Pre-print of Revision submitted to Interchange: A Quarterly Review of Education

A Framework for Quality Assurance in Globalization of Higher Education- a view toward the future

Jennifer Job
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Bharath Sriraman[1]
The University of Montana

Abstract: In the paper we theorize a framework for discussing quality assurance of globalized models of education used internationally. The philosophical assumption that homogeneity of perspectives achieves objectivity in practice is argued against using the examples of (1) Brain drain, and (2) Profit over quality. We present a coherent real world scenario for the abstract ideas on inequities in Sriraman & Adrian (2008) with a meta-analytical support of the literature.

Keywords: borderology; quality assurance; higher education; brain drain; meta-analysis of globalization of "higher education"; philosophy of education

In the past two years, Americans have witnessed an economic crisis that is to date requiring over a trillion dollars in government bailouts. To the chagrin of the general public, many of these bailouts have aided and abetted the white collar crimes of corporations and high ranking individuals within corporate structures. The golden parachutes conferred to failing CEO's stood in sharp contrast to middle class Americans who lost their retirement savings and homes.

The economic reactions, documented in cyclical periods since then has been a stock market fallout, currency fixing and manipulation by the Federal Reserve but what is interesting is the effects worldwide. For example in one week of October (25-29,2009), a NASDAQ loss of 5.3% was immediately followed by a Japanese market fall of 9.6%, a

[1] Corresponding Author. E-mail: sriramanb@mso.umt.edu

French fall of 8%, and a British fall of 7% (CNN), just one example of how closely the economies of the world are tied together. In this age of the Internet, international coalitions fighting wars, and cross-border trade agreements, the United States can no longer act in an isolationist manner, separated from the rest of the world by two vast oceans. In the information age, such borders no longer matter.

Thus the topic of globalization[i] of higher education is a timely and important one. Moreover, it is a personal topic for the authors of this paper, who have spent significant time in overseas institutions and have recognized a Western-driven agenda that may affect globalization of higher education in the future. Over the course of the last 14 years, the second author has experienced the life of a visiting academic on numerous sabbaticals and professorships in Norway, Iceland, Germany, Sweden, Turkey, Iran, Cyprus, India and Australia. Whether it is in the Serengeti of the Sudan or the laboratories of China, important information is being discovered and disseminated at light speed, and globalization is the method of giving a level playing field to the academies located across the world.

The functions of universities in developing countries share a number of similarities with those in developed countries, which include 1) creating civil servants to run the state; 2) housing faculty to serve as government advisors; 3) preserving the history of culture of a particular society (Altbach, 1998); and 4) providing opportunities for social mobility. However, universities in developing countries differ in several ways. Lim (1999) suggests that academics in developing countries primarily serve the local community (e.g., advising local government on development projects) and often play a central role in activism when national governments do not fulfill their responsibilities. To support this point, he offers an example of Indonesian faculty leading a student

demonstration in 1998 when the national currency dramatically dropped, causing food prices to sky-rocket. In developed countries, research and technological development has been taking place in the university since the beginning of the twentieth century (Van Damme, 2001). In developing countries, the amount and quality of research does not take place to the same degree. There are two possible reasons why the research is not up to Western standards: 1) former colonial masters provided little financial support for it and instead focused solely on creating civil servants to run the state; 2) large numbers of students have been attending universities in West for the last half century and many of them do not return home, often referred to as the brain-drain (Altbach, 1998).

Even though colonialism, for the most part, ended in the 1950s, the Western model of education is still the prevalent in the developing world for a number of reasons: 1) governments may not allocate appropriate funds to higher education institutions for fear of creating political opposition (Lim, 1999); 2) the World Bank[ii] has used their influence to keep governments in developing countries focused on basic education rather than higher education (Daniels et al., 2006); and 3) many developing countries lack the resources needed to provide higher education to students (Altbach, 1998; Daniels et al., 2006; Dixon, 2006; Lim, 1999). The answer to these difficulties is being found through globalization.

Globalization strategy making, as defined by Marginson and van der Wende (2007), intersects four zones: inter-governmental negotiations, institutions' global dealings, national system setting by governments, and local institutional agendas. These are charted in order to intersect national interests with globalization progression. As noted, “Arguably, outcomes are less determined in the global setting, where the possibilities are more open, than the national setting. For example, national institutional

hierarchies tend to be fairly stable with little room for upward mobility at the top. For governments and globally active institutions, there are two related objectives of global strategy: 1) to maximize capacity and performance within the global landscape, and 2) to optimize the benefits of global flows, linkages and offshore operations back home in the national and global settings" (p.16-17).

Methods of Globalization

Marginson (2004) makes a clear distinction between globalization and internationalization. According to Marginson, internationalization refers to "relations between nations as discrete entities, without implying any necessary change in those nations themselves or in the structuring of their relationship" (p.4). Internationalization in its purest form has been taking place since the institution of higher education began; British colonies modeled their universities after their parent country, and the Bonapartist model that was instituted in the French colonies created the academies that began later in South America (p.5). The difference is that these influences took place behind clear national borders.

Globalization, on the other hand, "refers to the spread of cross-national and worldwide phenomena, including their growing influence at local, regional, and national levels" (p.4). Globalization is a much newer phenomenon than internationalization; attention to the issue dates only back twenty years. It implies fluid borders, institutions that are independent of their national governments and dependent on foreign research instead, and movement of students, faculty, and education from academy to academy in creation of global standards. Marginson (2004) considers five aspects in his framing of globalization: education of foreign students; institutions working in foreign countries, online learning, academic partnerships and consortium, and professional associations. In

order to discuss the governance of higher education institutions, a brief overview of each of these aspects is needed here.

Students Studying Abroad

The obvious first step in globalization is the exchange of students across borders—students studying abroad. According to Marginson (2004), nearly five percent of all students studying in Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development countries were foreigners. 30.5% of students studying in Luxembourg in 1998 were from other countries, as were 16% in Switzerland, and 12.6% in Australia. Less than five percent of American university students were internationals; however, as the level of the degree heightens, so do the percentages. According to a study by Marginson and van der Wende (2007), 30.8% of foreign students were in research-intensive doctoral programs. While the UK had almost 24,000 foreign doctoral students in 2003, the United States had over 102,000. And in 1997, it was reported that 28.3% of all students earning doctorates in the United States were from other countries—nearly quadruple the next highest country. In addition, America offers the largest number of postdoc positions to students worldwide (p.23).

Institutions Established in Foreign Countries

Marginson and van der Wende (2007) describe the mobility of programs into foreign nations. Typically the movement is from West to East; the UK, United States, and Australia have established campuses in China, Southeast Asia, India, and Africa, as well as in Mexico and Latin American countries (p.41). The movement of higher education movements is so prevalent that the World Trade Organization has created a framework for governance in the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) to create economic equality (Altbach and Knight, 2007). The GATS provisions cover cross-

border supply (franchising), consumption abroad (movement to a new country), commercial presence (facilities and joint ventures), and presence of natural persons (professors and researchers). As of 2004, the GATS provisions were still under advisement (p.292).

USAID has established the Higher Education for Development office in order to "link US colleges and universities with institutions of higher learning in developing nations. Partners work together to design and implement solutions to development challenges across the developing world." (hedprogram.org, retrieved 11/28/08). HED has 300+ partnerships in 60+ countries, focusing on education, agriculture, economic development, and health. US institutions create these partnerships through a peer-reviewed application process through the USAID office.

Online Learning

Perhaps the fastest-growing and thus least-regulated aspect of globalization is online learning. As Marginson (2004) notes, "the development of e-distance learning...is largely driven by technological change and the corporate sector rather than educational change and government policy" (p.12). E-learning as described by Marginson can take on many forms, such as Internet sites, CD-ROMS, video-conferencing, and real-time chat (p.13). Marginson also cites the University of Pheonix (2007, p.41), a popular American on-line university, as a growing presence in Mexico, India, Latin America, and Eastern and Western Europe. The University of Phoenix provides students in poorer countries with relatively inexpensive access to higher education when they otherwise would have none.

Consortiums, Partnerships, and Organizations

In an effort to both regulate and capitalize on the globalization movement, several consortia have been established, mainly amongst European countries but stretching across the oceans as well. The GATS effort has already been discussed. The two best-known consortia of European harmonization of universities are ERASMUS and SOCRATES, designed to regulate degrees and curriculum across EU countries (Marginson and van der Wende, 2007). These two organization drove the Bologna Process and Lisbon Strategy, worth discussing here due to their influence on further globalization development[iii].

In 1998, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Italy convened their education ministers to align their degree structures. The idea was to create a degree that would be recognized across borders, thus allowing students from all of the countries to easily attend any of the universities and be assured the degree would be recognized at home. By the next year, twenty-nine countries had ratified the Bologna Process. In 2000, the Bologna Process was followed by the Lisbon Strategy, declaring that by 2010, the EU would be the most "competitive and dynamic knowledge economy in the world" (p.46). The Strategy was followed by the ECTS (European Credit Transfer System) and EQF (European Qualifications Framework). Revisions in 2005 also called for integration of global student populations outside of Europe, scientific research strengthening, and gender balancing in the university population (p.49). The OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) is incorporating countries from all over the world to follow such a model.

Motivation for Globalization

Aside from the reasons stated at the beginning of the paper, there are several key

motivations driving the higher education globalization process. Altbach and Knight (2007) present several (p.292-294).

Access is a difficulty in several countries, especially developing nations. Global access can take many forms: branch campuses, franchised foreign academic degrees, online programs, and independent institutions modeled after foreign universities. This type of access is essential for keeping up with demand, even in countries where less than 20% of the college age group is enrolling in institutions.

Altbach and Knight also discuss "traditional" internationalization versus "European" internationalization. Traditional internationalization provides cross-cultural perspectives for students and enhance curricula. Traditional internationalization tends to include study-abroad programs, international studies, and foreign language programs in its definition. European internationalization, on the other hand, focuses on economic and political integration to strengthen the European Union. This internationalization focuses on the initiatives described in the previous section.

In recent years, financial difficulty has been experienced by some universities in developed countries (Altbach, 2006; Amaral & Magalhaes, 2004; Dixion, 2006). For example, Lieven & Martin (2006) state the British government has raised the number of new students universities have to admit while simultaneously cutting their funding. As universities in the West lose public funding, they appear to be aiming toward becoming more of a primary provider of higher education in developing countries through internationalization, in the form of both profit and non-profit activities (Altbach, 2006). According to Van Damme (2001), internationalization can be conceptualized as the "activities of higher education institutions, often supported or framed by multilateral agreements or programs, to expand their reach over national borders" (p. 417). Some

examples of non-profit international activities include supporting international exchanges, offering internships and facilitating study abroad programs.

The arrival of globalization has allowed Western universities to focus more on for-profit internationalization in the form of distance learning, branching and franchising (Altbach, 2006). According to Stiglitz (2002), globalization is a phenomenon that produces a "closer integration of the countries and peoples of the world which has been brought about by the enormous reduction of costs of transportation and communication, and the breaking down of artificial barriers to flows of goods, services, capital, knowledge, and (to a lesser extent) people across borders" (p. 9). The increase in communication and technology has allowed more higher education institutions to become cross-borders providers through distance learning (Moore, 1994; Mortimore, 2006). Branching is gaining popularity among Western nations and takes place when a university is authorized by a foreign government to open a campus but still remains "under the authority of mother institution" (Van Damme, 2001, p. 424). Franchising allows a university to give permission to another institution to provide a degree or program in their name. Healey (2008) estimates that there are more than 1,500 Australian franchise operations in existence, mostly taking place in Asia. Branches in developing nations are cheaper to build, cheaper to run, and the faculty salaries are typically much lower than those in the home country (p. 292). According to Marginson (2004), exportation of US higher education totaled $14 billion in 2000.

These activities, regardless of whether a profit is made, may lead to opportunities for collaborative research and diverse learning for students as well as prestige for both developed and developing countries (Altbach, 2006). The increased presence of Western universities in the developing world may also promote global public goods. Increased

literacy would be an example of a global public good since individuals who participate in cross-border higher education programs may pass those skills on to their children or community members, which raises the overall level of literacy in a specific society (Marginson, 2007).

Western universities are not the only actors interested in providing higher education opportunities to students in developing countries. Since globalization has led to more open markets and lowered state regulation, the private sector has become quite active in higher education (Mok, 2006; Van Damme, 2001; Yonezawa, 2007). Media companies, corporate universities and IT companies are all offering higher education opportunities to students that were once seen solely as the responsible of the university (Daniels, 2006). Altbach (2006) states that these companies involved in cross-border higher education are often private and publicly traded companies (e.g., Kaplan owns the Dublin Business School).

With higher education enrollment on the raise and distance learning becoming more prevalent, the private sector is interested in the potential profits to be made in this market (Altbach, 2006) as well as the creation of an inexpensive skilled labor pool. According to Daniels (2006) the number of students seeking higher education in China has doubled between 2000 and 2003, and 23% of students in India are already participating in distance learning. These authors go on to state that developing countries will most likely not be able to meet the demand of the tens of millions of students will be seeking degrees in developing countries in the coming years.

Other motivations drive globalization as well. Globalization causes cultural homogenization in several ways. While it may seem "frightening" (Yang, 2003), globalization spreads cultural values and ideas across borders. There is also a hope that

financial and knowledge disparities may be corrected by globalization. Right now, the gap between the people living in the richest countries and the poorest is 74 to 1 (p.273). Spreading education as an economic commodity could perhaps give those in the poorest sector a chance at equalization. The method of globalization may dissipate the effects of education per capita expenditure disparities by giving students more choice. In addition, the educational values themselves may meld through globalization. According to a survey by Kragh and Bislev (2005), approaches to teaching vary across national lines. 1300 foreign students at the Norweigian School of Economics and Business Administration were surveyed as to their educational values. As they were all business students, their desired outcomes of their education were presumed to be similar. Students surveyed came from 31 different countries. Kragh and Bislev discovered that teaching expectations fell into two categories: discussion/group-oriented and lecture/nonegalitarian-oriented. Students from Finland, Denmark, Netherlands, UK, USA, Canada, Australia, Mexico, Singapore, and Lithuania expected the former category, while students from Japan, Russia, Poland, France, Italy, Germany, Spain, Thailand, Austria, and Belgium expected the latter. Yet upon closer questioning, the lecture-oriented students saw the value of group work in discussing business cases, while students from the discussion-oriented countries saw value in lecture in certain situations. The outcome was both an encouragement of mixed-methodology in teaching and homogenization in student values, presumably creating a student body with an expanded view of the world and how to deal with it. The value of this outcome cannot be overestimated. Perhaps if students share learning values, they will also be more willing to share knowledge accrual and scientific discovery.

Marginson (2007) suggests that private Western higher education providers offer

many of the same benefits to developing countries that public institutions do (e.g., improved literacy rates, a more skilled labor force). However, some governments are not interested in the West directly educating their students. This action has caused the private sector higher education providers in the West to increasingly use their influence lobby their government and the WTO in order to circumvent national governments that would prefer to keep both public and private Western Higher Education Providers (WHEP) out of their countries (Altbach, 2001). Governments in developed countries are keen on assisting the private sector efforts to persuade the WTO since there is a substantial sum of tax revenue at stake and it may help spread Western values (Mok, 2006). If the private sector and national governments in the West persuade the WTO to place higher education under its legal framework, then WHEP would be guaranteed access to higher education markets in all developing countries that are members of the WTO (Altbach, 2001).

Difficulties in Globalization

Globalization is not only the preferred model for higher education but also on a track that seems irreversible. So many factors are driving globalization that there is no possibility of reverting to a closed-border system of nationalism in education. As Allen, Bonous-Hammarth, and Teranishi state (2006):

> Across the globe, universities in China, the United States, Russia, India, Brazil, South Africa, France, and Australia represent major centers for economic development and socio-cultural exchange. Higher education institutions influence, and are in turn influenced by, difference and diversity in the world's population. These nations are also examples of the complex challenges that result where multiple, diverse, different communities interact, overlap, and exchange. These challenges are ones that we need to face and we will grow from them.

Arguably, globalization is the impetus behind the 300% increase in student

mobility that has taken place in the past twenty years (Van Damme, 2001). This phenomena has led to calls by international institutions, World Bank, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), for standards to ensure quality courses and degrees (Lim, 1999; Van Damme, 2001; Vedder, 1994). International institutions appear to be concerned about quality assurance in developing countries for a several reasons. First, there is ample evidence that some indigenous institutions lack the resources to provide a quality education to students (Lim, 1999). Second, WHEP may be guilty of offering educational opportunities that do not meet minimum standards of quality and may even be deemed exploitative i.e. students pay for an education that does not meet their needs (Altbach, 2001; Lieven & Martin, 2006). Third, governments in developing countries may not provide appropriate oversight of higher education providers (Altbach, 2001).

Several authors have suggested that resources often come from developed countries to make up for this deficit in the form of curriculum, materials and/or qualified staff. Altbach (1998) states the West has had a tremendous influence on the type of curriculum used in universities in developing countries. Mok (2006) adds when trends in Western curriculum change course the developing world follows. For instance, the teacher-oriented approach that was once acceptable has moved to a more global student-centered one with "emphasis on creativity, pro-solving approaches, multicultural environments, computer literacy and competency in English" (Yonezawa, 2007, p. 125). Altbach (1998) suggests developed countries provide aid in the form of textbooks since they may be scarce in universities. Lim (1999) claims elite universities are often the only institutions with a faculty who can effectively implement the curriculum provided by the

West since these institutions house professors with Ph.D.s who have been trained in the U.S. or Europe. These schools are often only available to wealthy. Most university faculty in developing countries seldom have a degree higher than a master's. Additionally, many instructors may not receive appropriate pay and, are therefore, forced to seek employment outside the university. With staff lacking the ability to provide students with an appropriate education, instructors may be brought in from the West (Van Damme, 2001). Lim adds that these academics are usually employed for the short-term and can potentially cause jealousy among indigenous staff because they often receive higher wages.

According to Van Damme (2001) there are serious consequences for students when institutions (native or foreign) offer programs or degrees that are deficit in quality. Students who participate in higher education programs that lack quality may encounter difficulty in the job market, both in their home country and abroad, because employers may not recognize their degree. Students who decide to transfer to a different institution or seek a higher degree may also run into problems with admission, if their former provider is viewed as illegitimate. The author goes on to say that when students are apprehensive about cross-border providers, they will be less likely to participate in those types of programs (e.g., distance learning, branching). When students do not attend programs provided by cross-border providers, the benefits internationalization offers students, institutions and countries (developed and developing) are lost.

Brain Drain

However, whereas globalization is the wave of the future, so to speak, there are several negative implications that must be addressed before the movement can be considered successful. The first is the inequity in exchange of knowledge toward the

Western countries, otherwise known as "Brain Drain." Marginson and van der Wende (2007) use Germany as an example—students leave to study abroad and in significant percentages decide to stay in the country where they studied. Countries thus lose not only the worker himself, but the knowledge gained that could have added to the economy and political system at home. This is a much larger issue when considering the influx of Asian students, especially near-eastern (i.e., Pakistani, Indian, etc.) into the United States. These countries' burgeoning economies desperately need their students to benefit from the high-quality education they receive in the US and then return to their countries to contribute to growth at home. But students who remain in the US contribute nothing at home, and 40% of Indian technical institute grads seek employment overseas (p.27).

Americanization of Higher Education

Relatively few American students choose to study elsewhere. Michael Stohl (2007) described his experience as the director of a task force to internationalize his university in California. As part of his directive, he instituted programs to encourage students to study abroad. Despite these efforts, only two departments had any growth in students studying abroad. Stohl cites a study by Engberg and Green (2002) found that only 3% of American students study abroad before they graduate. These numbers place an inordinate amount of importance on American education in the global realm.

A much more perplexing issue in terms of globalization is the Western higher education model pushing the effort. The clearest evidence of this force is the establishment of English as the language of higher education in both the sciences and liberal arts. While English is equaled by Mandarin and nearly by Hindu as the most spoken language in the world, 90% of non-English speaking students go to English speaking universities (Marginson and van der Wende, 2007, p.22). Non-English papers

are significantly less likely to be published or disseminated than English language papers, despite the quality of the research or science behind them. In fact, American papers alone flood the educational market (p.36). While America makes up a fraction of the world's population, a full 30.9% of papers published in science journals came from American institutions, followed by 8.8% from Japan, and 7.3% from the UK, an incredibly disproportionate amount. Marginson and van der Wende (p.22) discuss the "Americanized global sector" due to the overrepresentation of American institutions both at home and abroad. 54% of the world's top ranked universities are American, and many of the branched or franchised universities abroad are influenced either directly or indirectly by American schools.

The potential problem of this influence is the inference that may be drawn in terms of the Academy and governance. With such a large presence, the assumption can be made that the only quality research being done in the world is done at American institutions, which cannot possibly be proven. Many of the most recent major discoveries in terms of stem cell research, microchip technology, and energy have been made in international universities. In addition, we cannot afford to make the assumption that only Americans know how to run a university or teach a higher education course, as shown by the Copenhagen Business School study. For every top-notch university we have in America, we have several that are not meeting accreditation standards. There is also a sense of arrogance that keeps us from allowing other countries to assess our methods but give us the right to assess theirs. Efforts by the WTO to institute accreditation standards for international universities have been largely Western-driven with no sense of egalitarian process.

The last negative aspect of the American influence is the disservice American

students receive in the globalization scheme. The idea that American education and English is the only knowledge worthwhile prevents our students from taking full advantage of the positive aspects of globalization. According to the Engberg and Green study cited by Stohl, less than 8% of college students are enrolled in a foreign-language class. Only 14% of students take internationally-focussed courses, and only 6% of all language enrollments are in Asian languages, with 2% in Arabic and Hebrew (p.364). Considering the current American involvement in the Middle East and the rise of the Chinese economic projections for the next decade, our students will be extraordinarily underprepared to compete in the global society of the future if these trends do not change.

Profit over Quality

As discussed previously, profit is a driving force of globalization. While the GATS amendments are provisions created to equalize the economic trade of higher education globalization, they do nothing to ensure quality. In order to illustrate the negative implications of a profit-driven higher education economy, I would like to describe two examples from the last decade.

Lieven and Martin (2006) completed a comprehensive study of the importation of British higher education institutes into Israel from 1990-2000. In summary, several highly ranked British institutions, endorsed by the British Quality Assurance Association, established higher education programs in Israel over that decade. These institutions included Derby, Middlesex University, and Croftbury College. MBA, BA, and MS programs were began in conjunction with Ramat Gan College and Herzlyya Interdisciplinary Institute in Israel.

The impetus for these programs was largely profit over quality. At the time, UK

universities were being pushed by the education minister to discover new ways to create profit, as socialized education laws prevent at-home tuition hikes. Taking ready-made packaged programs to a country with a large English-speaking population was a clear path to profit—professors were paid less, the buildings were established, and best of all, Israeli students typically complete programs quicker than than British students, allowing for more students to be put through a program per year. The profit could be funneled back into universities in the UK. At the same time, Israel wanted the programs to offer more education spots to their college-age population, which was growing exponentially. The new programs were also intended to serve ethnicities typically underrepresented in the Israeli community, namely Arabs and Sephardic Jews.

The Israel initiative was a complete failure for a number of reasons documented by Lieven and Martin in conjunction with studies done by the Israeli government. The first point of falter was the UK's ignorance of Israeli college culture. While Israelis are typically older when they begin school (due to mandatory military service) and perhaps more mature and focused, they also tend to have full time jobs while attending school. The UK MBA was designed for full-time students who had twenty to thirty hours a week to study outside of class; not only did the Israeli students not have that kind of time, they expected to finish a term in three months when the typical British student was given five. In addition, the instructional experience of Israel schools is very different than British schools; Israeli students expect more hands on learning and less direct instruction, a factor ignored by the British programs. Thus, the students did so poorly in the programs that teachers ended up feeding them answers for exit exams, a fact that did not escape quality inspectors. (Ironically, while appeals to the British QAA by the Israeli government were ignored, the Israeli schools welcomed outside scrutiny which helped

their own professors improve their technique.)

Not only did the programs falter, but their was no attempt made by the British Government (which oversaw the university overseas programs) to work with the Israeli government to prepare for the outcome of the increased number of degrees. Workers with advanced technical and business degrees expected higher salaries, which ended up costing the economy 50 million NIS by 2000. No provisions were made to ease the economic system into this need, and the government of Israel largely covered the cost. This outcome, combined with the lack of regulation and quality assurance by the British system, drove the Israeli government to pass a law prohibiting such importation of higher education from overseas in the future—thus causing Israel to be seen as some, including Marginson (2004), as closed-minded to globalization when in fact there are extenuating circumstances.

Perhaps a less obvious but more insidious example of choosing quality over the educational health of the people involved is the John F. Welch Technology Centre in Bangalore, India (www.ge.com, retrieved 11/20/08). Instituted on September 17, 2000 by John Welch, former CEO of GE Technologies, Inc., the JFW Centre is a large-scale engineering school established to educate Indian students. Touted by GE as a philanthropic institution to provide high-tech skills to the underprivileged, the school does at first seem to do just that. Students are provided housing and board, a world-class global laboratory to work in, and educational opportunities they may not otherwise acquire.

However, upon closer inspection, the purpose of the institute is anything but philanthropic. Engineers educated at the institute are required to stay and work there for several years and are not eligible for GE jobs anywhere else in the world. Any invention

engineered by the students are immediately made property of GE and patented by the US. The Web site for the institute states that in the eight years of the institution, they have patented 185 technologies. Engineers in India make less than 10% of what engineers in the United States do, and by establishing the Centre, Welch ensured that he had a constant output of cheaply educated, cheaply paid labor churning out patents at an incredible rate. Outsourcing has thus gone from the labor to the education creating the ability to labor.

The Israel and India examples are just two of how profit-driven education can cause inequities in a system that is meant to balance. Just as we cannot expect the CEOs of companies to act out of the goodness of their hearts, the global communities cannot expect higher education institutions to act in a philanthropic manner with no governance in place.

A New Framework of Well-Being

In 2005, Hostetler[iv] produced a seminal article calling for researchers to pay closer attention to the consequences educational research has on students. He suggests scholars examine whether the research that leads to policy contributes to the well-being of students instead of simply focusing on whether it is methodologically sound. Well-being can be conceptualized as "the satisfaction of one's most major informed desires, taking one's life, or a portion of it, as a whole" (White, 1991, p. 30). The more one's desires are fulfilled the greater individual well-being they experience. These desires are made up of a combination of physical comforts (e.g., shelter, health), the kind of person one wants to become (e.g., patient, altruistic) and professional aspirations (e.g., fisherman, physician). The role of education, the author claims, is to help students develop informed desires by first teaching them what desires are culturally acceptable and then providing them with the skills needed to reflect on those desires. This process

allows each individual student to make choices about how to best achieve maximum well-being.

Educational researchers, Hostetler suggests, can begin to determine whether research will support well-being by considering the potential trade-offs that would be experienced by the students. He points to The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) to illuminate his concept of trade-off, but does not go into great detail. The work of Barone, Mallete & Hong Xu (2005) provides a nice overview that can illustrate Hostetler's NCLB example. These authors suggest NCLB, as it relates to early schooling and literacy, was initiated because students were not meeting state standards. Congress requested that the National Reading Panel (NRP) provide the research to support this legislation. The research NRP presented to Congress suggested that in order to help children become better readers and writers, teachers need to focus on improving alphabet knowledge, fluency, and comprehension skills. Little was mentioned in the report on different ways in which children learn. These authors argue that not considering the research on the different ways children learn leads to a trade-off: teachers are not matching instruction to individual student strengths. Instead, teachers relying on a uniform approach for teaching children to learn to read and write that may not be effective for some students. Hostetler would likely view this trade-off as limiting some children's ability to develop the skills needed to achieve a high level of well-being.

For the remainder of this section, we will rely on Hostetler's well-being framework to present the potential trade-offs citizens could experience if international policy is adopted to promote the two educational aims discussed in this essay. First, as previously mentioned, the for-profit international activities of WHEP appear to be on the rise, which may eventually bring higher education markets in developing countries under

the control of the WTO. Internationalization, according to the research, could increase opportunities for citizens in developing countries to participate in higher education and, in some cases, raise the quality of education offered. The second educational aim discussed in this essay was the implementation of quality standards, either at the national or international level. A system of quality assurance may decrease the likelihood of students being exploited by foreign providers or receiving an education that does not provide them with skills to be a productive in an increasingly globalized world. Both educational aims could lead to a more skilled labor force, global public goods and a reversal of the brain-drain, which could in turn strength the national economy.

Attempts at Governance

Scholars have presented two frameworks for ensuring students receive a quality education that international institutions could soon begin pressuring developing countries to adopt. The first option is a global system of quality assurance that resembles the Bologna Declaration (Marginson, 2004; Van Damme, 2001). The 1999 Bologna Declaration established guidelines to ensure the level of quality among European universities were equivalent. This quality assurance system allows credits to be transferable, degrees to be recognizable and ensures national curriculums center around similar content (Amaral & Magalhaes, 2004). This system would most likely ensure institutions are offering quality programs by setting international agreed upon standards, self-evaluating, relying on external peer evaluation and making reports available to the public (Faber & Huisman, 2003).

Marginson (2004) contends that in order to establish an equitable global quality assurance system, a bottom up process that gives local and national actors a voice in setting up guidelines is necessary. Local actors, in this case, would be both private and

public higher education institutions from different countries. Creating a quality assurance that allows these actors to participate will give indigenous higher education institutions the ability to sustain their local and national identity. The author believes that Europe and the United States need to make the first step toward agreed standards, which will then have a global effect. The author, however, does not offer details on the voice developing countries will have in determining standards.

Other authors (Lim, 1999; Vedder, 1994) believe an international system of quality assurance is not appropriate because standards will likely be developed by the West and may not represent all countries. They believe national quality standards are the solution. Lim (1999) offers a detailed approach to improving and assessing quality in universities in the developing world that begins at the institutional level. A strong commitment on the part of head faculty members and university leaders, he claims, must first be in place. Next, establishing the mission of the university and developing national quality management procedures should be introduced with external auditors to follow. Increasing in staff pay, guaranteeing academic freedom, addressing corruption are posited by Lim as additional provisions necessary for ensuring quality. Lim fears that without these provisions in place developing countries' commitment to quality assurance will be simply lip-service. Authors in favor of this national system of quality control do not, however, discuss whether the Western conception of quality would be inline with how an individual developing country views quality (Altbach, 2006). Furthermore, since governments in developing countries may lack the resources to provide oversight, where the funding will come from to implement either system is unclear.

While the EU has instituted ERASMUS to govern its quality of higher education, there is no global authority to ensure the quality of institutions abroad or whether a

degree from a university in the Sudan is comparable to one from a college in Greece. Several areas need to be addressed. Van Damme (2001) names them as:

1) National legislation and higher education policy (i.e., discrimination)
2) Qualifications authorities and policy (i.e., recognizing degrees)
3) Customs (i.e., cross-border materials)
4) Visas (i.e, who is allowed to get an educational visa or not)
5) Telecommunication laws (i.e., restriction of Internet)
6) Intellectual property rights (i.e., patents for new technologies)

Van Damme notes (p.432) that UNESCO has been very active in this field through the centre for higher education (CEPES) in Bucharest. This has driven the National Academic Recognition Information Centres initiative, which is pushing for policies dealing with the above qualifications.

Ranking Systems instead of Oversight

Rather than implementing a large-scale governance system, institutions and students alike have begun to rely on ranking systems modeled after the popular *US News & World Report* system in the United States. The two most respected and widely-recognized ranking systems are *The Times Higher Education Supplement Rankings of Universities (*THES) and *Shanghai Jiao Tong University* (SJTU).

The SJTU[v] is based on performance in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities: 20% citation in leading journals, 20% by articles in *Science* and *Nature* magazines, 20% by the number of leading researchers in their fields, 30% by the number of Nobel and Fields Medal winners, and 10% by the number of staff. The THES is determined 40% by opinion survey of academicians around the world, 10% from surveys of global employers, 5% on the proportion of international students, 5% on the proportion

of international faculty, 20% on student/staff ratio, and the final 20% on the same leading researcher index used by the SJTU (Marginson and van der Wende, "To Rank or Be Ranked," 2007). Both methods rank the top 100 institutes in the world. They have many positive aspects recommending both of them—research and publication is important to reputation, and both consider staff/student ratio. The THES focuses more on the actual students attending the institutions, which may align it more to the World Bank standards.

Both ranking systems have two serious issues. The first is a lack of holistic judgment of the universities. They are only focused on comprehensive-research universities and do not take teaching colleges or other specialties into account. Teaching quality, academic freedom, and student selection are also completely left out of consideration.

The other issue has much greater implications considering the discussion of Americanization in the previous part of this paper. 17 of the top 20 SJTU universities are American (Harvard is number one), while 12 of the top 20 THES universities are (Harvard is again number one). Money is overwhelming factor—financing improves facilities, hires Nobel winners, and drives research. In addition, the favoritism given to American research in journals, and the dependence on the English language, heavily skew both ranking systems toward America institutions. It is a self-perpetuating process, and many ranking systems are typically behind the actuality of the university. The possibility that excellent teaching and research work may be occurring in smaller schools is almost completely rejected, aside from Israel and Denmark (p.314), who tend to outperform their economic abilities.

Both educational aims, however, have consequences that could affect students' well-being. Globalization could decrease the ability of a government to determine who

can and cannot offer higher education opportunities to its citizens, if oversight is transferred to the WTO (Altbach, 2001). Policy makers' ability to regulate higher education in their country may be decreased because developing countries typically have not had an equal say in the decisions taking place in the WTO (Stiglitz, 2002). If this takes place, Altbach (2001) believes, students could then be at-risk for receiving an inappropriate education since WTO standards may not be stringent enough. If global or national quality standards are mandated by international institutions without developing countries having a voice in the process then that system could be new form of Western imperialism (Mok, 2006), which could potentially degrade traditional occupations, replace individual languages with English and limit an institution's ability to determine curriculum (Vedder, 1994).

If the WTO opens access to higher education markets and/or if developing countries are pressured into enacting either a national or international system of quality assurance, indigenous universities may be put out of business. These institutions may be threatened because of their inability to compete with cross-border providers or meet Western imposed quality standards, which could diminish students' well-being. As mentioned earlier, staff at local universities play an important role in the community and help ensure governments are enacting policies that will benefit the citizens of that particular country. If the presence of WHEP leads to the disappearance of these indigenous institutions then it is possible that the well-being of citizens could be diminished, since there is no evidence that WHEP faculty will take a similar interest in the local community and national policy issues.

Perhaps the attempt at governance that comes closest to Hostetler's vision of well-being can be found The World Bank Task Force on Higher Education and Society's report

entitled “Promise and Peril” (2000), which listed the following principles of good governance:

1) Academic Freedom
2) Shared Governance
3) Clear Rights and Responsibilities
4) Meritocratic Selection
5) Financial Stability
6) Accountability
7) Regular Testing of Standards
8) The importance of Close Cooperation

In the report, there is a clear focus on human rights, individual determination, and health of the host nation. The Task Force recommended faculty councils, governing councils, and set budget practices (p.64).

However, there is no authority given to the Task Force, and thus none of the standards have been implemented on a wide scale. Some of the more egregious examples given for these needs are:

- A senior observer of the African scene told the Task Force that “with the government in many countries having assumed the power to appoint and dismiss the Vice Chancellor, governance in the universities has thus become a purely state-controlled system...There are countries where even deans and department heads are also appointed by government and where heads of institutions change with heads of government.
- In China, the presidents of two leading universities, Beijing and Tsinghua, are appointed directly by the State Council, comprising the Prime Minister and the

Cabinet, acting upon the recommendation of the Communist Party.

- The Civic Education Project, a US-based, nongovernmental organization operating in parts of the former Soviet Union, commented that “hiring practices in universities are ad hoc and personnel are under the influence of high officials in the president's office or the Ministries of Education.
- Between the early '80s and '96, the total number of higher education institutions in El Salvador increased from six to 42. Many of these were low-quality, “garage” universities, resulting from poor external governance. (p.62-63)

As globalization of higher education grows exponentially, a dire need has presented itself with a clear governance system with authority on the level of that appropriated to NAFTA, NATO, and other like environmental and economic treaties. We suggest that the World Bank Task force be given the weight of enforcement following the model of the Lisbon Strategy, yet depending on the structure of well-being combining their own standards and Hostetler’s definitions. If students can be assured that their degree from a smaller, relatively unknown university will be recognized through a world-wide governance committee, they will be more likely to take chances on such universities and thus grow the population and exchange of knowledge—the ultimate goal of globalization. As Van Damme put it (2001):

> We have come to a point where voluntarism and deliberately chosen short-sightedness are no longer acceptable and where confrontation with issues of quality and quality assurance no longer is avoidable. The internationalization model, prevailing in most countries (especially in Europe), characterised by a rather naïve confidence in the quality of the partners involved, has reached its limits. In an increasingly competitive international market in higher education, quality will have to become a distinguishing characteristing guiding consumers

> and institutions in their strategic behaviour. Unless the quality dimension is fully integrated in internationalization policies, the further growth of mobility and transnational delivery will risk to be at the expense of its quality. We have come to a point where the international mobility of students and broader processes of internationalisation in higher education no longer can avoid the confrontation with issues of quality and quality assurance. (p.437)

Acknowledgement

The authors thank Dwight Irvin for his valuable input in the previous version of this manuscript, and the anonymous editorial panel for their insightful commentaries to improve the end product.

References

Arum, R., Gamoran, A., Shavit, Y. (2012). Expanded opportunities for all in global higher education systems. In L. Weis & N. Dolby (Eds). *Social Class and Education* (pp.15-36). New York: Routledge,

Allen, W. R., Bonous-Hammarth, M., & Teranishi, R. T. (2006). Higher education in a global society :Achieving diversity, equity and excellence. Amsterdam; London: Elsevier JAI.

Altbach, P.G. (2006). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3), 290-305.

Altbach, P.G. (2001). Higher education and the WTO: Globalization run amok. *International Higher Education*, *23*, 2-4.

Altbach, P.G. (1998). *Comparative Higher Education: Knowledge, the University, and Development*. CT: Greenwich. Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Amaral, A., & Magalhães, A. (2004). Epidemiology and the Bologna saga. *Higher Education, 48*(1), 79-100.

Barone, D., Mallette, M. & Xu, S. (2005). *Teaching early literacy: Development, assessment, and instruction.* NY: New York. The Guildford Press.

Bassett, R. M. (2006). The WTO and the university :Globalization, GATS, and american higher education. New York: Routledge.

Dale, R. (2005). Some complexities of globalisation and education Routledge.

Daniel, J., Kanwar, A., & Uvalić-Trumbić, S. (2006). A tectonic shift in global higher education. *Change, 38*(4), 16-23.

Dixon, M. (2006). Globalisation and international higher education: Contested positionings. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10* (4), 319-333.

Faber, M., & Huisman, J. (2003). Same voyage, different routes? The course of the Netherlands and Denmark to a 'european model' of quality assurance. *Quality in Higher Education, 9*(3), 231-242.

General Electric. (2008). John F. Welch Technology Centre. Retrieved 11/29/2008 from www.ge.com/in/ourcompany/jfwtc.html.

Healey, N. (2008). Is higher education in really 'internationalising'? *Higher Education, 55*(3), 333-355.

Hostetler, K. (2005). What is "good" education research? *Educational Researcher, 34* (6), 16-21.

Johnson, D.B., Arora, A., & Experton, W. (1998). *The financing and management of higher education: A status report on worldwide reforms*. Paris. UNESCO Conference on Higher Education.

Kragh, S. U., & Bislev, S. (2005). Universities and student values across nations. Journal of Intercultural Communication, (9), 48-63.

Lieven, M., & Martin, G. (2006). Higher education in a global market: The case of british overseas provision in israel. Higher Education, 52(1), 41-68.

Lim, D. (1999). Quality assurance in higher education in developing countries. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 24*(4), 379-441.

Marginson, S., & van der Wende, M. (2007). Globalisation and higher education. OECD Papers, 7(7), 1-85.

Marginson, S. (2007). The public/private divide in higher education: A global revision. *Higher Education, 53*(3), 307-333.

Marginson, S. (2004). Going global: governance implications of cross-border traffic in higher education. In W.G. Tierney (Ed). *Competing Conceptions of Academic Governance: Negotiating the Perfect Storm*. (pp. 1-32) Baltimore, Md: The John Hopkins University Press.

Marginson, S. (2007). To rank or to be ranked: The impact of global rankings in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3), 306-329.

Mok, K.H. (2006). Questing for internationalization of universities in East Asia: Critical reflections. *Osaka University International Symposium, 13-14 January 2006* (pp. 254-274). Japan.

Moore, M. G. (1994). Is there a cultural problem in international distance education?" In M. Thompson (Ed.). *Proceedings of Conference on Internationalism in Distance Education* (pp 188-194). University Park: The Pennsylvania State University.

Mortimore, P. (2001). Globalisation, effectiveness and improvement. *School Effectiveness & School Improvement, 12*(2), 229-249.

Rui Yang. (2003). Globalisation and higher education development: A critical analysis. International Review of Education, 49(3), 269.

Sriraman, B., & Adrian, H. (2008). A critique and response to multicultural visions of globalization. *Interchange: A Quarterly Review of Education*, 39(1), 119-130.

Sriraman, B. (2012). Polarities in (Nordic) Mathematics Education: Scaling the field. Plenary paper in G. Gunnarsdottir, F.Hreinsdottir, G.Palsdottir et al (Eds) *Proceedings of NORMA11 - The 6th Nordic Conference on Research in Mathematics Education*, Reykjavik, Iceland. pp. 65-80

Stiglitz, J.E. (2002). *Globalization and Its Discontents*. NY: New York. W.W. Norton & Company.

Stohl, M. (2007). We have met the enemy and he is us: The role of the faculty in the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade. Journal of Studies in International Education, 11(3/4), 359.

Sumner, J. (2008). From academic imperialism to the civil commons: Institutional possibilities for responding to the United Nations Decade for Sustainable Development. *Interchange*, 39(1), 77-94.

Unesco Publishing, Economica, & International Association of Universities. (2002). Globalization and the market in higher education : Quality, accreditation and qualifications. Paris: Unesco.

USAID. (2008). Higher Education for Development. Retrieved 11/28/2008 from www.hedprogram.org.

Vaira, M. (2004). Globalization and higher education organizational change: A framework for analysis. Higher Education, 48(4), 483-510.

Van Damme, D. (2001). Quality issues in the internationalization of higher education.

Higher Education, 41(4), 415.

Vedder, P. (1994). Global measurement of the quality of education: A help to developing countries? *International Review of Education, 40*(1), 5.

White, J. (1991). *Education and the Good Life.* NY: New York: Teachers College Press.

World Bank Task Force on Higher Education and Society. (2000). Higher education in developing countries: perils and promise. Washington, DC.

Yonezawa, A. (2007). Strategies for the emerging global higher education market in East Asia: A comparative study of Singapore, Malaysia and Japan. *Globalisation, Societies & Education, 5*(1), 125-136.

Zakaria, F. (2008) US has self to blame for economic crisis. Retrieved 11/28/2008 from www.cnn.com/2008/WORLD/americas/10/24/zakaria.financialcrisis/index.html?iref=newssearch.

---

[i] Globalization in this article is defined to encompass the corporate globalization as well as globalization from bottom up due to the spread of information technology in the *noosphere* (Sriraman & Adrian, 2008). For a more subtle treatment of the semantics of synonyms such as globalization and internationalizations, please refer to Sumner's (2008) expose in *Interchange*.

[ii] The World Bank seems to adopt contradictory stances with regards to viable bases for the governance of higher education. In an earlier report titled *The Financing and Management of Higher Education*, they urged "a more radical change, or restructuring…which means altering who the faculty are, how they behave, the way they are organized, and the way they work and are compensated" (Johnson, 1998, p.22).

[iii] Global higher education systems are plagued with both opportunities and disadvantages for the students they target as a function of the tier. Public 4 year and 2 year colleges in addition to some private 4-year colleges recruit students that are unable to attend tier 1 or elite institutions, and many of these students come from socio-economic backgrounds that reflect the economic stratification in their own countries (Arum, Gamoran, Shavit, 2012).

[iv] Hostetler's accounts have been interpreted to mean a perpetuation of the status-quo of neo-classical economics. Contrary to this interpretation being one in which each individual seeking to maximize their desires within the existing monetary devices in place, it places the onus of existential responsibilities on institutions to check marketization.

[v] Caveat Emptor: The Shanghai ranking system is viewed as problematic by academic researchers in the Nordic countries. The most troubling development foreseen for the Nordic community of researchers is increased pressure from their institutions to publish in ISI listed journals for the sake of furthering their institutions ranking within arbitrary schemes such as the Shanghai World Ranking of Universities, or for the sake of procuring extra-mural funding from external bodies that value citation counts. (Sriraman, 2012). The corporatization of universities in the Nordic world by borrowing or mimicking trends seen "across the (Atlantic) pond" does not bode well for scholarship or the basic purpose of academia. The Nordic world of mathematics education research is currently in a position where it can impose the "scale" of its own choosing. Only time will tell if the Nordic countries sustain their spirit of co-operation with one another, and the sharing of resources or whether they also succumb to the whims and vicissitudes of the competitive market economy (Sriraman, 2012)