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ABSTRACT

The last 20 years has witnessed a dramatic surge in international student enrolments around the world. Canada has been among the countries that have experienced some of the most significant increases international enrolments in college and university postsecondary educational institutions. This major research paper explores this trend and critically reviews the growing body of literature that seeks to explain this growth phenomenon. While the growth of the number students travelling the world in search of educational opportunities is, indeed, a global trend, the movement is largely from key developing nations to a smaller number of English-speaking, Western, wealthy capitalist countries. While for some scholars and commentators this movement is understood as part of the internationalization of all nations as part of the process of globalization, others see it as imbricated in the neoliberal project that has contributed to the corporatization of higher education and the commodification of knowledge within Western, capitalist nations. I review this debate with specific reference to data and examples from the province of Ontario, Canada.

**Key Terms:** Corporatization ~ Commodification ~ Globalization ~ Higher Education ~ Internationalization ~ Marketization ~ Neoliberalism.
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INTRODUCTION

“Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world”

(Nelson Mandela)

Nelson Mandela’s well-crafted words that serve as the epigraph for this introduction are deeply powerful. His remarks can be interpreted positively or negatively, depending upon who is doing the educating and the lens that is used to filter and produce the knowledge that is transferred in the educational process. The idea that knowledge equals power has a long history. Moreover, since the 1970s, western capitalist nations have undergone an economic transformation that is often associated with the rise of the so-called knowledge economy. This transformation is associated with a significant growth in post-secondary educational achievement within those nations. The knowledge economy is also associated with neoliberal globalization over the last 40 years. Globalization is not itself a new phenomenon. The spread of people, ideas, and technologies over the planet has been underway for many centuries. The pace, intensity, and breadth of this movement has waxed and waned. However, since the 1980s a plethora of political, economic, and technological variables have driven a new surge. Politically and economically the embrace by national governments and international institutions of policies and practices labelled by critics as neoliberalism has been key. The revolutions in information and communications technology, as well as the expansion of high-speed transportation, are the foundations of what David Harvey refers to as the compression of time and space (Harvey 1989, 201-308). As global linkages have expanded and intensified, global movements of people in search of educational opportunity have also increased, albeit unevenly across the world.
Canada is among the nations that have witnessed a dramatic surge in international student enrolment in postsecondary educational institutions, both colleges and universities. My personal interest in examining international student enrolment and the direction in which it has been trending over the past twenty years has been stimulated by this increase and the institutional focus on the attraction of international students over the last twenty years. My teaching experience at an institution in Ontario’s college system has afforded me first-hand observation of the fluidity of the demographic changes transpiring on campuses and by extension, students’ experiences of the impact of these changes. This major research paper explores the recent literature on this topic with a particular interest in the explanations offered as to the variables influencing this development. I also draw upon public information generated by post-secondary institutions and their organizations in Ontario, with specific reference to Brock University and Niagara College.

Political, economic, and social variables can be viewed as both push and pull factors contributing to the growth of international student enrolment in Canadian colleges and universities. Social and economic conditions in students’ country of origin may “push” them to seek higher education abroad. In my casual conversations with international students these conditions include a desire to increase their social and economic status, a perceived need to acquire specific respected credentials, and a hope for a better future that includes immigration or Canadian citizenship. Within host countries, political, social, and economic variables have driven governments and educational institutions increasingly to view international students as sources of skilled labour for provincial and national economies and sources of revenue for a post-secondary sector facing significant financial pressures.
These social and economic conditions are often the result of policies implemented by
governments and international organizations promoting a neoliberal form of globalization. These conditions include actions to encourage the commercialization of all aspects of life, the extension of private corporate and market-oriented modes of governance and management into ostensibly public institutions and organizations, and the further commodification of education and knowledge. The neoliberal emphasis on expanding market forces, at the expense of public or social interests, has had a dramatic impact higher education. I argue that the rise in neoliberal policies and practices implemented in higher education is inextricably interwoven with institutional interest in expanding international enrolments, and that, despite rosy rhetoric about the internationalization of the academy, the reality for both students and the future of the institutions is less positive.

This global phenomenon has generated a vast and growing body of academic and popular literature. Much of the academic writing on neoliberal globalization and international student enrolment in higher education originates in Australia and the United Kingdom. This is interesting given that in absolute terms the United States is the most common destination for international students. Nonetheless, in relative terms, Australia and the United Kingdom have a deep dependence on international student enrolment. Also, Australia and the United Kingdom have been leaders in the neoliberalization of post-secondary education. While my principal focus is international enrolments in Ontario, I have drawn upon the international literature in my analysis.

I have also examined publicly available documents produced by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities (MCU), the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), Colleges Ontario (CO), the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA), the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO), as well as the Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA)
between the MCU and Brock University as well as the SMA with Niagara College. These public documents are cultural artifacts that reveal key themes, goals, and concerns of the institutions that are, at one and the same time, implementing policies and practices that facilitate or encourage increased international enrolments and being impacted by these developments.

Today in Canada, higher education has become more unstable due to fluctuating, unpredictable enrolment. Global populism and nationalism combined with increased neoliberal policies and practices have contributed to the instability. Increased investments in higher education by countries like China, jeopardize western higher education dominance. Although, according to De Wit and Albach “student mobility continues to grow – from 2.5 million to 2008 to 5 million in 2018, student destinations are changing” (De Wit and Albach, 2018, p. 1). New key players are emerging in the international education market. Different destination options for international students is a contributing factor to the decline of international student enrolment currently experienced at western higher education institutions.

Within Canada, education is under the jurisdiction of the provinces and varies accordingly. Provincial differences in international enrolments include: the overall numbers; students’ countries of origin; marketing, recruiting, and rankings of individual higher education institutions; public funding; and, recently, responses to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The impact of each of these elements depends upon many factors. However, we may be on the cusp of a major change. The long-term effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on international enrolment trends cannot be ignored. Globally, the pandemic, along with other factors, has reduced international enrolment. Border closures, travel restrictions, and the shift to online course delivery has changed the field of play. Just as the wisdom of reliance on global supply chains is under question due to the pandemic, institutional reliance on a global supply of
students may also require a sober second thought.

Before engaging with the academic and other literature that analyzes and interprets the phenomenal growth of international enrolments, it is worth taking a brief look at the data regarding this development.

SECTION TWO: THE GROWTH OF INTERNATIONAL ENROLMENTS

An autoethnographic vignette from halls of the academy

Walking the buzzing campus halls after a five-year hiatus, I detected a markedly different environment different from when I was last working at the college. A tension lingered in the air as students passed one another on the way to their next class. Students with shared ethnic origins gathered separately in corners, common areas and cafes, each conversing in their first language, a safe way to speak their mind and share thoughts and experiences. In private areas, fellow instructors were discreetly discussing emerging classroom dynamics, issues arising in the learning environment, and newly required approaches to classroom management. Concerns about plagiarism and English comprehension had become critical aspects of conversations about how to achieve learning outcomes.

This was followed by an endless stream of student experience feedback – both positive and negative student experiences were expressed in my classrooms. These international and domestic student experiences that were shared with me led me to explore the topic of international student enrolment in higher education further. I sought to understand what was going on, questioning - what had changed?

In this section I present data that shows massive growth in international enrolments in the world, in Canada, and in Ontario. It is necessary, however, to begin with a caveat. A major
challenge with the data on international student enrolment is its inconsistency. The definition of an “international student” diverges across international, national, and even provincial institutions and organizations. It may also fluctuate based upon the different stages of the application and registration process reflected in the numbers. For example, numbers may be based upon student applications, offers of acceptance, student confirmations of acceptance of an offer, student registrations, or headcount enrolments. These indicators all may vary between academic terms. Also, government figures about the number of international students within a country may reflect the number of individuals on a student visa, not all of whom will be registered at an institution of higher education. Canada is a case in point. International students are allowed to stay in the country and work for a defined period after they have graduated from their program. The length of time is calculated in relationship to the length of the program. Thus, the number of people in the country on study permits does not necessarily correspond to the number registered in university or college programs at a given time. For example, according to an IRCC report, as of December 2020 there were 530,540 international students holding Canadian study permits, a number greater than that reported in a number of other sources. Nonetheless, while the numbers are not consistent among the various sources, the overall trend of the last twenty years is absolutely clear. Furthermore, a recent Statistics Canada report (2020) identifies all the growth in higher education enrolments in Canada in 2018/2019 as driven solely by international students.

To begin at a global level, according to the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, between the years 2000 and 2019 the number of students studying in a country other than their own grew by some 289 percent, from 2,097,653 to 6,063,665. Almost 25 per cent of these students were going to “Northern America” (United States and Canada) in 2000. By 2019, the number of international students in Northern America had more than doubled (511,689 to 1,211,931).
Interestingly, despite the growth, this represented a decline in the percentage of global enrolments going to Northern America from about 24 percent to 20 percent. Notwithstanding this trend, the number of international students in Canada grew faster than in the world as a whole, and as a percentage of the global total. According to the UNESCO numbers, international students in Canada increased from 36,540 in 2000 to 224,548 in 2019. This sixfold expansion moved the Canadian take of total international enrolments from 1.7 percent to 3.7 percent. While still well below the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia and New Zealand (the figures for these two nations are combined), this shows the growing attractiveness of Canada as a destination for international students. In 2019, the number of students studying abroad who identified as female was 2,807,584 million and 129,231 of these students studied in Canada. In comparison, in the same year 3,256,081 students studying abroad identified as male and 149,937 studied in Canada. These figures reveal a minimal sex difference in international student enrolment across Canada (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2019).

One of the striking facts about the growth of international student enrolments is that it is largely a movement from poorer developing nations to wealthier nations. The UNESCO data indicate that there were 49,074 outbound internationally mobile students from Canada in 2019. Put differently, there are four and half times as many foreign students coming to Canada as there are Canadian students travelling abroad. This reflects the pattern on a global scale of movement from poorer developing regions to rich Western countries, particularly those where English is the dominant spoken language. The significance of this trend will be discussed later in relationship to the analysis that sees growth in international enrolments as part of a trend towards internationalization. A further significant fact is that the incoming flow of students to Canada is dominated by two countries: India and China (Figure 1).
Figure 1: Canada – Study permit holders with valid permit as of December 31, 2018, by country of citizenship (University only Stats)

Source: Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2018

Data gathered from four postsecondary institutions in Ontario unmistakably reflect the upward trend in international enrolments. Figure 2 and Table 1 provides a comparison of total head count enrolment with international student head count enrolment numbers reported by Brock University, McMaster University, Seneca College, and Niagara College between 2010 and 2021. The statistics compiled in Figure 2 and Table 1 were sourced from publicly available annual reports located on each institution’s website.
Figure 2: Annual Head Count FT Enrolment Graph: Total vs. International Student

2010 - 2021

Table 1: Annual Head Count FT Enrolment Numbers: Total vs. International Students

2010-2021

* FT – Full Time Students

Sources: Niagara College Annual Reports 2010-2021, Seneca College Annual Reports 2010-2021, Brock University Headcount & FTE Annual Reports and McMaster University Annual Fact Book Reports 2010-2021.

Note: In the 2011-2012 Niagara College Annual Report the growth of international students began the noticeable upward trajectory. Niagara College reported in the 2014-15 Annual Report, a domestic drop in enrolment suggesting it was attributed to high school graduate rates lower in Ontario. In 2015-16, Niagara College reported demographic challenges and declining enrolment that had impacted the entire Ontario Post-secondary system. Domestic enrolment numbers again were not reported.
While the number of international students at each of these institutions is a relatively small percentage of total headcount, the increase over the 11 years is very notable. Interestingly, as domestic and overall enrolment numbers at Niagara College dropped in recent years, those declining numbers ceased to be mentioned in their annual report. Attention was redirected to being *world ready* and towards new *international expansion initiatives*. A steady annual increase in international student enrolment was featured in Niagara College’s annual report. In the 2015/16 Niagara College annual report, full time enrolment figures were absent. However, an apparent decline was highlighted indirectly through the acknowledgement of demographic challenges which impacted higher education overall in Ontario. An earlier 2014/15 annual report by Niagara College attributed a domestic drop to lower high school graduation rates in Ontario. The report only focused on positive upticks in international enrolment numbers.

Once again one must be attentive to issues with such data. The accuracy related to college and university enrolment numbers may vary due to inconsistencies in data gathering methods. Between 2016-2020, Seneca College reported the same overall enrolment numbers and international student numbers. Whether this reflects real stability or some reporting interruption is unknown. The statistical analyses Brock University and McMaster University provide in their annual reports provide granular detail, including a breakdown of enrolment, programs, gender, demographics, tuition and countries of origin numbers retrieved from student records database. These statistics presumably deliver a more accurate picture of what is really happening. Be that as it may, regardless of differences and irregularities presented in the data by these four institutions, the bigger picture and main message remains consistent. All four institutions saw a significant surge in international enrolments. The report provides staggering enrolment numbers as they continue to hit record highs.
Further supporting the institutional data discussed above, Statistics Canada, HEQCO, and OCAS reports also recognize the continuous rise in international enrolment in Canadian colleges and universities. In 2020, according to Statistics Canada, over 2.1 million students were enrolled in a Canadian college or university. International students encompassed 400,000 of that enrolment number, a significant part of this higher education landscape. According to a 2020 HEQCO report, Ontario attracted the highest number of international students in the country. For Ontario colleges, international students grew from just 2,777 studying during the onset of the 2000’s to 75,000 in 2019. University international student enrolments increased from 13,973 in 2000 to 72,277 in 2018. The information shows that growth at the colleges was even more impressive than that at the universities. Considering the large number of international student enrolments as of recent, the COVID-19 pandemic has and will continue to have a significant impact on international students studying in Canada. Factors related to travel bans, boarder closures, and a switch to online learning all have influenced a downward trend in international student enrolment in Canada. Noted in the same report by Statistics Canada, the sociodemographic of international students may be altered due to the differences in how main source countries of international students were affected by the pandemic.

According to the HESA report (2020) in 2018-19, international students made up 15.7% of all university enrolments and 16% of all college enrolments. The most rapid growth was witnessed in Ontario.
It is clear, then, that international enrolments are now a significant component of the student body in post-secondary organizations in Canada, as well as several other English-speaking wealthy countries. In the rest of this paper, I explore the literature that explains this growth in international enrolments. As will be seen, on the one hand, this is all consistent with other patterns related to globalization. Colleges and universities are increasingly immersed in and reflective of the internationalization of societies impacted by the movement of people, goods, ideas, and popular culture that comprises globalization. This might optimistically be understood as part and parcel of a more deeply interactive and integrated global society. On the other hand, there is more than a little narrow, institutional economic, self-interest at work as colleges and universities seek to resolve the contradictions of neoliberalism in the post-secondary sector.
With a rise in the global middle-class, an increased interest in international education, and the potential for future employment and immigration opportunities, Canada has become one of the top destinations for students pursuing higher education (El-Assal, 2020). Canada ranked fourth globally in 2019, with the United States, the UK, and China leading in international enrolments. Over 5.3 million students studied abroad in 2019, forecasting eight million by 2025 if the current trend continues according to a Project Atlas, 2019 report.

Table 2: 10 Most Popular Countries to Study Abroad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>International student population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1,095,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>496,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>492,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>435,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>420,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>343,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>334,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>282,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>208,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>120,991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Project Atlas, 2019)

Usher argues, “international students have been the tidal force keeping the system afloat in the absence of either more government spending or concerted institution cost-control” (Usher 2020, 11). With the presumption of such absences in mind, the trifecta of a poorer reputation of specific schools within the higher education sector, weak financial health, and excessive dependence on international students, some colleges and universities may be in for a turbulent, unstable future.
Over the past twenty years, globalization and neoliberal policies and practices have significantly altered the trajectory of and approaches to higher education within Canada. A plethora of changes over this period have shaken post-secondary institutions. These changes include but are not limited to: reductions in direct per-student government grants; increased emphasis on performance-based and targeted government funding; mandate agreements; tuition increases; institutional competition for reputation (encouraged by the emergence of ranking systems); and enrolments. At the same time, the dominance of English as the international language of business and science, the growth of the middle-class in nations such as China, India, and some of the petroleum-rich states in the Middle East, and the rise of the so-called
knowledge-based economy created opportunities in Canada, and other wealthy English-speaking nations, to expand their appeal.

Adding further to these factors is an interest in the development of human capital with a primary focus on the development of skilled labour and a global workforce to meet evolving labour market deficits, pathways to citizenship, sustainability, and corporatization whereby business models are implemented and exercised in higher educational institutions. These approaches and practices are a direct result of global and local market forces that are politically motivated and generated by economic policies. Among the outcomes, we are witness to a new and emerging set of imperialistic consequences on culture, knowledge, and the integrity of higher education.

SECTION THREE: EXPLANATIONS OF THE GROWTH OF INTERNATIONAL ENROLMENTS

Discussions of the rise of international enrolments are very much bound up with discussions of neoliberalism and globalization, and the causes and consequences of these phenomena since the 1980s. Therefore, this section begins with a brief discussion of these terms.

Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism is the term used by critics to describe a range of ideas, policies, and practices promoted by various academics, think tanks, governments, and politicians since the late 1970s. Broadly speaking, the aim of such policies is to encourage the expansion of market forces as the organizing principle of society. Neoliberalism explicitly builds on Adam Smith’s idea that the “hidden hand” of the market inevitably, if unconsciously, is the
most efficient way to distribute goods and services. However, unlike their 18th and 19th century predecessors, the champions of neoliberalism since the second world war recognize that the state has a distinct role to play in the creation of a market driven society. They advocate limited government intervention in the economy in the sense of conscious efforts to promote positive public outcomes through nationalizations of industry, subsidies, or welfare protections for citizens. However, the state is expected to protect and enhance private ownership, remove barriers to trade, limit the abilities of workers to organize, and promote the “market readiness” of citizens. Drawing on rational choice and/or rational actor theory, neoliberalism also promotes freedom of choice for individuals. Neoliberalism has had particular resonance in the Anglo-Saxon world, including Canada, since the 1980s (Dunk, Clement and Vosko 2003).

According to Steger and Roy (2020), neoliberalism is not simply an ideology nor an arrangement of policies – it involves a distinct mode of governance which they suggest is consistent with the principles of “new public management and public choice theory” (30). A reduced government is deemed “better” with respect to “market efficiency” and “economic effectiveness”. With less interference from governments in the regulation of the market a “series of mergers, acquisitions, and leverage buyouts, involving some of the nation’s largest corporations” (Steger 2020, 31) were fueled by neoliberal measures of deregulation and privatization.

Steger and Roy (2020) discuss fundamental dimensions of neoliberalism which are critical to understanding how it functions. These dimensions are ideology, a mode of governance, and a policy package that underscores the fundamental role of the free market and private business. The three concrete public policies related to neoliberalism are deregulation of the
economy, liberalization of trade and industry, and privatization of state-owned enterprises. Steger and Roy (2020) label these three public policy approaches as the D-L-P formula (Deregulation, Liberalization, Privatization). They argue that “by the end of the Roaring Nineties, neoliberalism in its various permutations and modifications had successfully spread to most parts of the world” (Steger & Roy 2020, 119). Harvey (2005), identifies this as accumulation through dispossession, arguing, “the neoliberal project is to disembed capital from these constraints” (Harvey 2005, 11). From the beginning Harvey suggests, the intentions of the neoliberal project were to restore class power to the economic elites by re-establishing conditions for capital accumulation. Harvey defines neoliberalization as “the financialization of everything. This deepened the hold of finance over all other areas of the economy, as well as over the state apparatus” (Harvey 2005, 33).

The promotion of market forces and privatization also involves glorifying “individual responsibility.” The shift from state to individual responsibility for one’s well-being is bound up with strict limitations on the growth of, or in some cases real reductions, in government support and funding across the public sector, including the education system.

Globalization

In a review of the sociological literature on globalization in the 1980s and 1990s, Guillen (2001) argued that “globalization is one of the most contested topics in the social sciences” (235). One of the key questions raised by the literature was whether there was “a global culture in the making?” (Guillen 2001, 235). Presumably, if this is happening, education would be one area where we should expect to see a global convergence. This would require an understanding of what is occurring within higher education, both locally and globally. Ostry
(1999, 1) describes globalization as “an ongoing process of deeper integration among countries” that has progressed in phases since the end of World War II. A significant emphasis of neoliberalism that contributed to globalization was the reduction and standardization of border barriers for the purposes of trade. This continued through the 70’s and 80’s (Ostry 1999, 1), and until recently, as global integration developed through economic liberalization, financial market deregulation, and the movement of capital.

According to Steger (2020), globalization is “about intensifying planetary interconnectivity” (17). He reminds us that globalization should not be viewed as a “monolithic social process”; rather, globalization takes on several individual yet interconnected “social forms” that comprise several different qualities and features. The first of these is embodied globalization, the movement of individuals across global borders. The second is disembodied globalization, involving the stretching of social relations because of the “movement of immaterial things and processes including words, images, and electronic texts, and encoded capital such as crypto-currencies like Bitcoin” (Steger 2020, 11). The third form is object-extended globalization, the “global movement of objects,” specifically traded commodities. Lastly, organization-extended globalization, is connected to the “global extension of social and political institutions such as empires, states, corporations, NGOs, clubs and so on” (Steger, 2020, 12).

Lundahl (2012) highlights the fact that the latest phase of globalization corresponds with the emergence of the knowledge economy or knowledge capitalism. Research and education have always been connected to the economy in several ways and at all levels, but with the rise of the knowledge economy, it takes on even greater economic significance. It is a key element of embodied globalization, in the form of students and professors moving about the planet.
Research and education is additionally part of disembodied globalization as ideas produced and transmitted within post-secondary institutions are disseminated globally. It is also part of object extended globalization, in so far as books, laboratory and other scientific equipment are among commodities traded internationally. And finally it comprises a component of extended globalization, as academic professional organizations, student organizations, and colleges and universities are increasingly global in aspiration if not always in terms of location or membership. While there is no question that neoliberalism and globalization have impacted educational systems, the arguments about how to interpret what is happening continue.

*International Student Enrolment as Internationalization*

For some authors, recent trends in international enrolment are simply part of the internationalization of the world that is an inevitable part of globalization. Knight (1997) specifically connects globalization with higher education, suggesting it involves institutions of higher education incorporating an international element into pedagogy, research, and services. This incorporation could be done through introducing international or intercultural aspects into course curriculum and teaching practices, including physical mobility of academic staff not limited to students only, collaborating different global and cultural perspectives and comparative approaches to research conducted, and being internationally inclusive in services offered.

For example, the Council of Ontario Universities report titled *Supporting Diverse Campuses* explicitly argues that “it’s vital that universities reflect the province’s population and help create inclusive environments.” It links this goal to the fact that estimates suggest that immigrants will account for 36 percent of Ontario’s population by 2036, and the need for the
ideas and skills of international students. “Ontario’s universities welcome more than 64,000 international students from more than 200 countries, helping bring a world of ideas to the province where they can help our businesses and communities thrive” (Ontario Universities, 2018).

The rapid pace of internationalization of higher education in Canada is recognized by contemporary scholars (Calma & Dickson-Deane, 2019; Guo & Guo, 2017; Stein & Oliveria de Andreotti, 2015; Zajda & Rust, 2020) who note persistent issues with the contemporary system of internationalization, higher education, and the influential neoliberal approach. Increasingly, scholars appear to recognize that internationalization is situated as a strategic priority for Canadian colleges and universities.

Since the late 1990’s, the term internationalization has been hotly debated and a topic for interdisciplinary research by scholars. The term internationalization is being employed more and more in discourse to address international dimensions of higher education (Knight 2003). The main purpose of internationalization is positioned as “to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society” (de Wit et. al. 2015, 29). Is this really what happens? Not according to Guo and Guo (2017) who suggest the void in international representation in much of the current curriculum and what is presented may be viewed as negative in ways that “reinforce stereotypes and prejudices” (863). Drawing on statistics and strategies from 32 Canadian universities and colleges, Buckner, Clerk, Marroquin, and Zhang (2020) highlight assumptions institutional administrators and leaders possess, suggesting internationalization will benefit institutions. It is framed as revenue generating, an enhancement in research productivity and improving the outcomes of students’ both academically and in the labour market (Association of Canadian Community Colleges,
This position is also argued by Beck, (2013), Marginson, (2010), and Steir, (2004) who all suggest that internationalization is an integral part of Canadian university strategies and highlight the predominant market orientation of internationalization. The way in which internationalization is framed, in this case from a neoliberal perspective, has a direct effect on its very understanding.

Knight (2004) and Sabzanlieva (2020) identify that the term “internationalization” means different things to different people and therefore is being used in an assortment of different applications generating confusion about its meaning. Beck (2013) argues that some detrimental influences of globalization and colonialism are potentially being reproduced through international recruitment – a form of internationalization. Stein and de Andreotti (2016) identify similar concerns suggesting internationalization plays a significant role in reinforcing western supremacy.

Internationalization has emerged as a major theme within the field of higher education according to Sabzalieva (2020). The term internationalization is not new, its use and popularity in the education sector have rapidly increased since the early 1980’s (Knight 2003). Knight highlights the importance of the ways in which definitions shape policies and how particular practice can impact definitions and policy. According to Knight (2003) this is due to internationalization becoming a “catch-all phrase” where the term captures anything related to global, intercultural, or international dimensions of higher education.

Soderqvist (2002) presents a slightly different view of internationalization providing a definition that centers on processes, educational change, and a more holistic approach to management in higher education institutions. They define internationalization as, “a change process from a national higher education institution to an international higher education
institution leading to the inclusion of an international dimension in all aspects of its holistic management in order to enhance the quality of teaching and learning and to achieve the desired competencies” (29).

Knight (2003) argues that internationalization should be understood at several levels: national, sectoral, and institutional. Knight (2004) provides an overview of the approaches to internationalization of each of these sectors in more detail for each approach which are reflected in Table A, B and C in Appendix C.

Knight (2004) examines the importance of defining internationalization at all levels and the relationship that exists between them, which should be reflective of the current era in which they exist. Knight (2003, 2) proposes a purposeful definition that relates to all characteristics of education and the function it plays in society as: “Internationalization at the national, sector, and institutional levels, is defined as the process of integrating as international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education.”

The definition of internationalization used by Knight (2003) takes into consideration many elements of what the term means in relation to education and the broader role internationalization has on several levels of a society allowing for changes to be made without changes occurring in the overall definition. Such a framing permits the definition of internationalization to be utilized globally and applied to social and local traditions, culture, and beliefs.

Knight (2003) suggests that new opportunities are presented by globalization along with potential risks and challenges. However, she notes the discourse is not centered on the “globalization of education” rather globalization is presented as a process affecting
internationalization. Knight argues “internationalization is changing the world of education and globalization is changing the world of internationalization” (Knight 2003, 3). This is an important area of study as the interrelationship between globalization and internationalization affects countries differently. This experienced difference takes into consideration a country’s independent history, traditions, culture, and priorities which have various effects on education. Altbach and de Wit (2018) have additional perspectives on these differences but with a less positive approach, noting troubling trends and actualities. With Brexit in 2016, the election of Donald Trump in the United States, and now the fallout from the pandemic, there is an increasing challenge for international students to obtain student visas as a result of these and other factors. Additionally, with nationalism on the rise, we observe an unwelcoming environment for students coming from abroad to study. Although these issues appear to be problematic, Altbach and de Wit (2018) contend they were predictable.

According to Sabzalieva, the ongoing intensification of internationalization “has become taken for granted, now woven into the everyday fabric of the higher education landscape” (Sabzalieva 2020, i). She concurs with Altbach and de Wit (2018) adding “in the context of rising nationalism, populism, and backlash to global interconnectedness, some suggest that this was Canada’s global moment” (Sabzalieva 2020, i). Canada has had an opportunity to maximize on international student interest and enrolment as global conflicts, student safety, racism, employment opportunities and immigration were a factor in altering students’ country of choice in which to study. As a result of these factors, an increase in international student enrolment to Canadian higher education institutions can be witnessed along with providing benefits to the country on an immigration, employment, and economic level.
Canadian institutions of higher education are profoundly involved in internationalization, a result of a substantial increase in international student enrolment on Canadian campuses and the implementation of branch campuses abroad – such as Niagara College’s Taif Campus in Saudi Arabia. However, it is essential to note that government funding (where it occurs) derives from immigration interests and funding policies, not education or internationalization. The Express Entry program is a federal government initiated program connected to the immigration process. The Canadian program accepts applications from skilled workers who are looking to become permanent residents of Canada. Looking to build a healthy, educated and skilled economy, Canada considers applications based on how the applicant ranks in comprehensive ranking system, a point system. The ability to work and pathways to permanent residency are how the Canadian government attempts to control the flow of international students. The express entry program is a reflection of the Canadian government’s commitment to immigration and bringing skilled, educated workers to Canada. International students fall under a category that is eligible to obtain permanent residency through a study pathway – a major stepping stone in obtaining permanent residency. International students who complete their higher education in Canada, increase their opportunities to extend their stay and potentially transition to permanent residence. The Canadian education that international students gain will support their future employment and immigration ambitions (Canada Visa, 2021).

With government funding practices and allocation in mind, it is important to reflect on some key questions posed by Knight (2004):

…what, in the year 2020, will be seen as the major accomplishments of internationalization during the past 30 years? Are we taking a long-term perspective on the implications and consequences of internationalization? What are key issues or questions that require further evaluation, research, and policy analysis to address and
guide the long-term impact and implications of internationalization at both the institutional and sector levels? (29-30)

These critical questions asked by Knight (2004) raise some interesting concerns in the foreshadowing of the future state of higher education and potential long-term consequences. The long-term impacts of internationalization are not clear. However, it continues to be studied, debated, and researched at both the institutional and sector levels. More work needs to be done. Broadening research to include international student perspectives, their experiences of studying abroad, and the differences between what international students were promised and what they received.

Knight (1991) argues that institutional attempts to cope with the effects of globalization, have transformed them. In a context of decreasing direct government investment in higher education, the significant financial benefits of international student enrolments have led to a dependency on its continuity. Canada is not anomalous in this regard. According to Currie and Newson (1998), the effects of globalization on education can be observed in Australia, Great Britain, and the United States as well. The present iteration of globalization “is influenced by economic policies linked to neo-liberal free market ideas” (Majhanovich 2020, 11) and can be observed in higher education.

International Student Enrolments as an element of the Commodification of Knowledge

Lundahl (2012) suggests that the education system and research are threatened by their colonization by neoliberalism. He argues that there are two interrelated strands – “the transformation of education and the educational governance, and the reshaped academic landscape, including changed demands on educational research” – (Lundahl 2012, 216) which have overwhelming consequences. Lundahl explores these consequences in a global context in
relation to neoliberal practices. He states that assumptions about “valid knowledge” and “valid research” along with disputes over educational theory are gaining traction and attention. He states that this current state of instability will require re-thinking and a reformulation of educational theory and conversations.

It has become routine to recognize knowledge as essential, if not one of the most important factors in the means of production and the development of new commodities. According to Kauppinen, “commodification has been and still is one of the key processes within capitalist market economies. Since the 1970’s, different forms of knowledge have increasingly been subjected to this process” (Kauppinen 2014, 393). This new phase of globalization or era of knowledge capitalism can be defined as the emergence of a new form of capitalism, one whereby the dependence is now on knowledge, rather than material resources. This emerging form of capitalism has reshaped the academic landscape, and in the process normalized the commercialization and corporatization of education. According to Lundahl (2012), the commodification of knowledge and higher education have occurred, in part, through the transformation of education, thereby producing educational growth and competition. The production of competition in education argued Lundahl is what Peters conveys as education wars: “In the age of knowledge capitalism the next great struggle after the ‘culture wars’ of the 1990s will be the ‘education wars’, a struggle not only over the meaning and value of knowledge both internationally and local, but also over the means of knowledge production” (Peters 2003, 165).

Lundahl (2012) argues, “There is little doubt that the academic landscape has changed towards performativity, market ideas and global competition…the strengthened links between money, markets and universities have three distinct and related elements: the determination of
the knowledge produced, the work and organization of academics and the control and exploitation of knowledge products” (220). The assumption that education should participate in the growth of the economy and encourage prosperity is not a new expectation.

However, there is a debate about whether knowledge is a commodity like any other. Michael Burawoy has argued that knowledge properly should be added to Polanyi’s list of fictitious commodities. Karl Polanyi, an Austro-Hungarian political economist, argued that markets are embedded in society. Central to Polanyi’s theory was the idea that prior to the introduction of capitalism, production and distribution were embedded in social institutions and processes. The “marketness” of the economy was subject to social limitations. These limitations included social traditions, and non-market principles of redistribution, reciprocity, and gift giving (Polanyi 1944). Polanyi argues that the rise of capitalism was dependant on the transformation of the relationship between the economy and society – magnifying the role of the market in society and removing these social traditions and non-market influences on distribution. Polanyi (1944) argues the following: “for once the economic system is organized in separate institutions, based on specific motives and conferring a special status, society must be shaped in such a manner as to allow that system to function according to its own laws. This is the meaning of the familiar assertion that a market economy can function only in a market society” (57). Polanyi goes on to identify a market economy as, “an economic system controlled, regulated, and directed by markets alone; order in the production and distribution of goods is entrusted to this self-regulating mechanism” (Polanyi 1944, 68). This type of economy is dependent upon an expectation that citizens will act in ways to achieve maximum profit. Several assumptions are made based on this form of economy and include the following: 1) goods sell at prices that equal
the demand price; 2) the presence of money required for purchasing power, and 3) therefore result in production that will be controlled by prices.

According to Polanyi, “the control of the economic system by the market is of overwhelming consequence to the whole organization of society: it means no less than the running of society as an adjunct to the market” (Polanyi 1944, 57). This resulted in a reversal of relationships. Where previously the economy was rooted in social relationships, now social relationships were to be grounded in a market economy. The result of this ultimately was the economic and political chaos of the First World War, depression of the 1930s, the rise of Fascism and National Socialism, and World War II.

Polanyi (1944) argues that the creation of markets for land or nature, labour and money (capital) was central to the rise of capitalism. Markets value things by assigning a price to them, by making them commodities. Polanyi defines commodities as “objects produced for sale on the market” and markets are, “actual contacts between buyers and sellers” (Polanyi 1944, 72). However, given the character of nature, humans, and money, Polanyi (1944) termed these fictitious commodities; a fiction required for the emergence of capitalism. Polanyi suggests that because land, labour and money are essential they must be organized in particular ways to introduce them into the markets, which are a fundamental part of the economic system. (Polanyi, 1944). Polanyi argues that these particular commodities, according to the empirical definition, are in fact not commodities at all. Labour is human activity. Land is nature. Money is a means of purchasing power. None of these are intended to be bought and sold. That is not why they exist. They each have characteristics that have nothing to do with their treatment as commodities. Therefore, “the commodity description of labour, land and money is entirely fictitious” (Polanyi 1944, 73).
In the words of Bob Jessop (2007, 4);

“a fictitious commodity has the form of a commodity (can be bought and sold) but is not actually produced in order to be sold. It already exists as a use-value before it acquires the form of an exchange-value…a fictitious commodity is not created in a profit-oriented labour process subject to the competitive pressures of market forces to rationalize its production and reduce the turnover time of invested capital”.

Polanyi (1944) warns that allowing the market mechanism to be the principal manager of humanity and the natural environment, while at the same time using money as a commodity rather than an instrument to facilitate exchange, will result in the destruction and erosion of society.

So how does the above relate to higher education? Michael Burawoy argues there is a fourth element that can be added to Polanyi’s theory of fictitious commodities – knowledge. Burawoy notes that we are living a world of neoliberalism and, pace Polanyi, that if you push markets too far, they undermine society. However, society (or elements of society) react in ways that are not predictable or necessarily progressive (Burawoy 2014). The unregulated commodification of land, labour, money, and now knowledge, destroys their ‘true’ or ‘essential’ character. For Burawoy knowledge is a fictitious commodity because it is “a factor of production that is not only an essential ingredient of the modern economy but crucial to the production of the other three factors” (Burawoy 2014, 19). Just as humans do not come into existence to be sold on the market, knowledge is not created to be sold. However, once that is perceived to be the primary raison d’etre of either people or knowledge their treatment undermines their long-term viability. As the production and dissemination of knowledge is produced primarily for those who can purchase it for use in commodity production, or as a commodity itself, universities, as a major venue for such production, are increasingly concerned with the private concerns of the
buyers, rather than broader public interests. Burawoy emphasizes universities are “increasingly oriented to private rather than public interests, particular rather than general interests, immediate rather than future interests – a distortion that makes knowledge a fictitious commodity” (Burawoy 2014, 19). According to Burawoy, this is evident “in the privatization of universities, for example, dispossession involves turning knowledge from a public good into a sellable asset. It has entailed the corporatization of the university, dependent on ever-greater student fees for credentials of ever less value” (Burawoy 2014, 20).

Palumbo, also feels that “knowledge is, in the context of the information age, the most likely candidate to be turned into another (the fourth) fictitious commodity (Palumbo 2020, 2). Palumbo argues that knowledge has been a target of the New Public Management (NPM) initiative over the past four decades. The notion that knowledge requires managing and that intellectual properties are being targeted as commodities places knowledge itself at risk. He asserts that, “corporations are interested in associating themselves with prestigious universities and research centres because that allows them to reduce their in-house R&D (Research and Development) activities while maximizing the returns on those commercial ventures” (Palumbo 2020, 15). This provides an opportunity for governments to potentially cut public budgets, promote economic growth and exploit a system whereby the undermining of peer-review practices results in the self-governing of their own scientific communities. This has significant social impacts. By removing the importance of review measures put in place to prevent this sort of behaviour, the commercialization of knowledge and ideas deemed relevant to a select group of corporations is enabled to control knowledge generation.

Jessop (2018) also explores the transformative influences of neoliberalism and the knowledge economy on higher education and research. For him, this has involved unpacking
“the production, valorization and application of knowledge as a key driver of the economic efficiency, competitiveness, profitability or effectiveness of the private, public and economic sectors, of good governance and of an enhanced quality of life” (Jessop 2018, 855). He is particularly concerned with how forms of knowledge become viewed as significant inputs to accumulation through private intellectual property rights such as patents (Jessop, 2018).

Jessop argues that there are three major reasons for the development of what he labels “academic capitalism.” The first is an appeal to education and research to satisfy the human capital requirements of a changing labour market and economy, offer infrastructure and service to businesses, and transfer knowledge in ways that actively contributes to the accumulation of capital. As part of this, the development of enterprising conveyors of intellectual capital from students, faculty and researchers is an expectation. The second, financialization enabled by neoliberal economic and social policies and practices increasingly influences education and research. The third, the demand for public spending cuts increases the discrepancy in competitiveness between universities that conduct research globally, and thus have an international presence and reputation, and other universities or colleges that offer credentialization and lifetime learning at the local level.

Jessop argues that the rise in academic capitalism unfolds in five distinct stages. Stage one regards the commercialization of education and research as products for sale. Examples of this would be reliance on private tuition, distance/online learning, fee-paying universities, and commercial research. Students are actively pursued, deemed future customers for capital. Stage two is the first step in what Jessop calls capitalization as the capitalist market economy advances in higher education and research. Stage three is a more profound step towards capitalization the involves “the quasi-commodification of mental labour as an input, including the separation of
intellectual labor from the means of intellectual production” (Jessop 2018, 105). This includes intellectual property rights involving the appropriation and privatization of knowledge and the commodification of teaching materials (the textbook industry). Jessop calls stage four financialization. The fifth and final stage is achieved when “a finance-dominated system subordinates’ education and research to the profitability requirements of ‘capital as property’” (Jessop 2018, 106). These are achieved through securing investments such as student loans or other revenue streams like student fees, rent, leisure facilities, etc. These stages produce the full privatization of universities and research institutions and integrate them into a financialized global market economy: “…profitability and shareholder value would then override all other goals” (Jessop 2018, 106). Although this has not fully taken place (as of yet) it is not unreasonable to assume that the process is well on its way.

Jessop suggests the connection to financial and economic goals is directly related to entrepreneurialism. Entrepreneurialism’s many forms contribute to the increase of college and university revenues, reputations, and financial stability. Jessop describes academic capitalism involving the following entrepreneurial stages:

1. The development of new products like preparatory courses, enhanced program offerings, professional and corporate training.

2. New methods of exploiting knowledge through evolving teaching and research practices and cost cutting and improvements on efficiency through standardization of practices of learning and creating new methods of product delivery. The online platform has opened opportunities (good or bad) to deliver lectures to more students at one time (synchronous or not), with one professor. This maximizes the investment and provides cost savings.
3. Generating new markets for their products. Opening satellite campuses and growing the customer/student base to sell their products. Niagara College’s satellite campuses in Riyadh Saudi Arabia, or McMaster University’s DeGroote School of Business located in Burlington, are concrete examples of the shift in marketing goods and services for higher education to which Jessop is referring.

4. In order to increase competitiveness in higher education, a combination of lowering tuition, offering new funding options, partnering with the private sector, creating international agreements whilst gathering a healthy supply of talent in the student and teacher pool.

5. The formation of new organizations in the education industry and research through global differentiation of such sectors develops new paths of knowledge as hierarchies of existing sectors are being challenged (Jessop 2018, 107).

According to Morley, Marginson and Blackmore (2014, 247), neoliberalism “is a process with incremental reforms constantly evolving and adapting.” Neoliberalism has transformed social relations into calculabilities and exchanges void of problematization which has led to cultural acceptance. Morley, Marginson and Blackmore argue, “the dominant feature of the neoliberal market-led provision of education is the blurring and blending of boundaries between the public and private sphere” (2014, 458). This has been achieved by an emphasis on education needing to be led by market forces. Private interests thereby supersede public good.

Baltodano (2012, 487) argues, “in this era of corporate schooling, colleges of education are competing with online and for-profit colleges to increase student enrollment. Academic capitalism has entered the classroom and it has redefined the academic premises upon which the
entire higher education system was instituted.” Recognizing the importance of this is critical for public education institutions to reclaim education as a public good. The shaping of education by corporate and economic interests is presenting a gradual deterioration of the intent of education as a public good.

The shift in the climate of education and current practices that are now well under way, follow a neoliberal framework which are slowly eroding the educational institution, the production of knowledge and freedoms. Baltodano insists, “neoliberalism has taken away the joy of learning, the creativity of teaching, and the formation of strong public intellectuals. Public education is slowly fading and is being replaced by new privatized forms of schooling” (Baltodano 2012, 489). As neoliberal ideologies take hold and heavily influence the development of knowledge while monopolizing educational institutions, a noticeable reflection of actions is underway to reform the system. The quality of our institutions is diminishing, affecting individual educational experiences, and in essence endangering its existence. Defunding and privatization of educational institutions may have serious negative implications for the future of democracy and society as a whole. Quoting Hursh, Baltodano, notes that “gradually the goal of public education was changed from forming critical citizens for a healthy democracy to focusing on their development of functional skills to become economically productive” (Hursh 2005, 5).

To do this shift in goals, ideas and messaging were commissioned to discredit the public education system. This had to be delivered to sway public attitudes and have the public buy into the notion that injecting private-sector, market-oriented or market-mimicking policies and practices was a good thing. A new fear needed to be instilled in society that if schools were not fixed (as if they were broken) there would be a loss of economic, accountability and the freedom to choose one’s institution. The neoliberal take-over of higher education has constructed
partnerships between corporations and universities to enhance the growing reliance on individuals rather than the collective to finance university operations. This can be observed through increasing tuition fees for domestic students and unregulated, substantially higher, tuition fees for international students. The way in which institutions operate has changed. Adopting values and practices employed by the private sector, creating a shift whereby institutions are becoming lucrative knowledge businesses. These factors are changing the needs and interests of students, faculty, administrations, and the institutions in Canadian higher education. Changes witnessed and experienced in higher education respond to the implementation of what Torres and Schugurensky describe as ‘institutional capitalism’ a term developed by Michael Useem (1984). According to Torres and Schugurensky, institutional capitalism “seeks to intensify the alliances between corporations and cultural institutions” (2002, 435). The neoliberal goal is to dismantle current expectations and practices of *public* higher education institutions in Canada. Higher education institutions in Canada are increasingly expected to behave like private, for-profit institutions, which are already well established in countries like the United States. Higher education is no longer about learning rather, it is now all about economic interests, namely profitability.

In light of the preceding discussion, the idea that the steep increase in international enrolments is simply a sign of growing internationalization is simplistic at best. There is certainly movement of people, ideas, and goods across national boundaries as part of a globalized academic or intellectual capitalism. However, there is reason to doubt that this merely reflects an increased sense of international cooperation and openness to other cultures. Indeed, in the last few years rising tensions between the West and China, resistance in Western Europe and the United States to immigration, or at least immigration from certain areas of the world, and
ongoing concerns about security, suggest that the world is not necessarily becoming one large, happy, global family. So, how else might one interpret the growth of international enrolments in Canada and certain other nations?

**International Student Enrolments as a New Twist on Colonialism**

According to Sabzalieva, the ongoing intensification of internationalization “has become taken for granted, now woven into the everyday fabric of the higher education landscape” (Sabzalieva 2020, i). She argues that “in the context of rising nationalism, populism, and backlash to global interconnectedness, some suggest that this was Canada’s global moment” (Sabzalieva 2020, i). Canada has had an opportunity to maximize on international student interest and enrolment as global conflicts, student safety, racism, employment opportunities and immigration were a factor in altering students’ country of choice in which to study. As a result of these factors, an increase in international student enrolment in Canadian higher education institutions can be witnessed along with providing benefits to the country in terms of immigration, the labour market, income, and the subsidization of post-secondary institutions in Canada.

Canadian institutions of higher education are profoundly involved in internationalization as a result of a substantial increase in international student enrolment on Canadian campuses and the implementation of branch campuses abroad, such as Niagara College’s Taif Campus in Saudi Arabia. At one level, the growth in international enrolment must be understood as being driven by the desire within source countries for emigration to Canada, not a deep interest in education or some commitment to internationalization. The Canadian government and the post-secondary sector are taking advantage of this reality. The Express Entry program, the
ability to work, and pathways to permanent residency are how the Canadian government manages the flow of international students.

According to a report for Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC), Canada has become one of the top destinations for international students (El-Assal 2020). Canada’s status as a top destination is attributed to the growth of the global middle-class and an increased interest in international education in certain nations, as well as the potential for future employment and immigration opportunities. International students are seeking more than simply an education overseas.

International students begin their journey with a student visa enabling them to study in Canada. Often, the school of choice is not of significance, “the specific school does not matter” (Hune-Brown, 2021, 21). The specific school is simply part of the process of attaining permanent residency. A key element of the strategy is for these students to attain a post graduate work permit. In essence, they “buy” themselves three years to work and live in the Canada in the hope that their sojourn will be followed by attaining permanent residency. On the surface, this process does not appear to be exploitative. However, it is important to identify the ways in which the entire process unfolds. Sabzalieva (2020, v) notes that the financial gains of internationalization for host countries can be witnessed in policy discourse globally but adds, “less visible are the storylines of risk (one hand, protecting international students from fraud and on the other, protecting Canada from those seeking to gain illegal access through international student routes) and gateways (in which international education opens access to the world and to the exchange of knowledge and global citizenship ).”

International student enrolment is now a significant industry with vested interests at both ends of the supply chain that delivers the commodity – students – to the market –
competing post-secondary institutions. Recruitment agents in countries from which students originate and the international enrolment bureaucracy in Canadian post-secondary institutions are both promoting international student enrolment. These efforts have driven activity in the international education industry to record highs. Hune-Brown (2021) asserts that “Canadian education is selling like hotcakes. You don’t even need to sell it – people come to buy it” (21). The CIC report mentioned earlier says Canada is the third most popular destination globally, trailing the United States and Australia (El-Assal 2020).

The increases in enrolment numbers are a result of a combination of proactive sales and recruitment, alongside government policies that enable the industry to flourish. Hune-Brown notes “salespeople aren’t difficult to track down in India. You could find an agent shop on every corner, on every street, on every road” (Hune-Brown 2021, 22). It is mainly an unregulated business available to anyone and as of recent regarded by some as a “dirty business.” The recruitment of international students has become its own business spawning the development of “recruitment agents”. Many Canadian colleges and universities are increasingly engaging these recruitment education agents to assist them in a highly competitive market. An example of active institution Marketing and Recruitment from Niagara College was exposed in their 2016-2017 annual report which stated, “To respond to the domestic market situation and to remain competitive, Niagara College continues to develop and execute creative marketing and recruitment strategies” (Niagara College Annual Report 2016-17). McMaster’s 2020/21 annual report notes “growth from international enrolment and other sources is a key focus...” (McMaster University Annual Report 2020/21).

According to a CBC report by Donavan (2019) many higher education institutions are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars annually in agent commissions. The report also
highlights a feeling that Canadian institutions are “keeping secrets” by not releasing information regarding recruiters, how they are paid and the commissions they receive in Canada for fear of “jeopardizing the financial or economic interests” of the institutions. This perceived secrecy, however, is not a global approach. Countries like Australia which are noted in the same report are highlighted, stating the educational institutions who use agents by law must disclose them. In Canada, Donavan (2019) stated “it’s a cost university struggling with declining domestic enrolment and decreased government funding are willing to pay, as international students have become integral to their financial stability” (para. 17).

In addition to the business and career interests of those involved in international student recruitment, there is a relationship between the growth of international student enrolments and plans for the Canadian labour market. Viewed through this lens, international students are a desirable commodity -- human capital. This perspective is presented in a recent strategic document titled “Building on Success: International Education Strategy 2019-2024” produced by Global Affairs Canada (2019). It states, “as more countries recognize that international students represent an important source of revenue and human capital, and as greater numbers of people worldwide can afford to study abroad, the sector has become increasingly competitive” (Global Affairs Canada 2019, 3). Moreover, “international education can help Canada meet current and emerging labour-market challenges” (Global Affairs Canada 2019, 5). The plan is to fast track applications for study permits: “the strategy will expand the Student Direct Stream to additional markets. The Student Direct Stream endeavours to offer faster processing of study permit applications to prospective international students from certain countries who plan to study in Canada at the post-secondary level” (Global Affairs Canada 2019, 10).
The Canadian state actively promotes Canada’s educational sector as part of its immigration strategy as evidenced by the launch of EduCanada in 2016, a “collaborative promotional initiative involving the provinces and territories through Global Affairs Canada and the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada” (Global Affairs Canada 2019, 8). “The EduCanada brand represents the high quality of Canada’s education sector and contributes to increased numbers of international students across the country” (Global Affairs Canada 2019, 8). The Canadian Trade Commissioner Service (TCS) that is part of Global Affairs Canada has been assisting industries and organizations achieve success in the world marketplace through initiatives to increase student direct stream to additional countries with funding of approximately $1 million over 5 years and $100,000 ongoing.

Many of the government initiatives are a response to Canada’s aging population and fear of future labour force shortages. A supply of international students who are, or will be, English-speaking, knowledgeable, trained, qualified and skilled is one way to address this issue. In 2018, 53,700 international students became permanent residents in Canada (Global Affairs Canada 2019, 5).

Zajda, and Rust (2020) identify four types of reforms that are linked to the market forces associated with human capital: (1) competitiveness-driven reforms; (2) financial-driven reforms; (3) market-driven reforms; and lastly (4) equity-driven reforms. They, and others, maintain that the growth of the internationalization of higher education is a direct result of the first three reforms. Further to this, the implementation of an easier process for international students to access Canadian higher education institutions is said to assist in the amplification of economic benefits for local communities, provinces, and Canada as a whole. The beneficiaries of the growth of international student enrolment in post-secondary institutions is
said to be Canadian institutions, local communities, and businesses. These include both economic rewards in the form of fees, tuition, rents paid by international students, as well as purchases of food and other necessities of life, and labour force perquisites comprising increased numbers of highly trained personnel.

Student well-being is not included in the reforms said to be driving increased enrolments. Hune-Brown (2021) reports that some higher education institutions are beginning to recognize international student issues and concerns. However, the way the system is set up ignores pressures international students face. Colleges and universities are not equipped to manage an “immigration settlement program” for youth. “They’d rather think of themselves as institutions of higher learning, not convenient waystations for young people in search of better lives…Purposeful denial. They don’t want to be responsible” (Hune-Brown, 2021: 29).

As a result of government “funding shortfalls” the well-being of international students is not a priority for institutions. They are, however, a critical asset for income security, exploited to preserve institutional bottom lines. Hence the common reference to international students as “cash cows” who pump millions of dollars into the Canadian higher education system. In a 2017 CBC news interview with Nour Alideeb, the chairperson of the Canadian Federation of Students – Ontario, said “there is a direct correlation between reduced provincial government funding to universities and sharply increased tuition fees to foreign students” (Crawley 2017, 2).

International students are viewed as valuable sources of revenue for both higher education institutions and the communities in which they reside.

Indeed, institutions of higher education have become reliant on the lucrative tuition fees paid by international students. Tuition fee income has grown at Canadian universities and colleges from $8 billion to $16 billion since 2007-08, a period that witnessed domestic tuition
fee income rise by 35%, while international fees increased by 350% (Usher 2020, 33). Usher suggests international students are “a prime source of money for Canadian colleges and universities. From 2007-08 to 2018-19, international fees grew from $1.5 billion to $6.9 billion” (Usher 2020, 9). This reliance can be primarily attributed to modifications to institutional practices and a reduction in government financial support. “In Quebec and Atlantic Canada, international students make up roughly 20% of enrolments, while in Ontario west to British Columbia, the proportion is less than 15%. At the college level, international students make up over 27% of enrolments, while in Quebec they represent only about 3%” (Usher 2020, 9).

Cox (2018) argues that government reforms to post-secondary funding have transformed universities “from an academy for the advancement of thought and understanding to one focused on supporting private commercial interests” (Cox 2018, 5). Inadequate “public funding” for institutions contributes to the belief that institutions do not serve the public. The new funding framework and Strategic Mandate Agreements (SMA), therefore, allocate a significant amount of operational funds based on enrolment (Cox 2018).

SMAs are agreements between the government of Ontario and post-secondary educational institutions. These agreements include an element of “performance-based funding.” They are considered a “key component of the Ontario government’s acceptability framework for the postsecondary education system” (Niagara College 2020-2025 Strategic Mandate Agreement, 3). The four charts below are excerpted from the most current SMAs for Niagara College and Brock University. These charts show that all the institutions are premising their future on significant increases in international enrolments over the next four years.
Table 3: Projected Funding-Eligible Enrolments – Niagara College

*Below is Niagara College’s projection of funding-eligible full-time headcount as of August 24, 2020.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020-21</th>
<th>2021-22</th>
<th>2022-23</th>
<th>2023-24</th>
<th>2024-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario College Certificate</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario College Diploma/Advanced Diploma</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>5,050</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario College Graduate Certificate</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Degree in Applied Area of Study</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,150</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,975</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,675</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This table reports on full-time headcounts from the Fall term.*

Source: 2020-2025 Strategic Mandate Agreement: Niagara College

Table 4: Projected Funding-Ineligible International Enrolments Niagara College

*Below is Niagara College’s projection of funding-ineligible international full-time headcount at college-operated campuses as of August 24, 2020.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020-21</th>
<th>2021-22</th>
<th>2022-23</th>
<th>2023-24</th>
<th>2024-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario College Certificate</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario College Diploma/Advanced Diploma</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario College Graduate Certificate</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Degree in Applied Area of Study</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,520</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,325</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This table reports on full-time headcounts from the Fall term.*

Source: 2020-2025 Strategic Mandate Agreement: Niagara College
Table 5: Projected Funding-Eligible Enrolments – Brock University

Below is Brock University's projection of funding-eligible enrolments as of March 31, 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credential</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
<th>2021-22</th>
<th>2022-23</th>
<th>2023-24</th>
<th>2024-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate FFTE</td>
<td>14,233</td>
<td>14,144</td>
<td>14,344</td>
<td>14,236</td>
<td>14,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's FFTE</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>1,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral FFTE</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FFTE</td>
<td>15,248</td>
<td>15,218</td>
<td>15,461</td>
<td>15,378</td>
<td>15,278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2020-2025 Strategic Mandate Agreement: Brock University

Table 6: Projected Funding-Ineligible International Enrolments – Brock University

Below is Brock University's projection of funding-ineligible international student enrolments as of March 31, 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credential</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
<th>2021-22</th>
<th>2022-23</th>
<th>2023-24</th>
<th>2024-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate FFTE</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>2,383</td>
<td>2,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's FFTE</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral FFTE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FFTE</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>2,831</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>3,143</td>
<td>3,297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2020-2025 Strategic Mandate Agreement: Brock University

According to a 2020 report by Higher Education Strategy Associates (HESA), since 2012-13 tuition paid by international students has covered more than 100% of the growth in university operating budgets. The 2020 HESA report highlights that international student enrolment has more than tripled since the beginning of 2008. International tuition fees have increased astronomically, highlighting the role of international students as a crucial source of
revenue for Canadian colleges and universities. According to a Statistics Canada report (2020), in Ontario, the average domestic tuition cost in 2008 was $5,667 increasing to $7,938 in 2020/21. However, these fees are significantly different for international students. In 2020/21, Statistics Canada reports the average undergraduate tuition fees for international students in Ontario are $29,714 reflecting a disproportionate amount of tuition paid by domestic and international students in Ontario. These tuition inconsistencies can be witnessed across Canada and are in line with international student fees charged by other countries.

**Figure 5: Total Fee Income by Source, Public PSE Institutions, Canada, in Billions**

The use of international student enrolments as a means of subsidizing educational institutions that still cater mostly to domestic students in certain ways reflects a very longstanding practice whereby wealth is transferred from poor regions of the world to wealthy Western nations. Countries such as Canada are able to capitalize on a legacy of colonialism that dates to the
emergence of England as the dominant colonial power in the 18th century. This is part of the
history that led to English becoming the dominant global language of both science and business.
Neoliberal governments in the English-speaking Western nations that seek to promise their
populations access to postsecondary education, but refuse to fund it adequately using public
monies raised through taxation, rely on the extremely high fees charged to international students.

SECTION FOUR: CONCLUSIONS AND QUESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Ontario universities once received around 80 percent of their funding in the form of
grants from the provincial government. Over the last several decades government support has
dropped dramatically to approximately 40 percent of operating revenue (Paikin 2019). The
significant reduction in public funding is a breeding ground for a rise in corporatization,
privatizing elements of “public good” for short term requirements in the labour force, and the
internationalization of higher education institutions. When uncovering the reasoning for Ontario
government funding cuts and the neoliberal business model used to determine higher education
funding in Ontario, one can observe the true catalyst behind the funding model changes (Cox
2018). Recent model changes in provincial government funding reduces support for higher
education in Ontario and aids in the development of a neoliberal system which prioritizes
corporate interests of for-profit business rather than benefitting the public good. These reforms
in funding policies in Ontario have shifted the focus towards the commercialization of
institutional research and de-valuation of specific higher education programs, such as the social
sciences and humanities. The promotion of private and commercial interests in higher education
as part of the new funding framework in Ontario impairs the ability of colleges and universities
to serve the public good (Cox 2018). Cox argues, “Ontario’s universities are important public
spaces that depend on robust public funding to thrive” (Cox 2018, 2). Scholars like Cox (2018) question how such changes in Ontario funding impact higher education mandates. A re-evaluation of institutional learning environments, curriculum, and outcomes have encouraged institutional change. These changes have created the conditions for a commercialization of higher education and a transformation of how students are viewed by the government and educational institutions. For governments seeking to advance a neoliberal agenda, students are perceived as customers shopping for educational products that they can use in their presentation of themselves as carriers of human capital on the labour market, rather than learners in search of knowledge that will enable them to live fulfilled lives as participants in a democratic society. For the educational institutions that are increasingly reliant on tuition and other fees paid by students, they become a source of revenue. University programs and other activities are valued for their revenue generating potential, rather than their contribution to the advancement of knowledge and other public goals. This commoditization of both people and knowledge.

In the province of Ontario, the current Government, led by the Conservative Party under the leadership of Doug Ford, has made numerous funding cuts, slashing higher education funding in 2019 by $450 million. According to Syed (2019), reductions in support for higher education include: dropping financial assistance for college and university students more than $300 million, eliminating free tuition for low-income students, lowering tuition fees by 10% (which amounts to a significant budget reduction for institutions), and eliminating the Ontario Colleges of Trades, among other things. The government is also moving to performance-based funding for a percentage of their grant to colleges and universities.

While education is a provincial responsibility in Canada, the federal government does contribute to the post-secondary sector through its three research councils (SSHRC, NSERC,
CIHR) and financial transfers to the provinces. However, direct federal support has also declined since the 1990s.

**Figure 6: The Federal Government PSE Cash Transfer Per Student**

The Federal Government PSE Cash Transfer Per Student (adjusted for inflation)

Source: CUPE 491

Implementation of Ontario’s new funding model has been delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the funding reduction has forced colleges and universities to continue and intensify the search for new revenue sources. Once again, these institutions are relying on international students to offset the loss of adequate government funding (IRCC, 2020; Paikin, 2019; Syed, 2019). This government funding disruption and concern with the reduction of public funding support since 2009 is highlighted by numerous scholars who suggest market forces have influenced the actions of educational institutions.
An example of this is the role of rankings in the competitive market for international students. Zajda and Rust (2020, 6) argue that “institutional rankings indicate the governance of a neo-liberal ideology of accountability, competition, and cost-efficiency.” According to Robertson (2012) the original purpose of higher education rankings has been distorted. Originally intended to attract students, they are now taking on “a life of their own”. Altbach and Hazelkorn (2018, 13) assert that methods used by different institutions and countries to assess teaching quality or to measure student learning are considered a “highly unreliable indicator of educational quality” based on the differences in methods employed to produce institutional standings in local and global rankings. Altbach and Hazelkorn (2018) conclude that rankings do not provide a consequential measure of education superiority, rather, they are simply used for commercial convenience.

Although the literature examined captures a perspective from 2000 – 2020, there is a plethora of relevant theoretical perspectives and arguments made prior to this period that support current arguments made. Several scholars present thought-provoking projections or pose critical questions asking, “where do we go from here” – debating what might higher education look like post pandemic? Is higher education in transition? What is taking place? Perhaps a new era of higher education reform will produce positive results. In fact, one outcome of discussions held at the Shaping Sustainable Futures for Internationalization in Higher Education (SSFIHE) conference in Toronto, noted by Sabzalieva, was “the need to deepen our understanding of the implications of present internationalization practices for the future.” (Sabzalieva, 2020, ii).

In conclusion, a combination of several factors discussed in this paper have highlighted the fundamental importance of higher education and how neoliberal government policies and
practices have ignored the true purpose of higher education institutions as campuses for advanced learning and the production of knowledge. Policies introduced at the government, institutional and sector level have changed the priorities and the learning landscape in Canadian higher education institutions. Institutions embracing commercial enterprise spawning new ideas of form and function related to academic programs raised challenges by many scholars, students, and faculty who question benefits of higher education institutions, what they offer students and society as a whole.

Globalization and the development of internationalization along with upward trends of marketization and privatization of higher education continue to change the learning landscape. A narrowing of skill sets taught to meet new social and provincial demands in the workforce have reshaped the learning environment. The increase in the commodification of students, presents valid reasons to pause and rethink long-term outcomes related to the consequences of neoliberalism and the business of higher education. Sky-rocketing tuition fees, and commercialization, have shifted higher education institutions from an environment of learning and knowledge production to supporting primarily commercial interests in a market driven, privatized world. New funding frameworks and metrics introduced by the government have altered the organization and delivery of higher education as a public good. The marketization of institutions has diluted the quality of higher education and the way in which institutions operate.

Education, and by association knowledge, is viewed as a business, aimed at private investment and self-regulation to control societal views, participation, conformity, and labour. Elements of privatization, corporatization, and the internationalization of higher education institutions have created conditions for reduced public funding and dangerous corporate
influence. The new approach of these institutions as businesses has left many dependent upon international student tuition to offset shortfalls in revenue. This has created a focus on international students as commodities and financial numbers rather than students as learners. With this shift, scholars are increasingly concerned with the integrity and public good of higher education.

This major research paper has provided a critical review of a growing body of literature exploring trends in international enrolment in Canada, and Ontario. My research was limited to the use of publicly accessible documents and existing literature which can be viewed as potential limitations for this review. Therefore, some of the future research questions I pose and suggestions for future areas of study should take this into consideration.

With the collapse of Laurentian University in 2021, and actively cutting “more than 60 programs and over 100 faculty and staff jobs” (Wurtele 2021, 1), it is difficult not to make connections to the significance of enrolment numbers and tuition income. The university’s collapse may be attributed to and seen by some, as a failure to attract enough international students. In a 2021, CBC News report, (Schwabe 2021) a consultant specialist stated, “Laurentian University dropped the ball when it came to attracting international students” Although Laurentian does recruit international students, it is nowhere near the Ontario average. Suggestions made by CBC in the same news report, that in 2018-19, the university could have brought in an extra $7.5 million had they been more serious about international enrolment (Schwabe 2021). One might ask whether the Canadian government ought to create the conditions for a public institution to need to turn to exploiting international students as a means to survive?
Understanding institutions’ international enrolment interests, current motivations, and why they are occurring allow for further potential research on this topic. Did institutions live up to their “internationalization” plans and mandates that were created? What did institutional internationalization plans look like and were they successful – what does successful internationalization mean and for whom? Do student experiences align with institution promises and ideas of internationalization – why or why not? Further to these questions, what is the long-term sustainability of international student flow, enrolment, and institutional dependence … Will there be a fall out? What will it look like and when? Will the global industry that has been created in the pursuit of higher education last? Have institutions paused to reflect on the recent collapse of Laurentian University? What might this suggest the future may hold for others?
Appendix A

Canadian College International Student Enrolment Numbers 2010 – 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada (map)</td>
<td>34,653</td>
<td>38,220</td>
<td>42,510</td>
<td>54,723</td>
<td>58,125</td>
<td>60,318</td>
<td>76,698</td>
<td>100,140</td>
<td>128,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland and Labrador (map)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island (map)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia (map)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick (map)</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec (map)</td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>3,096</td>
<td>3,306</td>
<td>4,593</td>
<td>5,514</td>
<td>4,812</td>
<td>5,412</td>
<td>5,682</td>
<td>8,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario (map)</td>
<td>21,270</td>
<td>24,927</td>
<td>27,339</td>
<td>37,503</td>
<td>37,605</td>
<td>37,308</td>
<td>48,183</td>
<td>68,037</td>
<td>86,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba (map)</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>1,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan (map)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta (map)</td>
<td>3,228</td>
<td>2,949</td>
<td>3,477</td>
<td>3,381</td>
<td>3,945</td>
<td>4,635</td>
<td>5,241</td>
<td>5,067</td>
<td>6,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia (map)</td>
<td>6,282</td>
<td>6,255</td>
<td>6,912</td>
<td>7,608</td>
<td>9,015</td>
<td>10,824</td>
<td>14,514</td>
<td>17,409</td>
<td>21,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territories (map)</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada. Table 37-10-0018-01 Postsecondary enrolments, by registration status, institution type, status of student in Canada and gender
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Appendix B

Canadian University International Student Enrolment Numbers 2010 – 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Total, field of study</th>
<th>International students</th>
<th>Total, International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED)</th>
<th>Total, gender</th>
<th>Total, registration status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>107,514</td>
<td>119,889</td>
<td>131,739</td>
<td>144,351</td>
<td>159,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland and Labrador</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>1,821</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>2,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>5,043</td>
<td>5,829</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>6,942</td>
<td>7,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>3,243</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>3,291</td>
<td>3,423</td>
<td>3,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>26,529</td>
<td>28,353</td>
<td>30,969</td>
<td>33,090</td>
<td>36,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario12 (map)</td>
<td>34,791</td>
<td>38,787</td>
<td>43,371</td>
<td>48,453</td>
<td>54,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,456</td>
<td>3,990</td>
<td>4,698</td>
<td>5,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan13 (map)</td>
<td>2,844</td>
<td>3,303</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>4,137</td>
<td>4,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta14, 15, 16 (map)</td>
<td>8,982</td>
<td>10,101</td>
<td>10,896</td>
<td>11,694</td>
<td>12,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia12 (map)</td>
<td>21,300</td>
<td>24,654</td>
<td>26,643</td>
<td>29,484</td>
<td>32,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territories (map)</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics Canada. Table 37-10-0018-01 Postsecondary enrolments, by registration status, institution type, status of student in Canada and gender
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Table 3: Policy and Programs at All Three Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Education and other national-level policies relating to international dimension of higher education; other policy sectors include cultural, scientific, immigration, trade, employment, and culture</td>
<td>National or subregional programs that promote or facilitate the international dimension of postsecondary education; can be provided by different government departments or nongovernment organizations; examples of programs include academic mobility programs, international research initiatives, and student recruitment programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Policies related to the purpose, functions, funding, and regulation of postsecondary education</td>
<td>Programs offered by and for the education sector specifically; can be provided by any level of government or by public or private organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Policies that address specific aspects of internationalization and/or policies that serve to integrate and sustain the international dimension into the primary mission and functions of the institution</td>
<td>Programs such as those identified in the section labeled Academic Programs in Table 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Knight 2004, 17)

Table 4: Approaches to Internationalization at the National or Sector Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>Internationalization of higher education is seen in terms of providing funded programs that facilitate institutions and individuals to have opportunities to engage in international activities such as mobility, research, and linkages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationales</td>
<td>Internationalization of higher education is presented in terms of why it is important that a national higher education sector become more international. Rationales vary enormously and can handle human resources development, strategic alliances, commercial trade, nation building, and social/cultural development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc</td>
<td>Internationalization of higher education is treated as an ad hoc or reactive response to the many new opportunities that are being presented for international delivery, mobility, and cooperation in postsecondary education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Internationalization of higher education is described in terms of policies that address or emphasize the importance of the international or intercultural dimension in postsecondary education. Policies can be from a variety of sectors, for example, education, foreign affairs, science and technology, culture, or trade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Internationalization of higher education is considered to be a key element of a national strategy to achieve a country’s goals and priorities both domestically and internationally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Knight 2004, 19)
Table 5: Approaches at the Institutional Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach at Institutional Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Internationalization is described in terms of activities such as study abroad, curriculum and academic programs, institutional linkages and networks, development projects, and branch campuses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Internationalization is presented in the form of desired outcomes such as student competencies, increased profile, more international agreements, and partners or projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationales</td>
<td>Internationalization is described with respect to the primary motivations or rationales driving it. This can include academic standards, income generation, cultural diversity, and student and staff development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Internationalization is considered to be a process where an international dimension is integrated into teaching, learning, and service functions of the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home</td>
<td>Internationalization is interpreted to be the creation of a culture or climate on campus that promotes and supports international/ intercultural understanding and focuses on campus-based activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abroad (cross-border)</td>
<td>Internationalization is seen as the cross-border delivery of education to other countries through a variety of delivery modes (face to face, distance, e-learning) and through different administrative arrangements (franchises, twinning, branch campuses, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Knight 2004, 20)
Appendix D

College and University Annual Report Statistics Sources:
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