. As well, a number are attracted through the possibility of immigrating and because of the ease of entry to students with low standards of English. In the New Zealand case there is no English standard for entry whereas in countries such as Australia students must have an IELTS (International English Language Training System) score of 5.0 to enter an English school.

Growth in international student numbers in New Zealand was promoted by the government to create additional export income. In 2003 and 2004 export education generated over \$NZ 2 billion per annum in foreign exchange, making it the country's fifth-largest export earner after dairy, tourism, meat, and timber products.

RELYING ON CHINA

Despite its strong growth, New Zealand's education export industry was very narrowly based. In the late 1990s nearly all of the growth in international student numbers in New Zealand came from China. Rapid growth in incomes in China over the past 20 years, coupled with a sharply rising level of high school participation and a lagging supply of places in state

The year 2006 has been a traumatic one for the export education industry in New Zealand as the impact of the retrenchment and closure of English schools has gradually begun to flow up to the universities

universities and colleges in China led to a surge in the numbers of Chinese students seeking an education abroad. In New Zealand, Chinese student numbers in the universities rose from only 93 in 1998 to peak at 16,523 in 2004. From virtually zero, Chinese student numbers rose to 58 percent of all international students at universities in New Zealand and 10 percent of overall university enrollments.

The universities in New Zealand became overly dependent upon this single market. The universities were dependent upon a supply chain that reached down through the secondary, vocational, English, and foundation schools of New Zealand. (A foundation school prepares students for university-level study.) The majority of international students in New Zealand attend these preuniversity schools. In particular, English