

A critical analysis of unsustainable higher education internationalisation policies in developing economies

Policy Futures in Education

0(0) 1–13

© The Author(s) 2021

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/1478210321999186

journals.sagepub.com/home/pfe



Hari Hara Sudhan Ramaswamy 

Rajiv Gandhi National Institute of Youth Development (RGNIYD), India

Sanjay Kumar

Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan (NYKS), Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, Government of India, India

Abstract

International higher education in many developed countries and more particularly in the United States and Australia has become a great source of revenue for their economies from students of the developing and underdeveloped countries (Least Development Countries). Money together with the mobility of international students from Least Development Countries to the developed world have created social inequality with no sustainable method for successful and sustainable internationalisation policies and agendas. This situation of inequality is created by a viciously interdependent circle formed by the erosion of monetary, human and linguistic capital. Calamities beyond human control including COVID-19 amplify social inequality due to the aforementioned erosion of capital. This article compares the international higher education scenes in the USA and Australia which have strong educational collaborations with a developing country like India. The piece uses extant literature in partnership with the technique of discourse analysis to provide a critical analysis of the politics of the existing internationalisation policies in international higher education and provides suggestions to deliver better internationalisation policies.

Keywords

Internationalisation, policy, Australia, United States, education, sustainability, India

Corresponding author:

Hari Hara Sudhan Ramaswamy, Department of Development Studies, Rajiv Gandhi National Institute of Youth Development, Sriperumbudur, 602105 India.

Email: harihs.research@gmail.com

Introduction

Globalisation is perhaps the 'zeitgeist' of the century (Naidu, 2006). Globalisation is attributed to a convergence of people, economies and the most important factor – technology. Due to this convergence and the technology factor, several pieces of information, many ideas, discussions, cultures and such other facets of life have come to meet together. This zeitgeist has resulted in what is being referred to as 'complex connectivity' (Cox, 2008). It creates a sense of interdependence (Jovanović, 2010). This state of interdependence has impacted the present nation-state arrangement due to which national boundaries now seem blurred, promoting international activity.

Globalisation has impacted several aspects of our everyday life (Steger, 2020). One of those aspects is education (Yang, 2003). This article especially focuses on higher education. The neo-liberalist principles govern most policies including education policies. Yang adds that education is no longer offered as a public good (p. 276). Education, especially higher education, which is the focus of this article, comes with a hefty subscription. This results in unequal access to education, whereby people who have the ability to pay the subscription have better access than the people who do not have the ability to subscribe. Yang observes that the benefit of the disintegration of borders can be realised by accessing quality education with the required subscription (p. 279).

As a consequence of this disintegration of borders and the educational benefit it has created, aspiring graduates have begun to look far afield in search of better training and qualifications (Shields, 2013). However, there is a certain disagreement amongst those who record human mobility (Dodds, 2008). The contention was that student mobility was not a great contributor to the global human mobility. Conversely, data suggest that in 2014 there was an estimated student mobility of more than five million. It is further estimated that in 2022 this number would well exceed seven million students who would be studying abroad (Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE), 2018).

Due to the focus of this article, the mobility of Indian students is considered in this article. Information for the academic year 2014–2015 suggests that approximately 281,160 Indian students studied abroad. This made India the second-highest exporter of students to study abroad (Gu, 2018). Indian students opted for the United States of America (USA) as their top-most choice amongst the many available study destinations. Other First World countries such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Germany and even China were among the top study-abroad destinations for students wanting to study abroad from India. This information can be corroborated by research done elsewhere (Aggarwal, 2017).

As seen above, so many students are exported to the global higher education 'market' by India, placing it second only to China. Indian students seeking to study abroad do so for various reasons, as explored by Gu (2018). Whilst the major reason to study abroad is to gain better training and qualifications in their desired academic field, there seem to be a few other ulterior motives. The most important ulterior motive that catalyses International student mobility towards countries like Canada, Australia, Germany and New Zealand is their immigration policy which allows graduates from higher education institutions (HEIs) to remain for a particular time in their country upon graduation and enrich their employability and job-oriented skills.

A study has revealed that Indians spent approximately 45,000 crores in Indian rupees or US\$7b in 2015 on foreign education (Budget, 2018). Another more recent piece of research has also shown that Indians spend a huge 33,000 crores just to study in the USA (Rathod

and Srivastava, 2018). This is a very substantive amount. It is also an extremely large contribution to the US economy. Paradoxically, however, India ranked 131 among 188 world nations in the Human Development Index (United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (Conceição, 2020)).

The commercialisation of higher education and the money spent on it as subscription by Indian students every year to access foreign education seems ever-increasing. This ever-increasing phenomenon could be attributed to the youth dividend of India. In other words, India has one of the highest youth populations in the world (Rajiv Gandhi National Institute of Youth Development (RGNIYD), 2017). This youth dividend provides an almost perennial supply of students from India to the global higher education market. It is this commercialisation of higher education that has shifted the hefty burden of subscription from the State to the vulnerable student population (Shear and Zontine, 2010). In addition to shifting the burden of subscription, the higher education ‘industry’ has gradually begun exploiting students and other stakeholders from developing economies like India.

This article is an analysis of the commercialisation of international higher education. Using the extant literature, the paper analyses the roles played by the countries which attract students from India. It is pertinent to note that these ‘attractive’ countries are predominantly First World. Through this analysis, the paper discusses the policy-level aspects of the governments of the First World countries and their HEIs which attract students from developing economies like and including India. The article also talks about the ways in which the exploitation of students occurs and how it shapes students’ experiences when choosing to study abroad.

By offering this focus, the article wants to draw the attention of the reader to the primacy of international non-exploitative student-friendly policy-level interventions that are required. The article considers the rights of international students in order to shape a better study-abroad experience for them. By building these arguments, the article urges the authorities concerned in the developing economies – for example, India – to consider the welfare and rights of students who study abroad and those from their country who aspire to study abroad. This is imminent and urgent because the present higher educational policies within developing countries like and including India implicitly allow exploitation of students studying abroad and those who aspire to study abroad. The following paragraphs look more closely at India’s higher education and study abroad scenario.

The Indian scenario

The following few paragraphs of this article work to identify the players that commercialise the Indian student ‘market’. The paragraphs show the various ways the players interact with the Indian student market by means of policies and analyse the reactions from Indian students. These students would have responded to the attractive propositions made by the governments of the popular study abroad destinations and their HEIs. To understand the role of these players, the Indian higher education scenario needs to be first better understood.

According to one study, India has generated an estimated 22 million students who have enrolled within HEIs in India (Gillian et al., 2003). Amongst this number, an estimated 60% of students have enrolled in private HEIs (Daugherty et al., 2013). These private HEIs are often characterised by inferior quality in terms of the teaching faculty, the methods adopted to deliver courses and the infrastructure. Private HEIs in India are seen as the melting pot

for lucrative career opportunities for students with a hope for better careers. However, this comes at a hefty subscription, thus exploiting vulnerable students and their families applying the principles of neo-liberalism (Bourdieu, 1998).

Daugherty et al. (2013) have also noted that there has been a growth in the number of HEIs in India in recent years, from 6000 in the 1990s to 46,000 in 2013. Despite the number of HEIs in India, making it the second-largest education system in the world after the USA, reports suggest that not many Indian HEIs are featured in the world's top-500 ranking, reflecting upon their quality. Hence, studies suggest that betterment is required in both quantitative and qualitative aspects of HEIs, keeping in mind the fact that India has long been a seat of higher learning, with its ancient universities like Nalanda, Taxila and Vikramshila attracting students from as far as Korea and China (Prakash, 2007).

India has had to adopt the principles of liberalisation, privatisation and internationalisation due, in part, to globalisation (Mishra and Bhatnagar, 2009). India has had to adopt these principles, particularly in the education sector, making higher education a 'private good' and the education sector an 'industry'. This situation is due to the 'developing' state of India's economy dependent on foreign interests that India has to support the arrangement of treating its students as tradeable marketable products just perhaps like certain other developing economies. In India, the CN Rao Committee drafted a Bill which was enacted as the Foreign Education Institutions (Regulation of Entry and Operation, Maintenance of Quality and Prevention of Commercialisation) Bill, 2005. Although the function of this law, according to Mishra and Bhatnagar (2009), is to govern Indian student mobility between India and abroad, still, the state of Indian student mobility is not in a good state void of any commercialisation. The following paragraphs throw some light on the Indian student mobility in certain study abroad destinations preferred by Indian students.

Longstanding India–USA bond

The US Embassy in India reported that the USA received just over one million international students from across the world in 2017. The international student population in the USA constitutes 5% of the total student population in the country. Of the one million students sent from India alone, approximately 186,000 students placed it second only to China, with an estimated growth rate of 12% from the previous year's numbers (Embassy of the USA in India, 2018). In addition, it is pertinent to note that India has sent the second-highest number of students for the second consecutive year.

The efforts of the USA to attract students from India to study in their country could be dated back to the 1950s when the then Prime Minister of India Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the then US Ambassador to India Ambassador Loy Henderson signed an agreement facilitating study abroad and international student exchange opportunities between the USA and India (United States-India Educational Foundation (USIEF), 2020). This acknowledgement of India by the USA as a vital and valuable partner in education exchanges and collaborations has paid off, with a record number of students from India choosing to study in the USA every year.

India–Australia blooming

Australia's economy has reaped similar benefits to that of the USA by attracting students from developing economies, including India. Its interest in the Indian student market,

however, has been during more recent times. Australia being one of the First World countries, it attracts several thousands of students from India every year for the purposes of education (Turpin et al., 2002). Of the total 695,485 students in Australia, 13.7% were international students from across the world in the year 2000. This international student number in Australia is much higher when compared with that in the USA, which was a mere 5%.

The aforementioned number is a tremendous success for the Australian education industry when comparing it with the other traditional and contemporary rivals like the USA and Canada, to name two. As Turpin et al. (2002) point out, Australia's approach to this success has been and is still a business-type mechanism. In this business-type mechanism, national agencies of Australia – namely the International Development Program (IDP), Australian Education Centres and the Australian Education International (AEI) previously known as the Australian International Educational Foundation (AIEF) – played, and some still continue to play, a vital role. As one researcher notes, the Australian education industry has quickly become aggressive in its entrepreneurial strategies in attracting international students, particularly from the developing economies like and including India (Marginson, 2002).

Although Australia plays host to a number of students from the developing economies of South-East Asia, it did not appeal as a popular study-abroad destination to Indian students until the 2000s. As Gillian et al. (2003) p.1396 note, in 1990 the number of Indian students in Australia across all sectors of education was a mere 378. It was only in the 1990s that the educational relationship between Australia and India was being redefined to reach newer heights. This led to a steady increase in the number of students from India studying in Australia in the 2000s to 10,000 (Gillian et al., 2003 p.1396).

This immense and drastic increase in the number of students from India choosing Australia as their study destination has been the success of the aggressive entrepreneurial model adopted by Australia's higher education industry. The government used all of the aforementioned education marketing vehicles to reach out to prospective students in India. Whilst Austrade and AEI do facilitate, monitor and deliver as vital trade partners for Australia's education industry, the contribution of these government bodies has been augmented by a particular autonomous education agency – IDP Education (Gillian et al., 2003).

IDP Education is an autonomous organisation that claims to be part-owned by 38 of Australia's HEIs and partly by a company called SEEK Ltd (IDP Education, 2018). It was privatised in countries like India as IDP Education India Private Limited in 2009. IDP Education also co-owns the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) with the British Council. IELTS is an English proficiency test that students from developing countries like and including India are required to go through. This exam could be seen as another economic opportunity for this Australian company, considering the number of students from India who would have to take the exam in order to study abroad.

In addition to the autonomous agency IDP Education, there are several other private organisations which work for the interests of the Australian education industry in India and which promote Australian education amongst the student population in India and recruit interested students and place them at suitable Australian HEIs. As Gillian et al. (2003) p.1399 point out, this contribution by IDP Education, the AEI in India and the several other private agencies either in small pockets or nation-wide has been imminent to the success of the popularity of Australia's Higher Education in India. IDP Education itself has offices across at least all the major metropolitan centres in India.

As Gillian et al. (2003) indicate, the Australian education industry, with its aggressive entrepreneurial model, has considered international students from developing countries like and including India as tradeable economic products and consumers. Whilst the latter have consumer rights, the situation of the former is worse as they are merely products used for monetary benefits – in other words, ‘cash-cows’. This is especially so during the COVID-19 pandemic. International students in Australia have been one of the most affected groups. Instead of helping international students, the Australian government responded by simply asking international students to ‘go home’ unless they had sufficient funds to help themselves continue their stay in Australia (Nguyen and Balakrishnan, 2020). Although the Australian government together with the HEIs later made efforts to help those international students who confronted difficulties due to COVID-19, the government’s first inconsiderate reaction – asking international students to ‘go home’ – only confirmed that international students are just ‘cash-cows’ to the Australian economy. The next few paragraphs discuss the case of an international student from India and the plight they underwent as an international student in Australia.

The case at first-hand

The case this article presents is of a vulnerable individual called Marcus (name changed) from a lower-middle-class family from South India. Marcus’ parents were self-made. Marcus and their parents wished that they (Marcus is referred to using this pronoun throughout) should go to Australia and study there. In 2003, they (Marcus and their parents) approached and consulted the major education agency that played a vital role in promoting Australia’s education interests in India. It is pertinent to note that Marcus is all the more vulnerable, being a 17–18-year-old middle-class person who had wanted to pursue their undergraduate degree in Australia.

Like any Indian teenager, Marcus also had parental instructions to pursue a particular academic career so that they could find a suitable professional career that pays well. However, Marcus wanted to pursue international relations (IR). An agent encouraged Marcus to consider Australia as their study destination as it is an easy pathway to settle down in Australia with permanent residence if they chose to study according to their parental instructions. Also, Marcus, a teenager who has never lived a rural life, was strongly prescribed a rural HEI by the agent. However, Marcus was interested in a different HEI in Melbourne, which had both the academic courses – the one prescribed by their parents and the one which they preferred. However, the adviser in the agency promoted this rural university. Despite the aforementioned situation, trusting the adviser at the agency, Marcus placed an application to study at this rural university just outside Sydney in 2004 having made all the financial and other preparations since 2003.. Marcus’ parents afforded their best for Marcus so that they could achieve their academic and professional dreams.

Marcus’ visa was temporarily cancelled. The adviser and the education agency (which is the prime player) had no information about the visa application status. When Marcus himself called the HEI in rural Australia, the officer said that the degree chosen was unavailable for the year 2004. The options that Marcus was left with were to choose another HEI, for which it was too late as their visa had already been applied for; or they could wait for the next year, wasting their precious time; or, as the officer suggested, they could take up another degree, study it for one semester and then change to the originally intended degree.

Marcus obediently took up the last suggestion given by the university officer and got their visa approved. Due to the confusion with the degree preference, Marcus enrolled late, after orientation week, and so they did not know what was what in their new life. Whilst they were allocated a student mentor who helped them with opening a bank account, getting a student ID and the other formalities, it was daunting for them. Culture shock was a huge factor, as Marcus was then the only international student in their class.

Marcus got the taste of the degree and tried their best to get good scores. However, many factors affected their exam performance. Although their IELTS was high enough, the subject assessments in India are different from the subject assessments in Australia. The academic writing style is different, and they had too little time to get used to it. Also, as they recall, whenever they sought assistance from the Learning Skills Unit (LSU) it was always closed. To worsen all this, there were other factors that added up to a bitter study-abroad experience. Whilst there were on-campus shops, better and cheaper shopping facilities were too far, bus services were too limited, there were no intercampus shuttle buses, there were not a lot of international students to mix with, and other factors.

To help themselves out of this suffering, Marcus worked out their options. They chose to leave this rural campus and move closer to the city, which meant they would have to choose a completely different degree. Considering this as the perfect opportunity, they planned to change their degree to a bachelor's degree in IR, if available, which was their original choice. Marcus had to adopt this strategy as international students in Australia are not allowed to change their HEIs for a period of up to one year. When they approached the International Office (IO) of the HEI, they advised Marcus that an IR degree course was not available and that only employment relations (ER) was available, and that both the degree options offer similar subjects.

Without further ado, Marcus grabbed this opportunity and changed their degree. They pursued that course for a year and saw a lot of disparities, discrepancies and partialities where international students were purposely marked down or, worse, failed. Due to this bitter experience, which resulted in a feeling of guilt that they were wasting their parents' hard-earned money, and depression because their actual talent was not being recognised, Marcus changed from that HEI to a Melbourne-based one. This HEI was their actual preferred choice. Unfortunately, Marcus was ineligible for direct entry into the degree. Hence, their application was assessed for entry into a pathway programme. These details were suppressed by Marcus's adviser at the education agency in India.

Provision of this information would have helped Marcus and their parents make better educational choices and decisions, which are huge investments that education agencies like these sometimes only recognise for namesake. Marcus explained that they were infuriated to be used as a pawn to meet the agency's sales targets. Because of this 'entrepreneurial approach', Marcus, a vulnerable student, suffered intense depression and was advised to return to India and get better. Marcus' parents were lured into spending many lakhs of thousands of Indian rupees in the hope that their child would have a better and brighter future. Now, the adviser is having a better future in Australia, working in a senior position with an Australian HEI as an Australian citizen.

Whilst there are many success stories of students from India, who would regard stories of vulnerable students from India like Marcus as a sheer bad luck, this is the time for such students, student bodies, HEIs, AEI, the Government Ministries of India and Australia and the education agencies themselves to come forward, accept their mistakes, apologise and compensate such vulnerable students, even though they may be a tiny number. If these

things were done, there could definitely be an agreement that international students from developing countries like and including India would not be treated as 'cash-cows'.

Money made through unmet promises

From the aforementioned case, despite the extremely profitable and noble business run by the education agencies, international students from developing economies seem to go through a tough time now and then. This is irrefutable. These education agencies send tens of thousands of students from India. India's revenue contribution to Australia's economy through international students places it second only after China (Verma, 2016). Australia hit a record influx of AUD\$24b from international student enrolments alone and a further AUD\$23.5b from their living expenditure (Hare, 2018).

These figures prove the success of the aggressive campaign of the entrepreneurial model of the Australian education industry using their agencies such as IDP Education and several others. These opportunistic agencies, which promote Australia's education interests in India, have formed a consortium called the Association of Australian Education Representatives of India (AAERI), according to Verma (2016). There have been scores of students who have been recruited by these agencies to Australia and were finally sent back to India. Verma notes that there are associations such as AAERI which follow ethical recruitment conducts, or at least claim to do so. However, thus far, there has been no action taken on the dubious HEIs which would make vulnerable international students from developing economies feel more like 'cash-cows'.

It is also a cause for worry, according to Verma (2016), that whilst the Australian government has updated many of its immigration rules and regulations, many education agencies including IDP Education India and several other education agencies that represent Australian HEIs in India are still promoting the 'pathway to work' and/or 'pathway to residency' on their websites, directly or indirectly. This contradiction alone is big test for the integrity of Australia's education by and large because of the malpractices of its vital players and contributors at different levels. Yet many students from developing economies like and including India seek to study in Australia, with their hopes and dreams.

A national newspaper in Australia has allegedly stated that international students are exploiters of the Australian immigration system (Paltridge et al., 2014). This news coverage appeared in a major newspaper in the wake of many international students being cheated by employers, HEIs, immigration agencies and other such organisations. As previously mentioned, international students contribute a substantive amount to Australia's economy, which is an already developed economy. However, it is unfair for the international students to be treated as exploiters, despite the billions of dollars that they contribute to developed state of Australia.

The schemes and policies of the Australian government to attract the thousands of students from India, and other developing countries like India, are like a mirage. The Australian government seems to want international students to choose Australia for those obvious and often promoted reasons of employment and residency, but, when they do, they are alleged to be exploiters. This devastates the lives of many vulnerable students who spend millions in search of quality training and education (Reich, 2016). It is pertinent to note that the various wavering updates in immigration policies in Australia have left the lives of a number of international students in a very precarious condition with an uncertain future

ahead, as they were simply not being provided with what they were initially promised during subscription to this study-abroad venture.

Inequalities and erasure of Indigenous languages

Paltridge et al. (2014) have mentioned that despite Australia's concerted efforts to attract international students from developing economies since the 1990s, scholars have constantly warned policy-makers of the potential and serious levels of inequality that the international education industry will bring to the society. For example, the high influx of students, as a consequence of Australia's education services, from the developing economies like and including India into developed nations like Australia will cause a lot of inequalities between countries. This is in part due to the monetary flow from developing economies to developed economies.

It is a well-known and established fact that international students from developing economies like India choose to migrate to the host country because of the superior standard of living, non-judgemental culture, education, employment opportunities and for permanent residency purposes (Marginson, 2012). Marginson observes that in 2008 alone, the English-speaking countries attracted more than 40% of the international student population to study in their countries. This, according to Marginson, is due to the hegemony posed by the English language which happens to be the medium of instruction in many developing countries, including India.

There are certain paradoxes when considering the issue of the hegemony posed by English across the world in spheres like education and employment. The first is that, whilst English is not the native tongue of many developing countries, the citizens of these countries are constantly being pushed to necessarily prove their expert proficiency in the English language to survive in this competitive world where the English language is hegemonic (Kubota, 2009). This results in the loss of knowledge of the native tongue and the gradual erasure of the Indigenous languages. The other paradox is that international students are expected to possess very high levels of English-language proficiency, often on a par with the local students.

Further, Kubota (2009) has suggested that academic institutions in the English-speaking world should help in maintaining a truly global environment by promoting translingual and transcultural values at their academic institutions. This will ensure a global environment that removes the linguistic barriers of communication. English should not be imposed as the hegemonic language on the students even whilst teaching. For example, theses and dissertations could be completed both in English and in the native language of the student. In this way, students are able to use their native Indigenous language academically and the knowledge is not restricted just to people who know the English language. Also, the Indigenous languages would survive.

Sustainability in internationalisation policies

Sustainability in the internationalisation policies of the HEIs does not refer to the prolonged sustenance of the policy with politico-economic prerogatives as the motives. Instead, sustainability in the internationalisation policies of HEIs encompasses the relational aspects (Ilieva et al., 2014). In this context, these relational aspects generally involve the people concerned, the time and the environment. Ilieva et al. (2014) have also critiqued the present

trend of internationalisation. It is said that internationalisation dwells in the idealism of goodness and that the consequences of internationalisation are good because the ideology itself is inherently good. Also, there seems to be an understanding that if internationalisation occurs according to the terms and conditions of the developed First World countries, then the consequences of internationalisation for developing economies will be the best for the developing economies.

Besides using idealism through internationalisation, it also uses the principle of instrumentalism, which says that it serves as an instrument for people to lead a good life with better living standards. However, in reality, it seeks to exploit those to seek the benefits of internationalisation. Ilieva et al. (2014) vehemently critique internationalisation further by citing Stier's ideals of internationalisation. Stier as in Ilieva et al. explains that education-alism is used as an ideal by countries and economies that seek to internationalise their education. This is to provide an image showing that they are the best options for education and teaching practices and that they have global solutions for the future's most pressing issues.

Ilieva et al. (2014) conducted an exploratory study at a Canadian university. It aimed to understand what people – students, professionals and academic staff – at the university thought about the present, the wrong and the best practices in internationalisation along with their understanding of the concept of internationalisation, among other such details. Among the respondents, 32% academic staff, 46% students and 17% professional staff did not know the meaning of internationalisation. Further respondents thought that commercialisation, their lack of knowledge about internationalisation and the sense of supremacy where diversity was to be disrespected were some of the unsustainable internationalisation practices. The respondents highlighted that internationalisation projects that include such ideals as relationality, reciprocity and a process that values and respects diversity would be sustainable.

Global citizens or stateless citizens?

According to Marginson, international students are citizens of one country who travel to another country that hosts them for the purposes of education. Their residential status can be compared to that of refugees and other tourists who do not have the protection of the host country, quite unlike the citizens of the host country (Marginson, 2012). These conditions, according to Marginson, do not allow them to use their citizenship agency to the fullest potential. China employed a student security mechanism through which it was able to influence a major drop in the number of Chinese students going to Australia and New Zealand for their education.

Marginson has also suggested that due to the high economic value and the foreigner status, international students are unable to claim their rights either under their host country's laws or under their home country's laws. Marginson has opined that there would soon be a high number of displaced people in various countries due to reasons including student migration for purposes of education. This displacement may occur due to climate change or other natural calamities, or as is currently happening due to COVID-19. This is the main reason for the 'denationalisation' of individuals, according to Marginson (Marginson, 2012). However, denationalisation translates to, in its menial terms, parallel to the meanings of globalisation or the effects thereof due to which the sovereignty of a nation dies and the boundaries countries which hold future prospects of research disintegrate.

Conclusion

The poor educational facilities in public HEIs in India have resulted in the mushrooming of many private HEIs, compromising quality and exploiting vulnerable students for a high subscription. Then came globalisation as a blessing however in disguise as it also entailed substantive subscription. Globalisation increased the pace of the world's (r)evolution. It provided students from India with access to foreign HEIs. However, whilst a majority of students ended up in successful careers after their education, there is still a minority of students like Marcus who are ignored and without compensation. To address this, HEIs should reduce the usage of education agencies and manage international student recruitment activities themselves.

Many of these international student recruitment agencies also promote English. English language has become hegemonic. Due to this, all knowledge is in the English language. This runs the risk of making Indigenous languages obsolete. Also, in order for people to gain knowledge, they will have to undergo the necessity to learn the English language. Hence, HEIs should adopt translingual and transcultural values. Whilst English can still be maintained, they should encourage educational activities in the students' native language. For example, theses/dissertation can be submitted both in English and in the students' native language.

The last point is that internationalisation policies should incorporate the value of sustainability. This means that internationalisation activities should lack commercialisation, should value diversity and should avoid the sense of supremacy – that they are the best. Also, the developed economies should mind the change of the world order and respond accordingly. They should value the developing countries, from which there is a huge monetary flow, making the developed countries stay developed. Also, international students should be protected by laws made by their home country and their host country, especially during times of displacement, as witnessed during the present uncertain times of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

Hari Hara Sudhan Ramaswamy  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4928-6105>

References

- Aggarwal S (2017) Top five countries where Indians prefer to study abroad. Available at: <http://businessworld.in/article/Top-5-Countries-Where-Indian-Students-Prefer-To-Study-Abroad/25-08-2017-124833/> (accessed 1 July 2018).
- Bourdieu P (1998) The essence of neoliberalism. *Le Monde Diplomatique*. Available at: <https://mondediplo.com/1998/12/08bourdieu> (accessed 10 July 2018).

NDTV (2018) India spends INR 45000 crores on foreign education. Available at: <http://profit.ndtv.com/news/budget/article-indians-spend-rs-45-000-crore-per-year-on-foreign-education-study-745514> (accessed 12 July 2018).

Canadian Bureau for International Education (2018) Facts and figures. Available at: <http://cbie.ca/media/facts-and-figures/>.

Conceição P (2020) Human Development Report, UNDP, New York, USA.

Cox M (2008) Globalisation: Are you for or against it? *Teaching Geography* 2: 75–76.

Daugherty L, Miller T, Dossani R, et al. (2013) *Building the Links Between Funding and Quality in Higher Education: India's Challenge*. Washington, DC: RAND Corporation.

Dodds A (2008) How does globalisation interact with higher education? The continuing lack of consensus. *Comparative Education* 44(4): 505–517.

Embassy of the USA in India (2018) 12% increase in Indians studying in the USA in 2017. Available at: <https://in.usembassy.gov/u-s-hosts-million-international-students-second-consecutive-year/> . accessed on 15th July 2018

Gillian M, Damachis B and McGuire J (2003) Australia in India: Commodification and internationalisation of higher education. *Economic and Political Weekly* 38(14): 1395–1403.

Gu M (2018) Mapping Indian student mobility. Available at: <https://wenr.wes.org/2017/08/india-mapping-student-mobility-from-the-worlds-number-2-sender> (accessed 31 March 2019).

Hare J (2018) International education hits \$24 billion. Available at: <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/higher-education/international-ed-hits-24bn/news-story/8c526941b930fedadff4460b040505b4> (accessed 18 July 2019).

IDP Education (2018) About us. Available at: <https://www.idp.com/india/aboutus> (accessed 18 July 2019).

Ilieva R, Beck K and Waterstone B (2014) Towards sustainable internationalisation of higher education. *Higher Education* 68: 875–889.

Jovanović MN (2010) Is globalisation taking us for a ride? *Journal of Economic Integration* 25: 501–549.

Kubota R (2009) Internationalization of universities: Paradoxes and responsibilities. *Modern Language Journal* 93(4): 612–616.

Marginson S (2002) Education in global market: Lesson from Australia. *Academe* 88(3): 22–24.

Marginson S (2012) Including the other: Regulation of the human rights of the mobile students in a nation-bound world. *Higher Education* 63(4): 497–512.

Mishra VV and Bhatnagar H (2009) Liberalisation of the higher education services under the GATS regime: Implications for a developing country. *Comparative and International Law Journal of Southern Africa* 42(3): 387–421.

Naidu GY (2006) Globalisation and its impact on Indian society. *Indian Journal of Political Science* 1: 65–76.

Oanh (Olena) Thi Kim Nguyen & Varsha Devi Balakrishnan (2020) International students in Australia – during and after COVID-19, *Higher Education Research & Development* 39(7): 1372–1376. DOI: 10.1080/07294360.2020.1825346.

Paltridge T, Mayson S and Schapper J (2014) Welcome and exclusion: An analysis of *The Australian* newspaper's coverage of international students. *Higher Education* 68(1): 103–116.

Prakash V (2007) Trends in growth and financing of higher education in India. *Economic and Political Weekly* 42(31): 3249–3258.

Rajiv Gandhi National Institute of Youth Development (2017) *Youth Development Index and Report*. Sriperumbudur: RGNIYD.

Rathod K and Srivastava K (2018) India spends INR 33000 crore annually to study in the USA. Available at: <http://www.dnaindia.com/academy/report-indians-spend-rs-33000-crore-annually-to-study-in-the-us-2273468> (accessed 20 February 2019).

Reich S (2016) Great expectations and the twilight zone: The human consequences of the linking of Australia's international student and skilled migration programs and the dismantling of that

scheme. In: Marianne Dickie, Dorota Gozdecka and Sudrishti Reich (eds) *Unintended Consequences: The Impact of Migration Law and Policy*. Canberra: ANU Press, pp.31–52.

Shear BW and Zontine AI (2010) Reading neoliberalism at the university. *Learning and Teaching: The International Journal of Higher Education in the Social Sciences* 3: 32–62.

Shields R (2013) Globalization and international student mobility: A network analysis. *Comparative Education Review* 57(4): 609–636.

Steger MB (2020) *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Turpin T, Iredale R and Crinnion P (2002) *The internationalization of higher education: Implications for Australia and its education 'clients'*. *Minerva* 40(4): 327–340.

United States-India Educational Foundation (2020) USIEF's historical landmarks. Available at: <http://usief.org.in/About-USIEF/USIEF-History-and-Overview.aspx> (accessed 20 February 2020).

Verma S (2016) Pathways to illegality or what became of the international students. In: Marianne Dickie, Dorota Gozdecka and Sudrishti Reich (eds) *Unintended Consequences: The Impact of Migration Law and Policy*. Canberra: ANU Press, pp.9–30.

Yang R (2003) Globalisation and higher education development: A critical analysis. *International Review of Education/Internationale Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft/Revue Internationale de l'Education* 49(3–4): 269–291.

Hari Hara Sudhan Ramaswamy (they/them/theirs) is an alumnus of the University of Madras (BSc Psychology) and Rajiv Gandhi National Institute of Youth Development (RGNIYD, MA Development Policy and Practice). They are currently an Editorial Chief for an online platform 'TheEcopreneur.in'. Their prime research areas are Gender & Sexuality, Education, Health & Environment, Human Resources and Law. They are an emerging author in these fields. Their first publication on climate change was featured in The Education Times supplement of The Times of India daily. They have been a recipient of Monash University (Australia) Vice-Chancellor's Bursary in 2007. They are also a Reviewer for the National Institute of African Studies (NIAS), UK. Besides these, Hari Hara Sudhan is working towards a research degree.

Sanjay Kumar (he/him/his) is an alumnus of the Rajiv Gandhi National Institute of Youth Development (RGNIYD) where he pursued an MA in Local Governance and Development. Since his graduation from RGNIYD, Sanjay has been actively engaged in grass-root level youth empowerment activities. His main areas of focus are youth civic engagement, education and politics. He is currently a Project Officer for the Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan (NYKS) and is involved in various projects and other research activities contributing towards youth development.