

- O'Neill, Onora (2002) *A Question of Trust*. The BBC Reith Lectures 2002. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pepin, Luce (2006) *The History of European Cooperation in Education and Training*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Power, Michael (1997) *The Audit Society: rituals of verification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rawls, John (1971) *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rifkin, Jeremy (2005) *The European Dream: how Europe's vision of the future is quietly eclipsing the American dream*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Riotta, Gianni (2012) Umberto Eco: it's culture, not war that cements European identity, *The Guardian*, 26 January.
- Ross, W.D. (1930) *The Right and the Good*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Santayana, George (1968) *The Birth of Reason and Other Essays*, ed. Daniel Cory. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sigalas, Emmanuel (2009) *Does ERASMUS Student Mobility Promote a European Identity?* ConWEB. Webpapers on Constitutionalism and Governance beyond the State, No. 2. [https://www.wiso.uni-hamburg.de/fileadmin/sowi/politik/governance/ConWeb\\_Papers/conweb2-2009.pdf](https://www.wiso.uni-hamburg.de/fileadmin/sowi/politik/governance/ConWeb_Papers/conweb2-2009.pdf)
- Sikka, Sonia (2011) *Herder on Humanity and Cultural Difference: enlightened relativism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spencer, Vicky A. (2012) *Herder's Political Thought: a study on language, culture and community*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Truszczyński, Jan (2012) Is Erasmus Europe's Success Story? *OpenDemocracy*, 17 December. <http://www.opendemocracy.net/can-europe-make-it/jan-truszczy%C5%84ski/is-erasmus-europes-success-story>
- Wolf, Susan (1992) Two Levels of Pluralism, *Ethics*, 102(4), 785-798.
- Zweig, Stefan (1935) *Triumph und Tragik des Erasmus von Rotterdam*. Vienna: Herbert Reichner Verlag.

## CHAPTER 8

# International National Universities: migration and mobility in Luxembourg and Qatar

JUSTIN J.W. POWELL

**ABSTRACT** Located in small states with extraordinary migration flows, the University of Luxembourg and Qatar University reflect global norms relating to research universities. Each has opened its doors widely in recent decades to scholars and students from around the world. Higher education in both countries relies to a considerable extent on global mobility; indeed, the international dimension of higher education is a precondition for their development. Elaborated internationalisation strategies characterise the universities in Luxembourg and Qatar, embedded in hyper-diverse and very wealthy nation-states as well as in significant regional and global networks. In these two cases, the 'national' flagship universities are thoroughly 'international'. These recently founded universities rely on global scientific collaboration, without which higher education and science could not flourish. Likewise, these young international national universities facilitate the accelerating global reach of higher education and science as they systematically foster the worldwide recruitment, cross-border mobility and multicultural networks of faculty, staff and students.

## Introduction

Higher education and science, producing intellectual dialogue, conferences and publications in the lingua franca of the day, are thoroughly worldwide activities. Research universities offer spaces for multicultural and multilingual learning and for scientific discovery. Increasingly, national ideals of 'progress' rely on successfully institutionalising universities that promise to generate the 'knowledge society' as well as economic development (Ramirez & Meyer, 2013). Today, all countries invest in higher education, the smaller ones often

expenditures this requires. Creating new institutions from the ground up may involve high costs and myriad challenges – especially for small states – due to limited highly qualified human resources and lack of economies of scale (Bacchus, 2008; Crossley et al, 2011; Martin & Bray, 2011). The costs of tertiary education have risen by 15% across the developed world since 2000 (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2011), yet scientific productivity varies considerably. Numerous successful universities have provided considerable returns to national investments in education and science as they reach beyond their home contexts to attract the best and brightest internationally, while others struggle to develop their reputations (Salmi, 2009).

Two nascent national universities with ambitious agendas – the University of Luxembourg and Qatar University – are embedded in very small but exceptionally wealthy states in which each university emulates global goals simultaneously with serving national and local needs. These examples show how small states compensate being on the perceived periphery of a scientific world characterised by stark and increasingly global rivalry. While geographically central in their respective regions, both countries lack hundreds of years of (higher) education institutionalisation that have conferred a massive head-start to many competitors in Europe and North America. The comparison of Luxembourg and Qatar emphasises similarities and differences in national ‘internationalisation strategies’ (see, e.g., Graf, 2009) and education and science policies. In distinct contrast to many federal countries like Canada, Germany, Switzerland or the USA, in which regional differences prevail and a plethora of universities exist (see, e.g., Braband, 2011), these highly centralised nation-states provide their few research universities with generous funding but limited autonomy.

From the beginning, universities have been standard-bearers of the nation-states in which they are located, often serving to train elites – from civil servants and business leaders to clergy and intellectuals. Yet they have also reached beyond such boundaries, be they political, linguistic or disciplinary, oriented as they are to universal goals such as truth-seeking and cross-cultural understanding. Higher education, more than ever owing to massive educational expansion in societies worldwide (Schofer & Meyer, 2005), is often viewed as the most assured pathway to elevated social status for individuals and to economic growth for societies, as those with tertiary education qualifications often enjoy higher salaries and lower unemployment rates than other groups. Higher education, while exhibiting durable national differences, has become even more international in orientation over recent decades, for example, due to successful European programmes like Erasmus that foster spatial mobility (Powell & Finger, 2013) and supranational coordination processes such as Bologna and Copenhagen (Powell et al, 2012).

To analyse the contemporary internationalisation of higher education, this contribution compares two relatively recently founded national

universities striving for international reputation: the University of Luxembourg in Europe and Qatar University in the Middle East. These universities exemplify major trends in tertiary education globally. Delving into the two case studies, this chapter compares these universities in their respective contexts, investigating how each national university relies on cross-border migration and global mobility to establish itself.

### Transnational Higher Education and Science

The on-going transnationalisation of higher education and science challenges traditional nation-based analyses of institutional change in education. In response, neo-institutional analyses have explored the diffusion of worldwide ideas and norms (Drori et al, 2003; Schofer & Meyer, 2005). Such work has uncovered the ideologies, values and assumptions that guide educators and policymakers as they continuously attempt to optimise their institutions and organisations based on comparisons with other countries. Trends in internationalisation, such as increased student and faculty mobility, are incontrovertible (see, e.g., the ‘Open Doors’ survey, Institute of International Education, 2012; Streitwieser, 2012). Continued growth in the numbers of youth and adults attending all types of higher education institutions is a key element behind both growing scientific capacity and the role of the university in knowledge production. For example, about half a million students, or just 1% of the youth age-cohort, were enrolled in higher education worldwide in 1900; a century later approximately 100 million youth were enrolled, representing 20% of the college-aged cohort (Schofer & Meyer, 2005). This phenomenal growth forms a critical base for the recruiting and training of the world’s future scientists and scholars (Altbach, 2005). The rationale and vision shared by many governments of how to build capacity for science is not difficult to understand: infrastructure for research lies at the heart of the knowledge triangle – ‘the beneficial combination of research activity, specialised education/training and innovation that advances our knowledge’ (European Commission, 2010, p. 3). Internationally oriented universities aim to prepare students for employment as well as for global citizenship, especially in states that rely to a large extent on foreign workers and the worldwide export of goods and services. In terms of research, governments hope universities will strengthen institutional capacity and broaden networks, to contribute to knowledge production on key issues, to enhance prestige and visibility and to generate revenue (Salmi, 2009). In both Luxembourg and Qatar, key challenges are to develop research infrastructure and to recruit the necessary expertise (on Luxembourg, see Meyer, 2008; on Qatar, see Qatar Foundation, 2013).

### (Inter-)national Research Universities between the Global and the Local

National universities have developed and attempt to realise their ambitions on different levels: within transnational, national and local contexts. The Universities of Luxembourg and Qatar are based in different world regions, grow within contrasting institutional environments and utilise very different resource-bases. Yet they are similar in aiming to become part of global dialogue and to compare favourably in world rankings with hundreds of other research universities, to be regional leaders and to address local needs. To reach these goals, they have chosen particular emphases and selected different internationalisation strategies; however, both states rely heavily on cross-border migration and international mobility to achieve their visions.

Evident in the cases of Luxembourg and Qatar, even very small states may exert influence via elite networks, supranational coordination and business acumen far beyond their population size or land area. For example, these countries host powerful media companies, Radio-Television-Luxembourg [1] and Al Jazeera [2] in Qatar, that wield considerable regional influence by shaping political consciousness. Import/export flows and labour migrations are vital because these countries are not self-reliant or self-sustaining; this is also true in academic markets. Owing to the reliance on other countries' universities to train their citizens, both their labour forces and their education systems reflect a high degree of internationalisation, especially at tertiary level. Both have chosen to invest in founding and expanding their own (inter-)national university to respond to changing global norms and economic conditions. Most importantly, Luxembourg and Qatar now attempt to convert their current economic success into long-term affluence via education and science.

As a correlate of heavy in-migration and cultural diversity, multiculturalism and multilingualism are further hallmarks of life in these states, although languages are also often highly stratified in their usage and prestige – and even politicised. Internally, less functional differentiation and tight social ties can ease decision-making and bundle resources across boundaries that in other contexts would be challenging. Cosmopolitan life and elite communication in both countries is centred in a single dominant city: Luxembourg and Doha, respectively. Other strategies to compensate for their lack of military force are advanced diplomacy (as seen in regional integration attempts, such as the Benelux or the Gulf Cooperation Council) or political neutrality, which led Luxembourg to host several European Union institutions such as the European Court of Justice. Perhaps decisively, these small states have amassed vast wealth from their strategic dominance in key industrial sectors. They have done so whether through discovery and extraction of national resource holdings, like Qatar's traditional pearl trade or its current natural gas reserves, or in highly profitable global industries, such as Luxembourg's traditional steel foundries, increasingly replaced by

banking. Thus, while small in terms of population and geographic area, these states are large in resources and influence.

Both countries have fashioned high-tech campuses for their universities as well as attempting to extend their networks far afield. The University of Luxembourg participates in the Université de la Grande Région,[3] a cooperative venture between universities in Belgium, France, Germany and Luxembourg. Education City, in the capital of Doha, Qatar, hosts a number of prominent foreign universities' branch campuses; Qatar University's own campus is also modern – but segregated by sex. The University of Luxembourg, while still housed in several regal structures, will soon move into a completely refurbished former steel factory site in Esch-sur-Alzette along the border with France. Campus Belval, initially budgeted at €600 million and comprising two dozen new buildings, has begun to accommodate research institutes, banks and retail stores, and R&D companies. Both states have invested heavily in top-quality foundations for education and science – and rely on migration and mobility to a significant extent. Elites are devoted to international education experience even as they have marshalled support for these universities. They recognise the importance of education and science for the future development of their countries. More than ever, these countries are embedded in transnational economic, political and cultural networks.

### Migration and Mobility as Foundations of the Global Research University

How are migration and mobility driving the development of the young universities in Luxembourg and Qatar, putting them on the path to becoming global research universities? Alongside excellence in research (top-quality faculty), academic freedom, and adequate facilities and funding, crucial factors in establishing the global research university include the internationalisation of students, staff and faculty and the resulting diversity (Levin et al, 2006). Inexorably, universities compete in a growing number of university rankings (e.g. *Times Higher Education*, Shanghai Jiao Tong), even if their worth and methodologies have been criticised (Steiner-Khamsi, 2010; Münch, 2011; Hazelkorn, 2013). Newer rankings, like U-Multirank, include all types of tertiary education, from all parts of Europe and the world. What is methodologically challenging is that most universities in Qatar are international branch campuses, with their home institutions ranked without the contributions directly attributable to developments in Qatar (on the myriad contemporary types of international university engagement in the Middle East, see Miller-Idriss & Hanauer, 2011). Unmistakably, direct comparison and competition as well as regional coordination, as in the Bologna Process in Europe, are key factors that have intensified institutional change.

Both the universities in Luxembourg and Qatar are oriented toward global standards, at least according to their mission statements and annual reports, and seek to become 'elite' universities by recruiting talent globally. Yet the target is shifting as 'super research universities' (SRUs) have undergone striking recent developments (Mohrman et al, 2008). This model emphasises certain qualities a handful of universities have pioneered – extraordinary research capacity, science and technology parks, and preeminent faculty clusters. The principles upon which the SRUs have developed emphasise particular qualities of universities in producing scientific knowledge: their missions are explicitly global; they are research intensive; they contribute to the expanding 'scientification' of all types of societal challenges (Droni et al, 2003); they focus on knowledge and economic integration and form public-private partnerships in the firm belief that university-based knowledge production enhances both social and economic progress. On the cutting edge, SRUs proclaim that they are at the forefront and should define global norms, whether related to graduate/professional training or research production and patent development. Growing budgets dedicated to these twin tasks and their prominence intensify the university's role as a major leader in scientific knowledge production (Baker, in press). Even if only very few of the thousands of universities actually achieve membership in this 'world-class' group, the model they provide is significant for all stakeholders; the principle of knowledge generation builds upon the conception of the SRU as vital both to worldwide economic competitiveness and national social development (Geiger & Sá, 2008).

The emphasis differs by university, with some world-class universities remaining very much an 'ivory tower' and others embracing strong roles in improving living conditions in their countries (Ramirez, 2006). Depending on region and especially languages spoken and scientific traditions practised therein, universities appeal to scientists, who more often than not publish their cutting-edge research in English and train their most ambitious students in multiple languages to facilitate career advancement. To analyse the extent to which these ascendant national universities reflect these broader global trends in higher education, each country and its national university will be placed in its cultural context.

### University of Luxembourg in Context

The Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg, nestled between Belgium, France and Germany, is home to half a million people, of whom three-fifths are natives. The country is trilingual, with Luxembourgish, German and French the official languages. Daily, many tens of thousands of workers commute from surrounding countries, bringing their native language and cultural sensibilities with them. More than half the workforce consists of cross-border workers; with its strong financial industry, demographic growth and the EU

institutions, Luxembourg has the second highest per capita GDP worldwide (International Monetary Fund, 2011), encouraging such tremendous migration flows.

As its three founding principles, the leaders of the University of Luxembourg chose multilingualism, interdisciplinary and internationalisation. These foci accentuate the strategy developed to capitalise on Luxembourg's history as a trading crossroads and its contemporary situation of cultural and linguistic diversity, as well as to compensate for being a new university in a very small state through strategic investments in promising research areas.

The University of Luxembourg, building upon the legacies of several postsecondary training institutes, was founded in 2003 as a private, government-dependent institution (*établissement public*) directed by a seven-member council, the Conseil de gouvernance. Most funding is provided by the state, although external sources have risen rapidly over the past several years (University of Luxembourg, 2013). From the very beginnings, Luxembourg has relied heavily on student mobility and tertiary education provided in neighbouring countries to supply qualified personnel, especially teachers, judges and physicians; this has generated cultural hybridity (Rohstock, 2010, p. 44; Rohstock & Schreiber, 2013). The university's antecedents can be traced back to the early 1800s when the national school system was first established, yet not until 1974 was the Centre universitaire du Luxembourg, hosting several humanities and social science departments, opened alongside teacher training institutes and an Institut supérieur de technologie, which offered technological courses of study (Meyer, 2008).

The mission statement emphasises that as 'a small-sized institution with an international reach, [it] aims at excellence in research and education. ... to be among the world's top universities. UL intends to be innovative, centred on research, ... and attentive to the needs of the society around it'. [4] With nearly 100 nationalities represented among the 6288 students (2012-13), and around half non-native, the university is extraordinarily diverse (University of Luxembourg, 2013). If the country has three official languages, the university replaces the local language with the current international scientific lingua franca, English. Regardless of nationality, each student pays tuition of just €200 per semester. Thus, state investment ensures that Luxembourg's national university can attract students from around the world.

In a hyper-diverse society marked by migration and mobility, internationalisation has been present from the start. A key challenge is to attract a talented undergraduate student body since the tradition in Luxembourg has long been to study abroad; elites continue to send their children abroad in large numbers. As Rohstock and Schreiber (2013) note, 'more students from Luxembourg study abroad than stay home, with Germany, Belgium, France, Austria and Switzerland the preferred destinations. Funded by the EU, the network of universities of the 'Greater Region' connects universities in the countries that share borders with



Luxembourg. At the same time, the small classes, low tuition fees and high quality of the faculty and campus also attract students from everywhere to Luxembourg. Today, all Bachelor-level students are expected to spend a semester abroad as a required part of their course of study, thus expanding European and global networks and ensuring the spatial mobility of University of Luxembourg students – and migration-driven transnationalisation.

Aiming to develop strengths based on both international trends and local/regional needs, the university has three faculties, all decidedly multidisciplinary: (1) Science, Technology & Communication; (2) Law, Economics & Finance; and (3) Humanities, Arts & Education. Further, two major interdisciplinary research centres aim to advance the cutting-edge goals internationally, namely the Interdisciplinary Centre for Security, Reliability and Trust, focusing on information systems, and the Luxembourg Centre for Systems Biomedicine. The university's total budget for 2012 from all sources was over €150 million (University of Luxembourg, 2013). By identifying in advance the most promising research areas that also reflect Luxembourg's economic and geographic contexts, the university concentrates its resources.

The university aims to achieve excellence in research by recruiting top faculty members worldwide. Although the funds provided by the national government are considerable (top-ranked in financial autonomy in Europe), organisational autonomy is limited.<sup>[5]</sup> In sum, Luxembourg has invested both considerable capital and strategic planning in the establishment of its national university, aiming to compete on a global scale by concentrating its resources, both intellectual and financial, and by building on the country's strengths and priorities. Alliances with other universities in the region and internationally underscore its international outlook. Hallmarks include its hyper-diverse faculty, staff and student body.

### Qatar University in Context

The State of Qatar gained its independence in 1971 and is a member of the Gulf Cooperation Council and the League of Arab States. Although this small Gulf state has a massively growing overall population (currently around 1.7 million; 15 times what it was in 1970), only about 15% (roughly 250,000) are ethnic Qataris (Qatar, 2012). Its native Arabic society and the bulk of its population and labour force, migrants mainly from Asia (especially India and Nepal), are highly stratified with the latter facing exploitation (Human Rights Watch, 2012). In the face of the undeniable, nearly complete reliance on the work of migrants, a government priority is 'Qatarisation' of the private sector and professional jobs currently held mainly by expatriates (Rubin, 2012). Considerable social and economic investments are needed to implement Qatar's ambitious national development programme – the *Qatar National Vision 2030* (Qatar, n.d.), especially because of the lack of an 'indigenous knowledge economy' and only several decades of educational expansion (Donn & Al Manthri, 2010, 2013). Explicitly or implicitly, Qatar

and the other Gulf states borrow foreign (especially American) models without sufficiently reflecting their costs and benefits or necessary adaptation to a contrasting cultural context (Phan, 2010; Hanauer & Phan, 2011; Kane, 2013).

Higher education in Qatar is bifurcated, with Qatar University, first established in 1973 as a college of education, joined recently by the 2500-acre campus Education City, funded by Qatar Foundation, which has attracted Western universities to establish international branch campuses (IBCs) (Lane & Kinser, 2011; Miller-Idriss & Hanauer, 2011). As of 2012, the following universities operate there, bringing expertise in targeted fields: Carnegie-Mellon (computer science), Georgetown (foreign affairs), HEC Paris (business), Northwestern (journalism), Texas A&M (engineering), University College London (museum studies), Virginia Commonwealth (design) and Weill-Cornell (medicine). These institutions seek to draw the elite of Qatari students who aspire to the 'gold standard' in tertiary education (Lewin, 2008). To do so, these IBCs must compete with the tradition of elite families sending their offspring to foreign, mainly anglophone, countries for university studies. If successful, this strategy may reduce the education-motivated study abroad of Qatari youth. Especially compared with the tremendous investments in capacity in Qatar, the programmes for Qataris to study elsewhere are limited.

In part to enhance Qatar University's competitiveness given the exclusive offerings of the new, mostly North American, IBCs, since 2003 the university has enjoyed considerable government funding as part of the country's major development programme. This significant reform has transformed and expanded the university, which aims to achieve the vision that it 'be a model national university that offers high quality, learning-centred education to its students' (Moini et al, 2009, p. 75). President Professor Sheikha Al-Misnad, herself an alumna (1977), is responsible for the curricular and organisational transformation of Qatar University into a leading university in the Arab world. The IBCs of Education City, as well as further institutions not housed there, bring their own principles, personnel and 'student cultures' (Wood, 2011), even as they contribute their home-grown reputations to Qatar. By contrast, Qatar University clearly reflects indigenous priorities and is set to facilitate their attainment.

Thus, higher education in Qatar is characterised by duality: Even as foreign research universities are invited to become pillars of the higher education system (now under the umbrella of the HBKU, or Hamad bin Khalifa University), the country has invested in the construction and expansion of a significant local university that reflects the country's particular heritage and is oriented toward local traditions and labour markets (Crist, 2013). This institutionalisation process emphasises the entire country becoming a world territory that operates as an ascendant node in multinational higher education and science – a hub situated between the West and the East.

If the vision is to serve national needs, the mission statement emphasises that Qatar University is 'the national institution of higher education in Qatar. It provides high quality undergraduate and graduate programs that prepare competent graduates, destined to shape the future of Qatar. The university community ... contribute[s] actively to the needs and aspirations of society' (Moini et al, 2009, p. 75). Furthermore, Qatar University seeks to 'promote the cultural and scientific development of the Qatari society while preserving its Arabic characteristics and maintaining its Islamic cultural heritage ... The University shall provide the country with specialists, technicians, and experts in various fields, and equip citizens with knowledge and advanced research methodologies' (p. 75). While crucial to remember that education in Qatar has only been formalised beginning in the 1950s, with the state replacing within-family instruction, this development is being cemented with tremendous investments – US\$4 billion was spent on education and science in 2008 alone (Fromherz, 2012, p. 152). 'Qatar has set the bar high with its goal of becoming a knowledge-producing economy at record speed. But the country holds some strong cards: a clear vision, highly committed leadership, and abundant resources to devote to the cause' (Rubin, 2012, p. 4). While Qatar University has long been considered among the better universities in the Middle East, the recent reforms have counteracted what many viewed as lack of academic standards and deteriorating performance (Moini et al, 2009).

The university, emphasising undergraduate teaching in particular, had 8706 students in 2009-10, with 38% being Qatari nationals and three-quarters women. Students of Qatari origin study tuition-free. Students are taught by a large group of 653 faculty (all ranks), with non-Qataris (70%) on one-year contracts and tenure held by Qatari faculty members (30%) (Qatar University, 2010); thus the teaching staff is highly stratified by origin. Addressing the needs of its community has been the hallmark of an institution located in a society experiencing massive demographic and economic change.

In terms of resources, Qatar has chosen to use its wealth to rapidly develop a high-quality education system – and to fund scientific research with 2.8% of GDP. In 2009-10, the research funding for Qatar University amounted to US\$60 million (Qatar University, 2010). The university sets out to improve its teaching and research by recruiting researchers globally. Generous funding from the national government (and through Qatar Foundation, especially for Education City) provides excellent facilities. Yet, both academic freedom and self-governance remain partial; the university is not led democratically. Recognising the discordance with global academic norms, reform initiatives aim to strengthen these dimensions to which most world-class universities conform.

As in Luxembourg, the internationalisation of all status groups is the rule due to the extraordinarily diverse population of the country, although there are inequalities; for example, only Qataris can study at Qatar University

free of charge. Attracting a talented undergraduate student body is difficult because traditionally the brightest students have gone abroad for their studies, similarly to Luxembourg. The large majority of female students at Qatar University results from their higher probability of seeking tertiary educational opportunities closer to home. In both country and university, Arabic and English are the two key languages, although this duality is contentious. Debates about the language of instruction emphasise the continuous challenge of serving different groups and aiming to place graduates in labour markets at home and abroad. Qatar University has chosen to focus on preparing qualified graduates for Qatar's dramatically expanding labour market, as have the Western universities' branch campuses. As in Luxembourg, it remains to be seen when these considerable investments in education and science will provide the university with a reputation to compete with the best universities worldwide.

In sum, Qatar has chosen a two-pronged strategy: to entice Western universities to provide their know-how and reputations and to establish and grow its own national higher education institution. In the past few decades, Qatari education, economy and society have experienced transformative growth. The fit between the diverse international branch campuses of Education City and the local initiatives to strengthen Qatar University and the goals of the family-led state will require further adjustment and strengthened cooperation. Similarly to the Luxembourg case, significant economic prosperity provides visionary leaders with myriad opportunities to construct some of the newest and most impressive university campuses anywhere. Yet international scientific collaboration and reputations must be established over the long term – and these require sustained international mobility and migration.

### Conclusions

Unlike many other small states, Luxembourg and Qatar are international, ethnically diverse and unusually prosperous. Almost completely dependent on international trading relationships and global markets for capital and labour, both countries have experienced extraordinary recent growth made possible mainly through immigration of the most highly qualified and less educated workers. Over the past decade, Luxembourg and Qatar have further intensified their investments in education and science, attracting scientists and students from around the globe. The institutional actors in Luxembourg and Qatar have compensated perceived vulnerabilities of small population, small size or peripheral geopolitical position with economic prowess and media influence – and by taking the lead in regional governance, whether the European Union or the Gulf Cooperation Council.

The two ascendant national universities reflect their ethnically and linguistically diverse host countries, yet their ambitions are not limited to their national contexts. Indeed, the governments of Luxembourg and Qatar

seem to have found promising mechanisms to compete globally, such as significant investment in selected, high-potential and often multidisciplinary research fields; the building of cutting-edge campus facilities; and the establishment of a range of undergraduate and graduate programmes to train local elites and attract individuals from around the world to help develop these dynamic organisations. Yet recruitment of international scholars and students to these lesser-known universities takes considerable effort, as do international and regional partnerships of differing depth and significance. Where the University of Luxembourg is weakly linked to other universities in the Greater Region, Qatar invests heavily in IBCs located at Education City; yet these too could work more collaboratively. Youth in both countries continue to be highly mobile in studying abroad. The time required to convert material resources into human capital or scientific advancement and reputation is much longer than the government-directed investment plans suggest. Arguably, competition in tertiary education and scientific activity will continue to increase worldwide, especially due to the massive expansion of education and science systems in East Asia and elsewhere.

Both Luxembourg and Qatar have shown their dedication to funding ambitious experiments in capacity-building via university institutionalisation. Whatever the future holds, these young universities are now the official national standard-bearers; simultaneously, they are thoroughly internationally oriented. Despite their historical, social and political differences and the similarity of being extraordinarily economically successful in recent times, both Luxembourg and Qatar have leaders who accept the principle that the future belongs to education and science, though they have not granted their universities full autonomy. Elites in these countries believe that to be successful, their countries must have a research university that adequately meets national needs, attracts their country's best students and competes worldwide. Without sustaining considerable cross-border migration and relying on the global mobility of faculty, staff and students, these international national universities would have to close their doors.

### Acknowledgements

My thanks to Bernhard Streitwieser for valuable feedback on an earlier draft of this chapter, portions of which have appeared in Powell (2012). For helpful comments, I also thank the participants in the project on 'Science Productivity, Higher Education Research Development and the Knowledge Society' (SPHERE), especially John Crist of Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar. This publication was made possible by NPRP Grant 5-1021-5-159 from the Qatar National Research Fund, a member of Qatar Foundation. The views expressed herein are solely those of the author.

### Notes

- [1] <http://www.rld.com>
- [2] <http://www.aljazeera.com>
- [3] <http://www.uni-gr.eu>
- [4] <http://www.uni.lu> (2012).
- [5] see <http://www.university-autonomy.eu>

### References

- Altbach, P.G. (2005) Globalization and the University: myths and realities in an unequal world, in *The NEA 2005 Almanac of Higher Education*, pp. 63-74. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Bacchus, M.K. (2008) The Education Challenges Facing Small Nation States in the Increasingly Competitive Global Economy of the Twenty-First Century, *Comparative Education*, 44(2), 127-145.
- Baker, D.P. (in press) *The Schooled Society: the educational transformation of global culture*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Braband, G. (2011) Eine gesamtstaatliche Aufgabe? Hochschulpolitik in Kanada und Deutschland, *Die Hochschule. Journal für Wissenschaft und Bildung*, 20(1), 95-109.
- Crist, J.T. (2013) International Perspectives: the growing presence of social science in Qatar, *ASA Footnotes*, 41(2), 9-10.
- Crossley, M., Bray, M. & Packer, S. (2011) *Education in Small States: policies and priorities*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Donn, G. & Al Manthri, Y. (2010) *Globalisation and Higher Education in the Arab Gulf States*. Oxford: Symposium Books.
- Donn, G. & Al Manthri, Y. (Eds) (2013) *Education in the Broader Middle East: borrowing a baroque arsenal*. Oxford: Symposium Books.
- Droni, G.S., Meyer, J.W., Ramirez, F.O. & Schofer, E. (2003) *Science in the Modern World Policy*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- European Commission (2010) *A Vision for Strengthening World-Class Research Infrastructures in the European Research Area*. Luxembourg: European Commission.
- Fromherz, A.J. (2012) *Qatar: a modern history*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Geiger, R. & Sá, C. (2008) *Tapping the Riches of Science: American universities and the promise of economic growth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Graf, L. (2009) Applying the Varieties of Capitalism Approach to Higher Education: comparing the internationalization of German and British universities, *European Journal of Education*, 44(4), 569-585.
- Hanauer, E. & Phan, A. (2011) Middle East: global higher education's boldest step, *University World News Global Edition*, no. 185, 21 August. <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20110819173149188&qury=hanauer>

- Hazelkorn, E. (2013) Reflections on a Decade of Global Rankings, *Beiträge zur Hochschulforschung*, 35(2), 8-33.
- Human Rights Watch (2012) Qatar: migrant construction workers face abuse. <http://www.hrw.org/news/2012/06/12/institute-of-international-education>.
- Institute of International Education (2012) *Open Doors: report on international educational exchange*. New York: IIE.
- International Monetary Fund (2011) World Economic Outlook Database. <http://www.imf.org/external/ns/cs.aspx?id=28>
- Kane, T. (2013) Higher Education in Qatar: does a US medical school break the baroque arsenal? In G. Donn & Y. Al Manthri (Eds) *Education in the Broader Middle East: borrowing a baroque arsenal*, pp. 85-105. Oxford: Symposium Books.
- Lane, J. & Kinser, K. (Eds) (2011) Multinational Colleges and Universities: leading, governing, and managing international branch campuses. *New Directions for Higher Education*, no. 155. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Levin, H.M., Jeong, D.W. & Ou, D. (2006) What is a World Class University? Teachers College Working Paper C12. [http://www.tc.columbia.edu/centers/coce/pdf\\_files/c12.pdf](http://www.tc.columbia.edu/centers/coce/pdf_files/c12.pdf)
- Lewin, T. (2008) In Oil-Rich Mideast, Shades of the Ivy League, *The New York Times*, 11 February. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/11/education/11global.html>
- Marin, M. & Bray, M. (Eds) (2011) *Tertiary Education in Small States: planning in the context of globalization*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning/UNESCO.
- Meyer, M.B. (2008) The Dynamics of Science in a Small Country: the case of Luxembourg, *Science and Public Policy*, 35(5), 361-371.
- Miller-Idriss, C. & Hanauer, E. (2011) Transnational Higher Education: offshore campuses in the Middle East, *Comparative Education*, 47(2), 181-207.
- Mohrman, K., Ma, W. & Baker, D.P. (2008) The Research University in Transition: the emerging global model, *Higher Education Policy*, 21(1), 5-27.
- Moini, J.S., Bikson, T.K., Neu, C.R., DeSisto, L., Al Hamadi, M. & Al Thani, J. (2009) *The Reform of Qatar University*. Doha: Rand-Qatar Policy Institute.
- Münch, R. (2011) *Akademischer Kapitalismus*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (2011) *Education at a Glance 2011: OECD indicators*. Paris: OECD.
- Phan, A. (2010) A New Paradigm of Educational Borrowing in the Gulf States: the Qatari example. Middle East Institute, 14 December. <http://www.mei.edu/content/new-paradigm-educational-borrowing-gulf-states-qatar-example>
- Powell, J.J.W. (2012) Small State, Large World, Global University? Comparing Ascendant National Universities in Luxembourg and Qatar, *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 15(1), 100-113.
- Powell, J.J.W., Bernhard, N. & Graf, L. (2012) The Emergent European Model in Skill Formation: comparing higher education and vocational training in the Bologna and Copenhagen processes, *Sociology of Education*, 85(3), 240-258.
- Powell, J.J.W. & Finger, C. (2013) The Bologna Process's Model of Mobility in Europe: the relationship of its spatial and social dimensions, *European Educational Research Journal*, 12(2), 270-285.
- Qatar (n.d.) *Qatar National Vision 2030*. Doha: General Secretariat for Development Planning.
- Qatar (2012) *Qatar in Figures 2012*. Doha: Qatar Statistics Authority.
- Qatar Foundation (2013) *Qatar National Research Strategy 2012*. Doha: Qatar Foundation. <http://www.qf.org.qa/news/347>
- Qatar University (2010) *Qatar University 2009-2010*. Doha: QU.
- Ramirez, F.O. (2006) Growing Commonalities and Persistent Differences in Higher Education, in H.-D. Meyer & B. Rowan (Eds) *The New Institutionalism in Education*, pp. 123-142. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Ramirez, F.O. & Meyer, J.W. (2013) Universalizing the University in a World Society, in J.-C. Shin & B.M. Kehm (Eds) *Institutionalization of World Class Universities in Global Competition*, pp. 257-273. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Rohstock, A. (2010) Wider die Gleichmacherei Luxemburgs langer Weg zur Universität 1848-2003, *Forum für Politik, Gesellschaft und Kultur in Luxemburg*, no. 301, 43-46.
- Rohstock, A. & Schreiber, C. (2012) The Grand Duchy on the Grand Tour: a historical study of student migration in Luxembourg, *Paedagogica Historica*, 49(2), 174-193.
- Rubin, A. (2012) Higher Education Reform in the Arab World: the model of Qatar. Middle East Institute, 31 July. <http://www.mei.edu/content/higher-education-reform-arab-world-model-qatar>
- Salimi, J. (2009) *The Challenge of Establishing World-Class Universities*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Schofer, E. & Meyer, J.W. (2005) The Worldwide Expansion of Higher Education in the Twentieth Century, *American Sociological Review*, 70(6), 898-920.
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2010) The Politics and Economics of Comparison, *Comparative Education Review*, 54(3), 323-342.
- Streitwieser, B. (2012) Editorial, *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 7(1), 1-4. Special issue on 'Research on Study Abroad, Mobility, and Student Exchange in Comparative Education Scholarship'.
- University of Luxembourg (2013) *Facts and Figures 2013*. Luxembourg: University of Luxembourg.
- Wood, C.H. (2011) Institutional Ethos: replicating the student experience, *New Directions for Higher Education*, no. 155, 29-39.



---

**Internationalisation of Higher  
Education and Global Mobility**

Edited by  
**Bernhard Streitwieser**

*Oxford Studies in Comparative Education*  
Series Editor: David Phillips



SYMPOSIUM  
BOOKS

**Symposium Books**

PO Box 204, Didcot, Oxford OX11 9ZQ, United Kingdom  
www.symposium-books.co.uk

Published in the United Kingdom, 2014

ISBN 978-1-873927-42-7

This publication is also available on a subscription basis  
as Volume 23 Number 2 of *Oxford Studies in Comparative Education*  
(ISSN 0961-2149)

© Symposium Books Ltd, 2014

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,  
stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means,  
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without  
the prior permission of the publisher.

---

## Contents

- Simon Marginson.** Foreword, 7  
**Bernhard Streitwieser.** Introduction, 11
- PART 1. GLOBAL ISSUES IN INTERNATIONALISATION AND MOBILITY**
- Chapter 1. **Rahul Choudaha & Hans De Wit.** Challenges and Opportunities for Global Student Mobility in the Future: a comparative and critical analysis, 19
- Chapter 2. **Darla K. Deardorff.** Why Engage in Mobility? Key Issues within Global Mobility: the big picture, 35
- Chapter 3. **Jane Knight.** Three Generations of Crossborder Higher Education: new developments, issues and challenges, 43
- Chapter 4. **Angeline M. Barrett, Michael Crossley & Titanji Peter Fon.** North-South Research Partnerships in Higher Education: perspectives from South and North, 59
- Chapter 5. **Joan Dassin, Jürgen Enders & Andrea Kottmann.** Social Inclusiveness, Development and Student Mobility in International Higher Education: the case of the Ford Foundation International Fellowships Program, 73
- PART 2. REGIONAL STUDIES: EUROPE, THE MIDDLE EAST, THE UNITED STATES, AFRICA, ASIA, AND LATIN AMERICA**
- Chapter 6. **Bernd Wächter.** Recent Trends in Student Mobility in Europe, 87
- Chapter 7. **Thomas Nørgaard.** Liberal Education in the Erasmus Programme, 99
- Chapter 8. **Justin J.W. Powell.** International National Universities: migration and mobility in Luxembourg and Qatar, 119
- Chapter 9. **Anthony Welch.** Seek Knowledge Throughout the World? Mobility in Islamic Higher Education, 135