IJAPS, Vol. 4, No. 1 (May 2008)

THE IMPACT OF SEPTEMBER 11 ON INTERNATIONAL STUDENT FLOW INTO MALAYSIA: LESSONS LEARNED

Morshidi Sirat

ABSTRACT

Generally, the flow of international students in Malaysia has increased steadily since 1996, when various higher education reforms were introduced to facilitate the entry of international students into higher education institutions. Malaysia's target is 100,000 international students by 2010. Currently, international students represent less than 5 per cent of all tertiary enrolments in Malaysia. Although the percentage is small but it is an important factor in the internationalisation of higher education in Malaysia. The impact of September 11 has seen a decreasing number of new applications from Middle Eastern countries to the United States (US). While students from these countries were reluctant to go to the US for their education, the US government-mandated changes in the admissions process themselves have contributed to the decrease in new enrolment. Interestingly, Malaysia has emerged as an important destination for students from the Middle East. Malaysia provides excellent education and adequate security. They feel safe in Malaysia. Realising these emerging opportunities, the government has organised seminars and exhibitions annually in the Middle East with a view to encouraging more enrolment. This paper will discuss several lessons learned from such a strategy, from the perspective of the government and the universities that have enrolled these students.

INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

A number of mobility schemes have emerged in recent years in the Asia Pacific region, some related to overseas students and others related to professional mobility (Lenn 2004). For instance, University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific (UMAP) was founded in 1993 with the purpose of achieving enhanced international understanding through increased mobility of university students and staff. In this connection, a UMAP Credit Transfer Scheme (UCTS) was introduced to increase student mobility by ensuring that credit is received by students for study undertaken when on exchange with other universities. It is significant that university participation in this UCTS is on a voluntary basis. One important facet of this student mobility

which is the subject of this paper is international student mobility (ISM). ISM has grown considerably over the past 20 years but the pattern has changed dramatically since the 1990s, and more so post September 11. Other perspectives of this paper lie in the projected increase of ISM in the future as a result of several mega trends in international higher education, particularly in relation to specific developments in the Asia Pacific region. One such development is the 'rise of Asia' or the 'Asian Century', spearheaded by China. Recently, there have been detailed research reports from the UK (e.g. the British Council, the Observatory on Higher Education) and Australia (e.g. IDP Education Pty. Ltd.) seeking to provide ISM forecasts over the next two decades. Many countries have utilised these forecasts to plan and restructure their higher education framework and ensure there is provision to meet this global upsurge in international students. For instance, new players in Asia (e.g. Malaysia, China) and the Middle East (United Arab Emirates) have entered the market with declared ambitions to become regional education centres by attracting several hundred thousand international students to their countries (Verbik & Lasanowski 2007).

The British Council (2003, 2004) pointed out that many studies have attributed the upsurge in global ISM to a wide range of factors and it is important to realise that there are variations in demands for student mobility according to geographical regions. It is also important to note that there appears to be a strong connection between intense student mobility and factors such as strong historical links, the sharing of a common language, and having similar education systems and frameworks. There are also a range of other reasons why a particular international student might choose one destination country over another for study. These include the perceived quality and reputation of the country's education provision, its accessibility, affordability and the opportunities for employment based on the qualification obtained. More recently, safety consideration and well-being have been factored into the decision-making process.

In the context of the Asia Pacific region as a whole, we would like to think of several factors that influence student mobility. Using Europe as an example, mobility in the Asia Pacific region could be affected by key political changes in the region. We would like to speculate that political changes in Asia in particular would give rise to the need to harmonise the higher education system, putting in place mutual recognition of credits and qualifications. However, currently a high level of student mobility is only evident among high-income and advanced developing countries in the Asia Pacific region.

In the current and future patterns of global flows of international students, some nations are and would continue to be primary exporters while others are importers and a third group, including Japan and parts of Europe, exhibit a more balanced two-way exchange (Marginson 2006: 18). In Europe, the 'Bologna Process' towards a European Higher Education Area (EHEA) by 2010 is intended to increase mobility between institutions in Europe and will have an impact on credit transfer arrangements through the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS). In Asia, occasionally we hear of "blue-sky" thinking about the establishment of the Asian Higher Education Area in the future (Morshidi 2008; Feng 2007). However, a more commendable initiative was by the South Koreans in the late 1990s when they initiated the East Asia Vision Group (EAVG). EAVG was formed in December 1998 with countries within ASEAN and Northeast Asia coming together to advance a common vision of higher education (de Prado Yepes 2007). Regionalism based on higher education was mooted and, based on the positive experience of the EU in relation to student mobility, many Asian countries were receptive towards this initiative. While this idea of an East Asian regionalism in higher education was being charted out, September 11 injected yet another very complex dimension into Asian regionalism in higher education, particularly as it relates to ISM and the Arab/Muslim World. In the case of Malaysia, the country appears to be attractive to international students from the Middle East and the Arab World. However, on the other hand, in post September 11 era Malaysians found it increasingly difficult to gain student visas to the USA .

Within the context of the above scenario, this paper is an attempt to examine and assess Malaysia's higher education experience with respect to ISM in the post 9/11 period. The challenge for the Malaysian government is to strike a fine balance between two competing objectives: expanding the higher education system to capitalise on the upsurge in demand for international higher education post September 11 (particularly from the Middle Eastern countries) and improving the quality of higher education so as to be on par with international standards. In other words, how do we maintain the quality of higher education with so many transnational higher education providers coming to Malaysia's shores to capitalise on Malaysia's real and perceived advantages as an education hub?

In the context of this paper, even though ISM can mean and be defined as any form of international mobility which takes place within a student's programme of study in higher education, we would only like to focus on mobility for an entire programme of study. In this particular context, the length of absence from home country study is the full duration of a course of study in a higher education institution and mobility can be

inward or outward. It is indeed vital for us to define ISM as such for in Malaysia there is a general lack of systematic information about the overall picture of student mobility, particularly individual mobility activity.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT MOBILITY

It has been implied above that the total number of students from abroad who enrol in a country's higher education institutions is the main indicator or statistics describing ISM (Davis 1995). In this regard, according to Verbik and Lasanowski (2007), ISM has over the past 10–15 years become an increasingly important part of international higher education, with the number estimated to have reached more than 2.7 million in 2005 (about 61% increase since 1992). Obviously, projection figures vary but the fact remains that ISM, as an important element of international higher education, is expanding. Looking at the figures provided by Verbik and Lasanowski (2007), what becomes immediately obvious is the scale and intensity of ISM and the opportunities and challenges that come with this phenomenon. For instance, more than 90% of international students have enrolled in institutions in countries belonging to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) with the main destinations (the USA, the UK, Germany, France and Australia) recruiting over 70% of them. It is also highlighted that significant year-on-year growth was recorded in the late 1990s and early 2000s in most of the main English-speaking destination countries (MESDC) with major source countries such as China and India providing a large number of enrolments each year. Incidentally, the USA is regarded as a very large international competitor (with more than 500,000 capacity for international students), followed by the UK, Germany, France and Australia as large (150,000–500,000). Marginson (2006) models the global flows of international students and subsequently pointed out the magnetic attraction of higher education provided by the USA system. Malaysia, a new player in ISM, is considered as a medium level competitor in the international arena for international students, with a 25,000–150,000 capacity (Verbik & Lasanowski 2007).

ISM: FROM MALAYSIA

For the USA, a major player, it has been noted that Asia has been a particularly strong source region, with 327,785 students from more than 30 different countries who decided to study in the USA last year, a figure

which accounts for 58% of the country's total 2006 international student intake. Based on Verbik and Lasanowski's (2007) data, of the 30-odd Asian nationalities which annually send students to the USA, Malaysia was in the "top ten source countries" between 1997 and 1999. Beginning 2000 onwards, substantially fewer Malaysians have been going to the USA and by 2006, the number plummeted to only 5,515. However, while many would attribute this downward trend in ISM from Malaysia to the USA to the post 9/11 factor, this may not be the complete picture. In fact, from Table 1, the downward trend had already begun in 1998 and the triggering factor could have been the Asian financial crisis whereby Malaysians found overseas education too costly. Furthermore, transnational higher education providers and branch campuses of reputable foreign higher education institutions have established themselves in Malaysia thus increasing local capacity (Morshidi 2006). In addition, the easing of regulations pertaining to higher education in Malaysia has made studying locally very attractive.

Table 1
The US' top ten source countries 1997–2006.

Country	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Canada	22,984	22,051	22,746	23,544	25,279	26,514	26,513	27,017	28,140	28,202
China	42,503	46,958	51,001	54,466	59,939	63,211	64,757	61,765	62,523	62,582
Germany	8,990	9,309	9,568	9,800	10,128	9,613	9,302	8,745	8,640	8,829
India	30,641	33,818	37,482	42,337	54,664	66,836	74,603	79,736	80,466	76,503
Indonesia	12,461	13,282	12,142	11,300	11,625	11,614	10,432	8,880	7,760	7,575
Japan	46,292	47,073	46,406	46,872	46,497	46,810	45,960	40,835	42,215	38,712
Malaysia	14,527	14,597	11,557	9,074	7,795	7,395	6,595	6,483	6,142	5,515
Mexico	8,975	9,559	9,641	10,607	10,670	12,518	12,801	13,329	13,063	13,931
South Korea	37,130	42,890	39,199	41,191	45,685	49,046	51,519	52,484	53,358	58,847
Taiwan	30,487	30,855	31,043	29,234	28,566	28,930	28,017	26,178	25,914	27,876
Thailand	13,481	15,090	12,489	10,983	11,187	11,606	9,982	8,937	8,637	8,765
Turkey	8,124	9,081	9,377	10,100	10,983	12,091	11,601	11,398	12,474	11,622

Shaded figures indicate country was outside top ten for indicated year

Source: Verbik and Lasanowski (2007)

A substantial decline in Malaysian student flow to the UK has also been reported. However, this decline is less dramatic compared to the situation in the USA. Notably, while still in the "top ten" source countries for the UK, the number of Malaysian students in the UK dropped from 18,015 in 1997 to 10,005 in 2001 and, interestingly, to rise again to 11,450 in 2006 (Table 2). Again, the decline in student numbers which began in 1998 is partly attributable to the high cost of higher education in the UK. At the time when the cost of overseas education was rising steeply (because of the strength of the British Pounds vis-à-vis the Malaysian Ringgit),

Malaysia was experiencing the debilitating aftermath of the Asian financial crisis. In order to reduce the outflows of funds, the government has intervened by expanding the capacity of local (private) higher education sector. The rise in student flows to the UK after 2002 could be attributed to the sending to the UK of sponsored students to pursue higher degrees and other professional courses where places are still very limited locally.

Table 2
The UK's top ten source countries 1997–2006.

Country	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
China	2,660	2,883	4,017	6,310	12,095	20,710	35,155	47,740	52,675	50,755
France	12,101	12,844	13,254	12,910	9,950	9,940	10,560	11,295	11,685	12,455
Germany	12,582	13,037	13,568	13,750	11,370	10,960	11,785	12,095	12,555	13,265
Greece	21,737	25,602	28,605	29,580	31,150	28,585	26,005	22,825	19,685	17,675
Hong Kong	7,767	7,977	8,829	8,380	8,335	8,870	10,105	10,575	10,780	9,455
India	2,302	2,965	3,498	3,760	4,875	7,750	12,465	14,625	16,885	19,205
Ireland	15,572	15,894	15,144	13,930	13,510	13,235	13,460	14,715	16,345	16,790
Italy	4,990	5,254	5,748	6,080	5,415	5,170	5,440	5,215	5,315	5,460
Japan	4,665	5,332	5,686	6,150	6,470	6,355	6,300	6,395	6,180	6,200
Malaysia	18,015	17,380	12,632	10,140	10,005	10,680	11,780	11,805	11,475	11,450
Nigeria	1,834	1,920	1,902	2,120	2,650	3,340	4,585	5,940	8,145	9,605
Singapore	5,646	6,081	6,016	5,460	4,410	4,175	4,250	3,905	3,630	3,275
Spain	6,945	7,220	7,660	7,780	5,860	5,705	6,095	6,105	6,000	6,225
US	9,448	10,117	10,981	11,470	9,425	9,985	11,630	13,380	14,385	14,755

Shaded figures indicate country was outside top ten for indicated year

Source: Verbik and Lasanowski (2007)

Malaysian students' presence in Australia is very strong, with 18,074 in 2006, and the country is third in importance after China and India in terms of foreign student enrolment in Australia (Table 3). Again, the decline in student flows to Australia in 1999 and 2002 could be linked to the effect of the Asian financial crisis and September 11, respectively. But more importantly, the decline could be due to the fact that Malaysian students could now pursue their Australian-style education (offered by Monash University Sunway Campus Malaysia, for instance) in Malaysia.

Evidently, the so-called MESDC—the USA, the UK and Australia—are the main destinations for students from Malaysia, while Germany and France are not particularly important. As noted earlier, historical links and the English language are the two intervening factors for this situation. The number of Malaysian students in East Asia is also small. According to Verbik and Lasanowski (2007), Malaysia is one of Japan's most consistent source countries for international students, with per year student numbers changing very little over the years. In other words, the Malaysian market

has remained virtually unchanged in the past decade, with student enrolment ranging from 2,128 in 1997 to 2,156 in 2006. Arguably, Dr Mahathir's "Look East" policy since the 1980s is the main factor for ISM to Japan and to a certain extent, South Korea.

Table 3
Australia's top ten source countries 1997–2006.

Country	1997*	1998*	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Brazil	1,023	1,073	280	458	1,027	1,704	1,793	2,097	2,869	4,081
China	3,828	5,273	4,633	6,191	11,640	23,332	31,255	41,562	54,274	63,543
Hong Kong	17,236	18,161	16,205	17,888	21,753	16,131	18,159	18,175	17,196	16,558
India	5,690	8,073	9,420	10,399	10,316	11,271	13,920	19,587	26,303	36,078
Indonesia	18,394	17,715	12,650	13,484	15,822	17,632	17,092	15,405	13,830	13,025
Japan	11,817	10,739	3,984	4,169	5,438	7,509	8,495	9,131	9,352	9,110
Malaysia	16,257	16,485	15,767	18,868	19,385	16,431	18,554	18,819	18,262	18,074
Singapore	14,308	16,509	18,742	20,405	22,725	11,639	11,384	10,368	9,460	8,906
South Korea	18,312	11,184	4,287	4,534	6,719	8,904	8,889	9,138	10,506	12,352
Taiwan	7,492	6,403	2,985	3,235	3,967	5,698	6,051	5,996	5,683	5,614
Thailand	7,395	6,299	3,756	4,228	5,793	11,602	10,279	10,289	10,408	10,934
US	1,660	2,087	2,533	3,319	4,629	10,864	11,985	12,463	12,277	11,901

Shaded figures indicate country was outside top ten for indicated year

Source: Verbik and Lasanowski (2007)

* Figures available for this year include the total number of foreign students, including school and English-language (ELICOS) students

Table 4
Malaysian students in institutions of higher learning in the Middle East, 2002–2006.

Countries	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
Saudi Arabia	127	125	125	153	138
Jordan	361	361	310	444	490
Egypt	4,664	4,330	5,768	6,256	5,780
Morocco	0	0	0	63	101
Sudan	0	0	0	0	96
Syria	0	0	280	343	427
Yemen	0	0	194	143	285
Morocco	0	0	38	0	0
Total	**5,152**	**4,816**	**6,715**	**7,402**	**7,317**

Source: Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia (2007)

Note: Data includes sponsored and private students at all levels of study

1. Medicine
2. Dentistry
3. Islamic Studies
4. Pharmacy
5. Others

Another important destination for Malaysian students is the Middle East. From Table 4, between 2002 and 2006, Egypt, Jordan and Syria are the major receiving countries for Malaysian students. Arguably, Egypt has traditionally been an important destination for Malaysian students since the seventies and eighties.

ISM: TO MALAYSIA

As a receiving country, Malaysian international higher education has only recently emerged as a contender in the market for mobile students in the Asian region in particular. Based on Verbik and Lasanowski's (2007) analysis, Malaysia has an approximate 2% share of the international student market, with around 55,000 foreign students enrolled in the country's higher education institutions in 2006. (The actual figure is only 45,550, Table 5). Traditionally, the large majority of them have come from the neighbouring Asian countries of Indonesia, Thailand, Bangladesh, the Maldives, Singapore and, overwhelmingly, China. Malaysia, it appears, has profited from being considered as a desirable and highly competitive alternative to other countries in Southeast Asia. Private higher education institutions in Malaysia have been successful in recruiting students in key Asian markets (including the Middle East). But, the percentage of foreign students at private higher education institutions varies markedly. For instance, INTI International University College has no less than 60% of its foreign student population from China. However, among the public higher education institutions, it is important to realise that enrolments of foreign students are capped at 5% of total enrolment in undergraduate but not in postgraduate programmes. This has led to a noticeable steady growth of postgraduate and doctoral students and not undergraduate students in many public universities. Malaysia has set a target of 100,000 foreign students by 2010 and in this connection, related strategies and programmes have been put in place to achieve this target. This is clearly spelt out in the recently released *National Higher Education Action Plan, 2007–2010*.

Table 5
International students at public and private higher education institutions in Malaysia, 2002–2007 (July).

Year	Public	Private	Total
2002	5,045	22,827	27,872
2003	5,239	25,158	30,397
2004	5,735	25,939	31,674
2005	6,622	33,903	40,525
2006	7,941	36,449	44,390
2007 (July)*	12,419	33,131	45,550

Source: Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia (2007)

Note: Based on student visas/passes issued by the Immigration Department, Malaysia.

Based on the analysis provided by Verbik and Lasanowski (2007), it becomes immediately evident that over the past decade, on average, Chinese students are believed to have accounted for approximately 35% of Malaysia's total overseas student enrolments each year, presumably at least partially as a result of the geographical proximity between the two countries. In addition, student mobility between Malaysia, Singapore and China is considerable because of socio-cultural and linguistic similarities between them, particularly among ethnic Chinese in Malaysia and Singapore.

More recently, however, Malaysia has experienced a decline in the number of Chinese students enrolling in Malaysian higher education institutions but the number of international students from the Middle East countries has been increasing steadily. Arguably, China has been allocating substantial resources towards the development of its own higher education system and in light of the country's investment, Chinese mobility patterns to Malaysia appear to be changing. In view of this situation, Malaysian recruiters have widened their market search for international students by targeting many countries in the Middle East including the United Arab Emirates, Oman, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, and Lebanon (Sedgwick 2004). As a result of these efforts the number of students from the Arab World at Malaysian higher education institutions, in particular at Malaysia's International Islamic University (which uses both Arabic and English as the medium of instruction), have been growing steadily since September 11.

Post 9/11 and ISM to Malaysia: Pattern, Emerging Issues and Lessons Learned

Arguably, many studies have described the factors affecting ISM, leading to the development of the "push-pull" model of student mobility (Davis 1995). In this model, the push factors are explained in terms of the conditions in the sending country that create a generalised interest in overseas education but do not give specific direction to individuals. The pull factors on the other hand are thought of as conditions specific to a potential host country that serves to point students to particular destinations. Receiving countries would normally put in place strategies to enhance both perceived and real advantages in order to influence pull factors in the decision-making process. Source countries for international students would react to the advantages and cost of ISM accordingly. Minimising the push factors is one such option especially if ISM results in serious outflow of resources. In other words, Davis (1995) notes that while student mobility is largely the result of individual decisions, these private choices occur within the national contexts. In this respect, it is argued that the conditions in home countries surely set up the circumstances that "push" individuals to seek educational opportunities abroad. Notably, the two basic home country conditions that appear to be related to promoting significant student mobility are: (1) the wealth and development status of the home country and (2) the extent to which a nation invests its resources in human development (or generally known as the human development index). The positive response of the host country to eliminate barriers and constraints could further facilitate ISM in the country concerned. The case in point is a new Malaysian scholarship programme, which is expected to provide 1,000 students with an opportunity to study in Malaysia over the next four years. The expected outcome is more students from the Arab World enrolling in Malaysian higher educational institutions (*Arab News Agency* 2007). Likewise, a recruitment campaign is underway in the Middle East, with the Ministry of Education marketing Malaysia's good value in comparative terms, and highlighting its socio-cultural and religious similarities with this region (*The Star Online* 2007). Arguably, Malaysia's good bilateral relations with countries in the Middle East would ultimately increase the number of foreign students in Malaysia *(*Rashid 2007).

Obviously, rising tensions between the USA and the Middle East post Sept 11, the invasion of Iraq, and unstable economic and political conditions throughout much of the region are several of the push factors that have motivated students to seek safer and more affordable options closer to home. It has also been noted that increased enmity towards the West, and the

resurgence of political Islam and the traditional values in the region have also contributed to this trend (Sedgwick 2004). However, it is important for Malaysia to recognise that while substantial numbers of students from the Middle East are coming to Malaysia to pursue their higher education, this student flow may not be sustainable in the medium to longer term. This is because many countries in the Arabian Gulf region in particular are now aggressively implementing plans to expand higher education capacity and infrastructures (see Appendix 1). Reuters (October 31, 2007), reported that the Arabian Gulf countries, in particular Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates are planning to spend more than US$22 billion on education projects designed to catapult knowledge dissemination in the region into the 21st century. Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman and Qatar, are the other countries that make up the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), are also spending sizeable sums on education. It is also reported that the total spending on educational projects exceeds the $20 billion proposed arms sales from the USA to the countries of the GCC. Local provision of higher education is expanding very fast in the Arabian Gulf region in particular.

It is important for Malaysia to note that many students from the Gulf and broader Middle East are now enrolling at US-style universities in the Gulf region (Sedgwick 2004). They gain US-style qualification without actually having to travel to the USA (where barriers and constraints are being implemented). This is indeed an opportunity that is of great appeal to students wishing for a U.S. university education, yet fearing that the USA has become less than welcoming, both socially and bureaucratically, in the years since September 11, 2001 (World Education News & Reviews 2007; The Atlanta-Journal Constitution 2003; The Chronicle of Higher Education 2002). As a result, the American University in Beirut, Lebanon, experienced a 41% increase in application from the Arab World since 2001 and the American University in Cairo, Egypt has experienced similar response (Sedgwick 2004). It is also reported that a majority of newcomers to these two USA-style institutions hail from the Arab Gulf region, especially Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

Recently, World Education News & Reviews (November/December 2007) reported that Northwestern University had announced in November that it would open a branch campus for journalism and communication studies in Qatar. The School of Communication and the Medill School of Journalism will begin to offer programmes in journalism, media and integrated marketing communication, and media industries and technologies in the fall of 2008. The programmes will culminate in the first degrees to be conferred by Northwestern away from its main campus, in Evanston, Ill. In addition, many private entrepreneurs are opening private higher education

institutions in the Middle East, resulting in a sudden expansion in the capacity for higher education in the region. However, Khaleej Times (November 9, 2007) reported that officials in Kuwait and Oman are refusing to recognise the credentials of those with degrees from a number of private universities in Bahrain, which in turn has prompted Bahraini officials to launch an evaluation of all private universities licensed in the country. According to local media reports, some private universities are no more than storefronts selling degrees.

The recent development in Japan will be of great interest to Malaysia too. The *Yomiuri Shimbun* (2007) reported that a government committee agreed in April on a plan to accept more foreign students into universities and graduate schools in Japan, and to set a target figure of 1 million such students by 2025. Members of the subcommittee, which is tasked with internationalising higher education, reached a basic agreement to recommend:

- Introduction of a unified Japanese-language examination for foreign students wishing to go for higher education in Japan.
- Expansion of the scholarship system to encourage foreign students to choose Japan as a place of study.
- Allowing foreign students to start the academic year in September, the beginning of the academic year in most overseas countries.
- Having more classes held in English.
- Adopting a more flexible credit-transfer system.

All of the above point to the fact that markets for international students are becoming increasingly competitive (Clark & Sedgwick 2005). While the projected places for international students have been very optimistic, we are now looking at problems of over capacity in certain countries. Arguably, in order to be a winner in this highly competitive environment, Malaysia has to move beyond numbers (of international students enrolled in higher education institutions) to meaningful outcomes of ISM and other student exchanges.

CONCLUSION

All of these mega trends noted above will have ramifications for ISM to and from Malaysia. Obviously, there are lessons learned for Malaysia. The steady declined in numbers from China, its key market, suggest further decline in the future (and now we are looking at the mobility of Malaysian institutions, in particular private education institutions, to China); massive (more than US22 billion) investments in higher education infrastructures in the Arabian Gulf region with the establishment of US-style higher education institutions compared to a paltry US$4.8 billion towards infrastructural improvements in Malaysia, will greatly affect future ISM to Malaysia; and bureaucratic difficulties that will continue to impede Malaysia's competitive progress in the global education market. While the *National Higher Strategic Plan 2020* and the *National Higher Education Action Plan, 2007–2010* are important blueprints to chart Malaysia's future higher education development, the implementation of these plans must take full cognizance of the fast changing development in international higher education. As such, national plans will tend to become outdated as soon as they are launched.

APPENDIX 1

Some Foreign Universities with Branches in the GULF

Doha, Qatar

Carnegie Mellon University
Opened: Fall of 2004
Offers: B.S. degrees in computer science, information systems, and business

Georgetown University
Opened: Fall of 2005
Offers: B.S. in Foreign Service

Northwestern University
Opens: Fall of 2008
Will offer: B.S. in journalism and communication

Texas A&M University
Opened: Fall of 2003
Offers: B.S. in chemical, electrical, mechanical, and petroleum engineering. In 2007, added master's programs in engineering and science.

Virginia Commonwealth University
Opened: Fall of 1998
Offers: B.F.A. in communication design, fashion design, and interior design

Weill Cornell Medical College
Opened: Fall of 2001
Offers: A two-year pre-med program, followed by a four-year medical program, under separate application, leading to an M.D.

Abu Dhabi, UAE

INSEAD Business School
Opened: Centre for Executive Education and Research in the fall of 2007
Offers: Executive-education courses

Johns Hopkins University
Opens: Summer of 2008
Will offer: A graduate program in public health

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Masdar Institute of Science and Technology, affiliated with MIT, will recruit faculty members, train instructors, and design curricula.
Opens: Fall of 2009
Will offer: Graduate education and research, with a focus on science and technology, particularly alternative energy

New York University
Opens: Fall of 2010
Will offer: Full liberal-arts curriculum, undergraduate and graduate

Sorbonne

Opened: Paris-Sorbonne University Abu Dhabi in October 2006
Offers: License, master's, and doctorate degrees (following the European system) in 10 departments

Dubai, UAE

Boston University Institute of Dental Research and Education, Dubai
Opens: July 2008
Will offer: Graduate dental training

Harvard University
Opened: 2004
Offers: Continuing-medical-education courses through the Harvard Medical School Dubai Center Institute for Postgraduate Education and Research

London School of Business & Finance
Opened: December 2007
Offers: Executive M.B.A. and executive-education programs

Michigan State University
Opens: Fall of 2008
Will offer: Full liberal-arts curriculum

Rochester Institute of Technology
Opens: Fall of 2008
Will offer: Initially, part-time graduate courses in fields like electrical engineering, computer engineering, finance, and service management. By 2009, graduate offerings will be full time and will include applied networking, telecommunications, and facility management. By 2010, expects to welcome undergraduates.

Ras al Khaymah, UAE

George Mason University
Opened: 2005
Offers: B.S. degrees in biology; business administration; economics; electronics and communications engineering; geography; and health, fitness, and recreation resources

Sharjah, UAE

American University of Sharjah
Opened: 1997, originally operated by American University (in Washington, D.C.), now independent
Offers: Bachelor's degrees in the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Engineering, School of Architecture and Design, and School of Business and Management, as well as eight master's programs

Source: http://globalhighered.wordpress.com/

REFERENCES

Arab News Agency 2007. Saudi students look towards Malaysia for higher studies, 3 May 2007. Retrieved January 1, 2008, from http://www.arabnews.com/?page=1&section=0&article=95719&d=3&m=5&y=2007/

British Council 2003. *Vision 2020: Forecasting international student mobility – A UK perspective*, 4.

British Council 2004. *Going Global. The UK International Education Conference,* 8–10 December 2004, Edinburgh, Scotland. Retrieved December 31, 2007, from http://www.britishcouncil.org/

Clark, N. and Sedgwick, R. 2005. International students: It's a buyer's market. *World Education News and Reviews 18*(4), August.

Davis, T. 1995. Flows of international students: Trends and issues. *International Higher Education*, May. Retrieved September 23, 2007, from http://www.bc.edu.bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News01/text2.html/

de Prado Yepes, C. 2007. Regionalisation of higher education services in Europe and East Asia and potentials for global change. *Asia Europe Journal 5,* 83–92.

Feng, D.H. 2007. Google my late-father? or India, China and United States: What could/may happen in 21 century? A speech delivered at the National Academy of Sciences, *The dragon and the elephant: Understanding the development of innovation capacity in China and India*, United States National Academies' headquarters, September 24–25, 2007.

Khaleej Times (November 9, 2007). Kuwait and Oman refuse to recognise degrees from private universities in Bahrain. *World of Education News and Reviews (WENR) 20*(11), November/December 2007.

Lenn, M.P. 2004. *Quality assurance and accreditation in higher education in East Asia and the Pacific*. World Bank paper Series, Paper no. 2004–6, August.

Marginson, S. 2006. Dynamics of national and global competition in higher education. *Higher Education 52,* 1–39.

Ministry of Higher Education. 2007. *Compilation of statistics.* Putrajaya: Ministry of Higher Education.

Morshidi, S. 2006. Transnational higher education in Malaysia: Balancing benefits and concerns through regulations. In F. Huang (ed.). *Transnational higher education in Asia and the Pacific Region.* RIHE International Publication Series No. 10, Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima: Hiroshima University, 109–150.

Morshidi, S. 2008. *Trends in international higher education and regionalism: Issues and challenges for Malaysia.* Paper presented at Waseda GARI International Symposium on Asian Cooperation, Integration, and Human Resources, Waseda University, 17 and 18 January 2008.

Rashid, N.F. 2007. MOHE pushing for more Arab students in Malaysia. South-South Information Gateway, Saturday, 29 September. Retrieved September

29, 2007, from http://web5.bernama.com/ssig/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=10874/

Reuters (October 31, 2007). Education spending surpasses military spending. *World of Education News and Reviews (WENR) 20*(11), November/ December 2007,

Sedgwick, R. 2004. Middle Eastern students find options at home and elsewhere. *World Education News and Reviews,* November/December. Retrieved December 29, 2007, from http://www.wes.org /ewener/04Nov/Feature.htm/

The Atlanta-Journal Constitution. 2003. Tougher US visa rules keep foreign students away, 13 August 2003. Retrieved July 31, 2007, from http://www.ajc.com/news/content/news/atlanta_world/0803/13mba.html/

The Chronicle of Higher Education. 2002. Foreign students find it a difficult year to win the State Department's favor, 15 November 2002. Retrieved July 31, 2007, from http://chronicle.com/weekly/v49/i12/12a04001.htm/

The Star Online. 2007. Bid to double foreign students at varsities, 23 April 2007. Retrieved January 1, 2008, from http://thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2007/4/23/nation/17519507&sec=nation/

*The Yomiuri Shimbun***.** 2007. 1 million foreign students by 2025, April 19.

Verbik, L. and Lasanowski, V. 2007. International student mobility: Patterns and trends. *The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education*, UK (September).

World of Education News and Reviews (WENR) 20(5), May 2007.

World of Education News and Reviews (WENR) 20(11), November/December 2007.