



International Relations Conference on India and Development Partnerships in Asia and Africa:  
Towards a New Paradigm (IRC-2013)

## Internationalization of Higher Education in India: Contribution to Regional Capacity Building in Neighbouring Countries

Vidya Rajiv Yeravdekar\*, Gauri Tiwari

*Symbiosis Centre for International Education, Symbiosis International University, Pune, India*

---

### Abstract

The notions of globalization and knowledge economy are concomitant. Higher education and work-preparedness competencies are the chief levers that impel economies to scale the value chain by optimizing the capacity building potential of their workforce. This assumes an even greater significance in developing countries because the vast majority of them are beset with higher education systems are in gross disrepair, and the governments are ill-equipped to take the situation in hand. It is in this thematic backdrop that the paper studies India's contribution to regional capacity building through internationalization of higher education. The Indian higher education system has a long-standing tradition of drawing students from other developing countries in Asia and Africa; and, in this, India offers the "source countries" an avenue to enhance their human capital base. The paper studies the research concern through descriptive and critical synthesis of published literature.

© 2014 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>).

Peer-review under responsibility of Symbiosis International University (SIU).

**Keywords:** Globalization; Internationalization; Capacity Building; Higher Education; India

---

### 1. Introduction

It has been widely projected that capacity building will be the chief differentiating feature of growth in developing countries in the years to come. The etymological origin of the expression, "capacity building" belongs to recent years, and has undergone significant transformation.<sup>1</sup> In an oft-cited interpretation, the United Nations

---

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +91-20-25652444; fax: +0-000-000-0000 .  
E-mail address: [dr-vidya@symbiosis.ac.in](mailto:dr-vidya@symbiosis.ac.in)

Development Program (UNDP) defines the concept as “the ability of people, institutions and societies to perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve objectives” (UNDP 2002, as cited in DFID, n.d., p. 3). In the context of development-oriented application, it is implied that such assistance as optimizes the existent resources—as in higher education’s role in enhancing the human capital—are the most helpful. Also implicit is the understanding that the resulting outcomes will not be easily exhaustible, and, hopefully set off a chain reaction of regenerable development.<sup>ii</sup>

As an article of empowerment to the developing world, higher education has gained prominence in the last few decades (King, 1991, p. 267, as cited in Girdwood, 1993). Quite possibly, UN agencies such as UNDP and the World Bank’s espousal of the cause has thrust it forward as a high-priority agenda item. There are several denoted reasons for higher education to have emerged as a preferred item of aid to developing countries, and *sensu lato*, all are tied to the knowledge economy construct.<sup>iii</sup> As obvious as it might seem, the crux of the paradigm is simple: knowledge is the key driving force of an economy. In a productivity-centric interpretation, Dahlman & Utz (2005, p. 2) define knowledge economy as follows:

. . . an economy that creates, disseminates, and uses knowledge . . . to enhance its growth and development  
 . . . any economy [that] harnesses and uses new and existing knowledge to improve the productivity of agriculture, industry, and services and increase overall welfare.

Further, the authors highlight the role of higher education in enabling knowledge economy: [creating] “a sustained cadre of “knowledge workers” (p. 8). Salmi (2009) expresses a similar outlook: “. . . the general recognition that economic growth and global competitiveness are increasingly driven by knowledge, and that universities can play a key role in that context” (p. 1).

As things stand in the present global milieu, the notions of “knowledge economy” and quality higher education institutions are concurrent (Altbach, 2004; Salmi, 2008, as cited in Ramaprasad, 2011, p. 45). This derives from the enhanced significance that tertiary education assumes in a knowledge economy: tertiary education comes to be the lifeblood of “human capital base”, which is made up of skilled workforce and innovative knowledge (Cookson, 2007; Yusuf & Nabeshima, 2007, as cited Salmi, n.d.). The emphasis on higher education is attributable to the impressionistic knowledge that higher education generates the intellectual facility which can be effectively applied to the available knowledge base.

Just as the relation between higher education and knowledge economy presents, so, too does the global disparity in access to higher education—much less the *quality* of higher education. The World Bank’s report, “Perils and Promises” 2000, which examined the state of higher education in developing countries brought to light the missing links in higher education in developing countries. Most important was the case that higher education does not result sufficiently in career competencies and “high skills”, therefore, “comparative skill formation” and corporate competitiveness are areas of neglect (cf. Brown, 2001; Brown & Lauder, 2008). It also revealed the case that developing countries are chasing a “moving target”: as high-income countries push the frontiers of knowledge forward, the rest of the world has more catching up to do. On an even more discouraging note, it was demonstrated that barring a few exceptions, developing countries fare poorly on all parameters that constitute the overall quality of education: resources are limited; infrastructural support insufficient; quality of faculty sub-par; pedagogical practices outmoded and unproductive; and vulnerability to socio-political instability (World Bank, 2000). As a result of all of these, higher education in developing countries does not fully serve the knowledge economy model.

## 2. Internationalization of the Indian higher education system

A developing country itself, India makes an interesting study. The history of higher education goes as far back as 5 B.C. in Takshashila (Greek rendering, Taxila). The university in Nalanda in 5 A.D. is also a monumental milestone. At its zenith, the university attracted scholars and students from as far away as Tibet, China, Greece, and Persia. It is also notable that it is one of the first residential universities (Perkin, 2006, as cited in Agarwal, 2009). The most outstanding aspect being that the country heralded internationalization of higher education for the rest of the world: internationalization was not an addendum, but the very creed that defined the ethos of higher education.

Owing to its longstanding reputation for being a stronghold of international education, rather than policy prescriptions, India continued to host international students in the period after Independence. The trend has had its ebb and flow, as can be seen from the figures below:<sup>iv</sup>

Table 1: Inbound mobility of international students

Year	1990-91	1992-93	1994-95	1996-97	1998-99	2000-01	2002-03	2004-05	2006-07	2008-09
Students	12,899	12,767	11,888	5,841	5,323	6,896	7,756	13,267	18,391	21,778

Source: Association of Indian Universities (as cited in Powar, 2012, p. 245)

In the discussion on India's contribution to regional capacity building, it is relatable that the country has traditionally drawn students from countries which are developing economies and previously colonized—countries in the “periphery” in the lexicon of neo-colonialism or “low and middle income countries” as a developmental economist might point out. Powar (2012, p. 243) states that this segment is as high as 95% of the total number of international students. It is characteristic of these countries—as is the case with most developing countries—that the economic asymmetry is perpetuated by a dysfunctional tertiary education system (Santos, 2006, as cited in Collins & Rhoads, 2009). Powar (2003 p. 24) confirms that higher education systems are unsatisfactory in countries that have traditionally “sourced” international students to India. In particular, the quality of education in skill-oriented disciplines such as science, technology, medicine, management, and professional-vocational programs is worryingly poor.

Table 2: Region wise distribution of international students

Region	1990-91	1995-96	2000-01	2005-06	2008-09
Asia	5741	4831	3866	10493	16004
Africa	6318	4081	2964	2403	4193
N and S America	263	309	327	654	614
Europe	173	127	179	206	304
Australasia	35	40	44	71	66
Miscellaneous	369	699	405	629	597
Total	12899	10087	7785	14456	21778

Source: Association of Indian Universities (as cited in Powar, 2012, p. 245)

Table 3: Country wise distribution of international students

Countries	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Iran	1120	1264	2180	2669
Nepal	1352	1411	1728	1821
United Arab Emirate	1500	2034	1878	1560
Ethiopia	226	302	1033	1289
Sri Lanka	582	530	466	997
Afghanistan	35	65	422	976
Saudi Arabia	419	551	771	835
Bahrain	382	481	446	600
Kenya	418	523	621	592
Oman	646	505	608	548
Total	6680	7666	10153	11887

Source: Dongaonkar and Negi (2009) p. 4

That being said, it must be pointed out that relative superiority in the quality of higher education is not significant by itself. Students from low-wage source countries seek cross border higher education as means of “augmenting their chances of obtaining a high-wage job” (Rosenzweig, 2006, as cited in Agarwal, n.d.a). This explains, at least partially why cross-border student mobility has been on the rise in South Asia in spite of the fact that domestic higher education has improved in all source countries and international education cost has been on the rise. In a roundabout logic, it appears that greater educational capacity only works to drive students to seek cross-border higher education.

In the discussion on rationales that frame international student circulation, Agarwal (n.d.a) synthesizes De Wit (2007) as follows, and argues that amongst the countries of South Asia, the “capacity building” approach is the most dominant. The following table depicts the key approaches in rationales that guide international student mobility; the limitation and context of each rationale; and stakes for host and home country—as in whether the rationale is advantageous (“win”) or disadvantageous (“lose”) for the country.

Table 4: Rationales that frame international student mobility

Approach	Limitations	Context	Host country	Country of origin
Mutual understanding	Foreign policy	Takes a very broad view	Win	Win
Revenue earning	GATS Negotiations	Takes a myopic view of student flows	Win	Lose
Skill migration	Migration of highly skilled persons	Looks at students as potential migrants and views that as brain drain	Win	Lose
Capacity building	Development aid	Assumes that all students return home after education abroad	Win	Win

Source: Agarwal (n.d.a, n.p.)

### 3. India’s headship in cross border higher education in the South Asian Region

Cross border higher education has come to be regarded as an important lever of knowledge economy. India’s predominant position as provider of quality higher education in pockets of the developing world, such as the South Asian Region (SAR) has been documented and demonstrated in several studies (Agarwal, n.d.a). Asher (2007, p. 26) notes in particular the role of Indian management and engineering institutions in providing access to populations in parts of Asia and Africa skill training that will contribute to building globally competitive workforce. The author points out that it is common for several higher education institutions in India to offer semester abroad programs in one of the South Asian countries as means to foster global competencies. It is precisely in reference to such initiatives that OECD (2006, n.p.) observes that the most important contribution of cross border higher education to knowledge economy is that it helps build skilled workforce in developing countries where the level of tertiary education is particularly sub-par. The understanding herein is that it is easier, cheaper and quicker way of building capacity in higher education and skills training than doing it ground up (Lane 2011, as cited in Lane & Kinser, 2011).<sup>v</sup>

Often times the above-stated import of cross border higher education is facilitated by making available scholarships and tuition waivers to encourage achievement of tertiary education or skill-specific training abroad. The beneficiaries are often contractually bound to return to the home country and contribute to such projects as are compatible with the government’s development agenda. It is also observed that in doing this, governments often bring local institutions in partnerships with foreign providers through collaborative programs such as dual degree so as to also strengthen the capacity of domestic institutions along the way. While the import of cross border higher

education occurs plentifully enough, it is often not the result of policy prescriptions, nor is it regulated by policy instruments; therefore, the resulting benefits are sub-optimal (OECD, 2006, n.p.).

India's long standing predominance as provider of cross border higher education is attributable to numerous factors. International students from popular source countries in identifiable regions—the Gulf region, the “African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States”, East Africa and North America (Dongaonkar & Negi, 2009)—perceive Indian higher education system to be worthwhile. This is also true of the Indian Diaspora, which adds up to over 25 million in 130 countries and has proven to be a strong patron of the Indian higher education system (Kumar, Sarkar & Sharma, 2009). It is noteworthy that there is some degree of coincidence in the catchment areas of inbound international students in India and regions of high concentration of Indian Diaspora. Kuznetsov (2006) has demonstrated the comparative advantage that Diaspora can add to international competitiveness by enriching its networks, such as alumni association (as cited in Salmi, n.d.). The Indian Government, cognizant of the opportunities herein has recently undertaken several initiatives. The constitution of Committee for the promotion of Indian Education Abroad (COPIE) by the Ministry of Human Resource and Development (MHRD) (Powar, 2002, p. 22), in particular is a notable step. Similarly, the Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs' “scholarship programs for Diaspora children” (knowindia, 2012) and scholarships offered by the Indian Council for Cultural Relations (ICCR) (Powar, 2013, p. 22) are other examples.

In continuation are other factors related to the demographic profile of international students in India. This student group aspires to pursue higher education in the English language,<sup>vi</sup> and is, more often than not, on a restricted budget.<sup>vii</sup> In addition, there exists some degree of socio-cultural similarity between India and the popular source countries (Powar, 2013, p. 23). India's ability to offer higher education in English at a fraction of the cost of industrialized countries, combined with its physical proximity to regions that are teeming with higher education aspirants further strengthens the country's position as host country. The South Asian region, in particular is important to India for academic reasons. The vast majority of higher education systems are based on the “London model” of affiliation (Stella, 2002). Further, other academic elements such as curriculum, accreditation, and examination procedures are also similar (Agarwal, n.d.a).

International education can play a big part in promoting socio-cultural progression (Iñiguez, 2011, p.83).<sup>viii</sup> Relatedly, it is common to note amongst parts of Asia and Africa less than progressive socio-cultural patterns and politico-governmental roadblocks. These students stand to gain enormously from imbibing India's relative political stability and socio-cultural democratization (Agarwal, n.d.a). The aspect about transference of progressive socio-cultural ethos is tied to politico-diplomatic associations between India and the popular source countries. The Government of India has expressly proclaimed its intent to undertake initiatives to strengthen the presence of international students in India in the interest of public diplomacy (Gaur, 2006). Internationalization of Indian universities has more to it than altruistic and symbolic inspirations. India's hegemonic position as the provider of cross-border higher education amongst the popular source countries is related to its overall diplomatic and ambassadorial status (Sharma, 2008; Tharoor, 2012). The notion of “soft power” (cf. Nye, 2005)<sup>ix</sup> and its application to the Indian context by Tharoor (2012) upholds the case about the possibility of improving higher education networks that strengthen India's brand standing, especially in the “South Asian Region” as provider of cross border higher education and leader in knowledge creation and dissemination; cf. Whitaker (2004).

It is also relatable that international students from developing source countries who pursue higher education in India prove to be valuable members of the workforce. A report on the compiled data of international students who successfully completed undergraduate or post graduate degree from one of the higher education institutions in Pune, a city in peninsular India, which boasts the largest population of international students, demonstrates that these students tend to be high achieving professionals when they return to their respective home countries. It is noted that these students frequently obtain positions of seniority in governance, policy making, and administration. It is also observed that they acquire managerial positions in the corporate sector, especially in areas pertaining to accounting, finance and business administration (S. Mandore, personal communication, October 14, 2013). It is common knowledge that a number of heads of states and political leaders in Asia and Africa completed higher education in India, for instance Aung San Suu Kyi, (Vijetha, 2012) and Hamid Karzai (Kanwar, 2003). It would be reasonable to square the success of these students as leaders and members of the workforce with the employability and value-addition aspects of their higher education.

#### 4. Growing prominence of Indian private partakers in cross border higher education

If inbound mobility of international students has increased in India in the last decade, it is to be credited, at least partially, to the emergence of private participants in Indian higher education (Agarwal, n.d.a; Agarwal, n.d.b). The growth of private participants is fuelled by the failure of Indian Government to address the systemic challenges and meet the higher education demands of the population (Bery, Bosworth & Panagariya, 2004; Stella, 2002; Thakkar, 2012). Altbach (1999) states that multi-nationalization of higher education, chiefly collaborations between countries of the “North” and “South”<sup>x</sup> is fuelled by private institutions. This has come about, largely on account of two factors: external controls are less stringent; and, entrepreneurialism is a bigger presence in the private sector.<sup>xi</sup> The specific expression of internationalization in India, as in much of South Asia and the Gulf region has been in the form of privately owned and managed international branch campuses (Agarwal, n.d.a; Knight, 2012; Wilkins, 2010). In fact, in a research study of Indian branch campuses in popular source countries, the OBHE (2006) noted that the vast majority of them were private institutions (as cited in Agarwal, n.d.a).

India’s association with the “South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation” (SAARC) at the supra-national level merits note in the discussion, even if its relevance is on the descent. The Government has proclaimed a policy of regional cooperation in higher education to achieve capacity building in the region. The agenda is operationalized through a “Committee of Heads of the University Grants Commission/Equivalent Bodies”. Besides contributing to allocation of scholarships and systematization of higher education across the SAARC region, India proposed setting up of “South Asian University” in New Delhi in 2005, which was ratified in 2007. Notwithstanding the ineffectual nature of the Association’s policies and governance, India’s headship in developmental schemes within the organization is unquestioned (Agarwal, n.d.a).

#### 5. Conclusion

Although marred by lack of policy and initiative, the Indian higher education system continues to contribute to capacity building in regions in Asia and Africa. The country’s ancient heritage and the presence of Indian Diaspora in these regions certainly help strengthen India’s perception as a hospitable host country and provider of quality higher education. It would be fair to conclude that the above denoted regional pockets share commonality with India on several counts. Amongst these factors, similarities in socio-cultural landscapes and organizational structures of higher education are important. Further, the prevalence of English as the medium of instruction and relatively low tuition fees and cost of living strengthen the country’s stature as host country. It has emerged that these regions have relied on the Indian higher education system to enhance their human capital base and create knowledge networks. An encouraging development in the discussion is the emergence of private providers of higher education in India. It is sufficiently evident that this group has propelled internationalization of higher education into an unprecedented momentum. Fuelled by the Indian Government’s failure to address the growing demand for higher education in forte segments, such as engineering and management across the country and in the popular source countries, private partakers have continued to capture an increasing share of the higher education market. It would be fair to project that India will continue to contribute to the human capital base, and in so doing, promote knowledge economy in several regions in the developing world. It is encouraging that increasing modernization and methodization of Indian higher education correlate positively with the demand for skill-oriented global competencies. This will help prepare an internationally competitive workforce which will enable India and parts of the developing world move up the value chain in the global economy.

#### References

- Agarwal, P. (2009). *Indian higher education: envisioning the future*. Thousand Oaks, US: Sage Publications.
- Agarwal, P. (n.d.a). International India a turning point in educational exchange with the US. Retrieved January 13, 2013 from <http://www.usief.org.in/USIHEC/Chapter%204/Internationalization%20of%20Indian%20Higher%20Education.pdf>
- Agarwal, P. (n.d.b). *Privatization and internationalization of higher education in the countries of South Asia: An empirical analysis*. New Delhi, India: Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER)
- Altbach, P. (1999). *Private Prometheus: Private higher education and development in the 21st century*. Westport, US: Greenwood Press.
- Asher, M.G. (2007). *India’s rising role in Asia*. New Delhi.
- Bery, S., Bosworth, B. & Panagariya, A. (2004). *India Policy Forum 2004*. Brookings Inst Pr.
- Brown, P. (2001). *High skills: Globalization, competitiveness, and skill formation*. Oxford University Press.

- Brown, P., Green, A. & Lauder, H. (2008). *High skills: Globalisation, competitiveness and comparative skill formation*. Oxford University Press.
- Chappia, H. (2014, February 23). Brain drain in reverse: China now world's No. 3 education hub. *The Times of India*. Retrieved from <http://www.samachar.com/Brain-drain-in-reverse-China-now-worlds-No-3-education-hub-ocxllkacbjf.html>
- Collins, C. S. & Rhoads, R.A. (2009). The World Bank, support for universities, and asymmetrical power relations in international development. *Higher Education*, 59, 181–205. doi: 10.1007/s10734-009-9242-9
- Dahlman, C. & Utz, A. (2005). India and the knowledge economy leveraging strengths and opportunities. Retrieved January 13, 2012 from <http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/235713/India%20and%20the%20Knowledge%20Economy%20Leveraging%20Strength%20and%20Opportunities.pdf>
- DFID research strategy 2008-2013 working paper series: capacity building. Retrieved from [www.research4development.info](http://www.research4development.info)
- Dongaonkar, D. & Negi, U.R. (2009). *International students in Indian universities 2007-08*. New Delhi: Association of Indian Universities
- Eade, D. (1997). *Capacity building an approach to people centred development*. Oxford, UK: Oxfam.
- Gaur, M. (2006). *Foreign policy annual*. New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House.
- Girdwood, A. (1993). Capacity building and higher education in Africa: a comment on the capacity building rationale and aid to higher education in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 23(2)
- Íñiguez, A. (2011) *Conditions for the internationalisation of higher education: between inclusion and exclusion in a globalised world*. Barcelona
- Kanwar, Y. (2003, March 8). Karzai recalls Shimla days. *The Hindu*. Retrieved from <http://www.hindu.com/2003/03/08/stories/2003030804151100.htm>
- Knight, J. (2011, March 12). Regional education hubs: Rhetoric or reality? Retrieved January 22, 2013 from <http://ihe.britishcouncil.org/global-sessions/education-hubs-reality-or-rhetoric>
- KnowIndia (2013). Retrieved January 17, 2013 from [http://knowindia.gov.in/knowindia/overseas\\_indians\\_affairs.php?pg=2](http://knowindia.gov.in/knowindia/overseas_indians_affairs.php?pg=2)
- Kumar, P., Sarkar, S. & Sharma, R. (2009). *Migration and Diaspora Formation: Mobility of Indian Students to the Developed World*, IMDS Working Paper Series Nos. 7-9 May 2009
- Lane, J. & Kinser, K. (2011). The cross-border education policy context: Educational hubs, trade liberalization, and national sovereignty. *New Directions for Higher Education*. doi: 10.1002/he.446
- Nye, J. (2005). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. PublicAffairs.
- OECD. (2006). The World Bank, OECD and Nuffic International workshop on cross-border higher education for capacity development. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/fr/sites/educeri/theworldbankoecdandnufficinternationalworkshoponcross-borderhighereducationforcapacitydevelopmentthehague14-15september2006.htm>
- Powar, K.B. (2002). *Indian higher education: A conglomerate of concepts, facts and practices*. New Delhi, India: Concept Publishing Company
- Powar, K.B. (2003). *Internationalisation of higher education focus on India*. New Delhi: Amity University Press
- Powar, K. B. (2012). *Expanding domains in Indian higher education*. New Delhi, India: Association of Indian Universities Publications.
- Ramaprasad, A. (2011). Envisioning a world-class university system for India. *International Journal of Technology Management & Sustainable Development*, 10 (1).
- Salmi, J. (2009). *The Challenge of Establishing World-Class Universities*. Washington D.C., US: The World Bank.
- Sharma, K. (2008). *Internationalization of higher education: An aspect of India's foreign relations*. New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House.
- Shaw, C. (2014, February 14). UK universities – it's time to go to India. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2014/feb/14/uk-universities-india-british-council-report>
- Stella, A. (2002). *External quality assurance: case study of National Assessment and Accreditation Council*. Retrieved January 17, 2012 from <http://www.unesco.org/iiep/PDF/pubs/india.pdf>
- Thakkar, A. (2012). Kapil Sibal questions opposition to foreign investment in education. *The Times of India*. Retrieved January 17, 2013 from [http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2012-08-25/edit-page/33367677\\_1\\_foreign-universities-higher-education-foreign-educational-institutions-bill](http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2012-08-25/edit-page/33367677_1_foreign-universities-higher-education-foreign-educational-institutions-bill)
- Tharoor, S. (2012). *Pax indica India and the world of the twenty-first century*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.
- Tierney, W. (2012). *International Higher Education* (62), 5-7.
- Vijetha, S. N. (2012, November 17). An emotional reunion for Suu. *The Hindu*. Retrieved from <http://www.thehindu.com/news/cities/Delhi-an-emotional-reunion-for-suu/article4104972.ece>
- Whitaker, A. M. (2004). *The Internationalization of higher education: A US perspective*. Retrieved January 17, 2013 from <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-06202004-192329/unrestricted/WhitakerMP.pdf>
- Wilkins, S. (2010). Higher education in the United Arab Emirates: an analysis of the outcomes of significant increases in supply and competition. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 32(4).
- World Bank (2000). *Higher education in developing countries peril and promise*. Washington, US: World Bank

<sup>i</sup> See Eade, 1997. Frequently used interchangeably with expressions, “capacity development” and “community capacity building”.

<sup>ii</sup> It is important to point out that this view supports endowing such aid as will work to empower and galvanize the beneficiary: it is not enough to extend assistance that will not guarantee enablement. This understanding also signifies a change in goalpost in the “North-South” dynamics—it is more helpful to equip developing countries with the means to bring about self-reliance than spawn a cyclical donor-recipient equation.

<sup>iii</sup> See Collins & Rhoads (2009) for discussion on assistance from intergovernmental agencies to universities and the role of resulting knowledge creation in national capacity building in developing countries.

<sup>iv</sup> The number of international students is likely to be much higher since several Indian universities do not submit data. Further, the data collection has not been coordinated well. The Association of Indian Universities (AIU) is the only agency which has been collecting data in a scientific manner (Powar, 2013).

---

<sup>v</sup> “. . . there is an increased recognition that higher education is important for the economic development of many nations. Instead of solely relying on strengthening their domestic higher education sector, a process that could take decades, some nations have elected to recruit IBCs as a way to quickly expand capacity and access to academic programs offered by reputable and established colleges and universities in other countries” (p. 81).

<sup>vi</sup> Previous research has upheld the international students’ inclination for English as the medium of higher education: Wilkins (2010) states the great measure to which English speaking countries have benefitted from globalization, profiting as they do, from their long-held reputation of strongholds of superior higher education in English—the *lingua franca* of international education.

<sup>vii</sup> Interestingly, Altbach & Lulat (1985, p.50, as cited in Agarwal, n.d.) had stated that increase in tuition fees in industrialized Western host nations would negatively impact recruitment of international students there.

<sup>viii</sup> “To ensure that the internationalisation of education does not become an area in which the processes of exclusion and social inequality are replicated, it is essential to perform an analysis of the determining factors and of the contexts in which the intention is to globally connect educational processes. The importance of higher education as a means of combating social inequalities and fostering the scientific, technological and social growth of a society is an objective that must not be overlooked”.

<sup>ix</sup> Nye (2005) argues that American universities have contributed enormously to the country’s empowerment. This has come about through the parallel acculturization that takes place when international students study in the US. This is, of course in addition to more tangible factors that empower the US as host country, such as financial gains from tuition and supporting infrastructure (cf. Whitaker, 2004).

<sup>x</sup> Dependency theory paradigm

<sup>xi</sup> In the more specific framework of internationalization of higher education, Tierney (2012) lists three factors that have helped propel private institution the world over in to the frontlines. The first is the redefinition of the “customer” in the last decade to include entities such as the “part time working adult”. Secondly, private institutions have incorporated technological advancements far more than their public counterparts and in doing so they have created new markets for themselves; for instance, technology has greatly helped enable re-configuration of courses to suit the needs of the student. Lastly, two concurrent incidences have made room for the expansion of private institutions: the phenomenal growth of tertiary education all over the world, coupled with the occurrence of traditional configuration of public universities, which implies that they are incapacitated to meet the needs of students while still adding to their revenue stream.