International higher education student flows

Better understanding the global picture

AIEC | October 2019
We would like to thank our funders and data collaborators for supporting the project

Australian Government
Department of Education and Training

This project has been facilitated by the Australian Government through the Department of Education and Training.

The Enabling Growth and Innovation grant supports the National Strategy for International Education 2025, through $3 million year to deliver big picture projects that develop Australia’s role as a global leader in education, training and research.

The following global agencies have provided us support to date:

• Department of Education, Australia
• Statistics Canada
• Higher Education Authority, Ireland
• Higher Education Statistics Agency, UK
• German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies
• Council on Higher Education, South Africa
• Campus France
The project is being delivered through a collaboration between Navitas, Nous Group and Austrade

Navitas is a world leader in developing and providing educational services and learning solutions with locations throughout Australia, North America, Europe, Africa and Asia.

Nous Group is an award-winning management consulting firm with over 350 people across eight locations in Australia and the UK. Nous is an expert in higher education and international education.

Austrade is the Australian Government’s trade, investment and education promotion agency. It supports Australian education providers market intelligence, in-market support and thought and policy leadership.
The project builds on existing work and research in this area.

Key existing resources that we have built upon include:

**UNESCO**
Which collects and reports global flows of international students between countries.

**PROJECT ATLAS**
A global research initiative that collects and disseminates comparable student mobility data for participating countries.
QUESTION 1

There were around 5.2 million international students globally in 2016 – what proportion came from China?

A. 10%  
B. 20%  
C. 30%
Key source country to key destination country flows make up a large share of all identified global student mobility.

Global flows from China to other countries make up twenty percent of all student mobility and five of the top six global student flows. Asian enrolments to the top three make up almost a third of all flows.

Source: Nous global student flow integrated dataset Layer 1, based on modelled UNESCO student mobility data.
What were the objectives for this project?

Our Australian Government EGI grant project has three objectives:

1. To develop a tool to integrate significant international education data to understand country specific trends and reconcile/seek to explain any discrepancies across sources.

2. To understand macro trends in the global higher education market, painting a clear picture of student mobility in higher education.

3. To identify drivers of trends in key source country/destination country relationships.
Data availability and consistency has been a barrier for the project

The initial focus of the project was on engagement with global data agencies to access data, which provided a number of responses.

- **The data is available and can be purchased by anyone.**
- **The data is available and can we can support you with a tailored request.**
- **The data is available, but cannot be shared for privacy reasons.**
- **The data is not available or not collected in that format.**

This has made bottom up matching as was initially planned by the project not possible.
Consistency of student or enrolment data also varied significantly across key destination countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What we were trying to improve...</th>
<th>GRANULARITY</th>
<th>CURRENCY</th>
<th>RESOLUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More detailed information on students than current to country flows.</td>
<td>Providing more recent data reducing the lag in understanding trends.</td>
<td>Clarification of discrepancies across key data sets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information on the variables listed are not consistency available for all (major) destination countries.</td>
<td>Up to date data is not possible. Not all key destination countries have internal access to information within 12 months.</td>
<td>Inconsistencies and discrepancies across data sets occur due to different definitions. These are being identified and recorded through the course of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inconsistent data means that we had to take a different approach to integration

**Layer 1**

**Macro student mobility flows in tertiary education**

**What is available?**
Information on source country and destination country over time (2004 to 2016)

**Data source**
UNESCO Global Student Mobility data

**Data type**
Tertiary Ed student numbers Various integrated sources

There were 112,300 Chinese students studying in Australian in 2016

**Layer 2**

**Publically available student numbers**

**What is available?**
Includes further information by level of study (PG or UG) OR field of study

**Data source**
Project Atlas country reported data

**Data type**
Higher Ed student numbers Various integrated sources

64,000 of these are studying Business (minor reported difference – 114,000)

52% are studying at UG level

**Layer 3**

**Country specific data sources**

**What is available?**
Macro student mobility flows in tertiary education

**Data source**
Country specific reported data sources, including: UK (HESA); Australia (MIP/HEIMS); US (Open Doors, publicly available); Ireland (HEA provided data); Germany (DAAD provided data); South Africa (HEIMS provided data)

**Data Type**
Visa reported data (some enrolment reported data has been used if required)

These students are highly concentrated at Go8 universities in Melbourne & Sydney.
Initial integration has addressed gaps that exist in UNESCO's reported global flows.

This represented a gap of around 12% based on non-reported data.

Source: UNESCO Tertiary student mobility. Note: China (as a destination country) reported figures were included in the UNESCO reported data, but information was not presented on the relevant source countries.
Differences also exist across the OECD and UNESCO data based on definitional differences.

**Figure C4.a. Long-term growth in foreign enrolment in tertiary education worldwide, 1975-2015**

- **Foreign students**: do not have citizenship of the country in which they studied (e.g. studying on working visa)
- **International students**: moved to another country for the purpose of study. (i.e. student visa)

For example UNESCO reports a total of 2.8 million international students in 2005, while OECD reports 3.0 million students in 2005.

Following initial analysis principles were used to inform selection of three ‘deep dive’ case studies

Four principles were utilised...

- RELEVANCE
- NOVEL
- TIMELY
- ANALYTICAL FOCUS

...to determine three case study topics.

1. Understanding the maturity of destination **countries** and the drivers for emerging destinations

2. Understanding global product preferences for **key source countries** and the impact on global mobility

3. Understanding the impact of **country-specific policy responses** on student mobility
Understanding the **maturity of destination countries** and the drivers for emerging destinations
The first case study focuses on emerging destination countries in the international education system

What we already know

There are a number of emerging destinations in the global international education system.

Some of these emerging destinations (such as China, Malaysia, Russia and Canada) are growing at a faster rate than most established destinations (US, UK and Australia).

What is the focus of the research

Identifying which destination countries are emerging

Understanding the drivers behind recent growth trends in key emerging countries

Determining the implications for Australia
QUESTION 3

What destination country has had the largest increase in market share?
The USA, UK and Australia are dominant destination countries, but new countries are emerging.

### Total number of international tertiary students studying in destination country, 2003 to 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<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>United States</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The UK and France have experienced declining share, while competitors such as Russia, Canada, China and Malaysia have increased theirs.

Source: Nous global student flow integrated dataset Layer 1, based on modelled UNESCO student mobility data.
While the sector typically considers major destination countries based on size, we adopted a novel three-dimension maturity assessment to classify countries. We ran a cluster analysis on three factors related to destination countries...

- **Volume** – how many students studied there in 2016
- **Growth** – increase in student numbers from 2011 to 2016
- **‘Pulling Power’** which accounts for the nature of where students come from

...to provide a more holistic view of different ‘clusters’ of destination countries globally.
'Pulling Power' provides an assessment of the destination country based on their student profile.

The international students that USA attracts ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>310K</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>136K</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>60K</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... are more diverse than the international students Russia attracts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>77K</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>22K</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>20K</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case study | China to USA
'Pulling Power' – 92 (High)

1. Geographic distance – 11,647 km
2. Cultural distance – (39%* across six dimensions)

This makes USA an 'high Pulling Power' destination country.

Case study | Ukraine to Russia
'Pulling Power' – 22 (Low)

1. Geographic distance – 4,666 km
2. Cultural distance – (9% across six dimensions)

This makes Russia a 'low Pulling Power' destination country.
The clusters analysis groups together the countries that are ‘most similar’

Destination country cluster analysis* based on volume, growth (3 year CAGR) and ‘pulling power’

Height (indicates how different or distinct two clusters are)
Six clusters of destination countries are identified, three of which we have classified as emerging.

### A. Major destination countries

1. **Established** destination countries
   - United States
   - United Kingdom
   - Australia

2. **Mature** destination countries
   - France
   - Japan

3. **‘Next wave’ emerging** destination countries
   - Canada
   - New Zealand

4. **‘Latent’ emerging** destination countries
   - Germany
   - Russia
   - China

### B. Fast growing destination countries

5. **‘Promising’ emerging** destination countries
   - Malaysia
   - Netherlands
   - Turkey
   - Saudi Arabia
   - UAE

### C. Junior destination countries

6. All other destination countries – which attract less students, have lower ‘pulling power’ and/or are experiencing lower growth.
Emerging destination countries are driven by different categories of source countries

- **Global top ten source countries**
- **‘Close’ source countries**
- **Other**

Major source countries include **Bangladesh** (34K) and **Nigeria** (15K) in 2016.

Growth is driven by students from **China** (+11K) and **India** (+4K).

The influx students are driven by ‘close’ source countries **Kazakhstan** (+21K), **Ukraine** (+10K) and **Uzbekistan** (+9K).

**Malaysia**  
‘Promising’ emerging destination country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100k</td>
<td>111k</td>
<td>124k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29k</td>
<td>35k</td>
<td>39k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32k</td>
<td>38k</td>
<td>42k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38k</td>
<td>39k</td>
<td>42k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canada**  
‘Next Wave’ emerging destination country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164k</td>
<td>172k</td>
<td>189k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88k</td>
<td>93k</td>
<td>105k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12k</td>
<td>12k</td>
<td>12k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64k</td>
<td>67k</td>
<td>72k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Russia**  
‘Latent’ emerging destination country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>213k</td>
<td>226k</td>
<td>244k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16k</td>
<td>20k</td>
<td>21k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153k</td>
<td>175k</td>
<td>193k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45k</td>
<td>32k</td>
<td>29k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Australia will increasingly be competing with both established and select emerging destination countries for share of students studying overseas

In the global market, emerging destination countries within the top ten have increased its share of all international students.

Global top ten destination countries’ share of international students (2011–2016)

Focusing on Australia’s top three source countries (China, India and Malaysia), emerging and established destination countries have increased similarly.

China, India and Malaysia’s top ten destination countries’ share of international students (2011–2016)
QUESTION 4

Between 2011 and 2016, in which market did Australia have the biggest decline in share of global students?

Access the survey by going to sli.do
Enter the ID - #AIEC
But, largely the big declines that Australia has experienced in recent years has been due to established rather than new emerging competitors.

### Net change in share of students from other destination country, Australia and other destination country groups, 2011 to 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>‘Next Wave’ emerging</th>
<th>‘Latent’ emerging</th>
<th>‘Promising’ emerging</th>
<th>Established (US and UK)</th>
<th>Mature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Indonesia</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
<td>+0.8%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>+5.4%</td>
<td>+0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Hong Kong</td>
<td>-10.1%</td>
<td>+0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>+0.2%</td>
<td>+7.9%</td>
<td>+0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Singapore</td>
<td>-10.9%</td>
<td>+0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>+0.1%</td>
<td>+7.3%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Bangladesh</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>+50.6%</td>
<td>-15.1%</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>-6.9%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>+0.7%</td>
<td>+0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend (1): Negative relative growth ▼ Positive relative growth ▲  
Legend (2): Negative ▼ Positive ▲  
Legend (3): Negative / Positive
Understanding global product preferences for **key source countries** and the impact on global mobility
The second case study focuses on global product preferences of key source countries

What we already know

Product is a key driver in the decision making of students on where and what to study.

There is a relatively strong understanding of trends in product preferences in the Australian context, but there is not a strong understanding of how these trends align with broader global product preferences.

What is the focus of the research

Identifying key global students segments and classifying based on key drivers of choice.

Understanding product preferences for key source countries.
QUESTION 5

China, India, South Korea and Germany are the largest source countries or ‘sending’ countries. What are the fifth and sixth?
China is the key source country globally, but India and Nigeria have both grown as a share of all students.
Initial analysis identified key global student segments and how it has changed over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying Business</td>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying Engineering</td>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying ‘other’</td>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying ‘other’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India</strong> studying Engineering</td>
<td><strong>India</strong> studying Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying Mathematics and Computer science</td>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying Mathematics and Computer science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying Social Sciences</td>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India</strong> studying Mathematics and computer sciences</td>
<td><strong>India</strong> studying Mathematics and computer sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying Sciences</td>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying Humanities</td>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying Arts</td>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India</strong> studying Business</td>
<td><strong>India</strong> studying Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Korea</strong> studying Business</td>
<td><strong>South Korea</strong> studying Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vietnam</strong> studying Business</td>
<td><strong>Vietnam</strong> studying Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Korea</strong> studying ‘other’</td>
<td><strong>South Korea</strong> studying ‘other’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India</strong> studying Sciences</td>
<td><strong>India</strong> studying Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying Humanities</td>
<td><strong>China</strong> studying Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vietnam</strong> studying Business</td>
<td><strong>Vietnam</strong> studying Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kazakhstan</strong> studying Engineering</td>
<td><strong>Kazakhstan</strong> studying Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kazakhstan</strong> studying Business</td>
<td><strong>Kazakhstan</strong> studying Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India</strong> studying Health professions</td>
<td><strong>India</strong> studying Health professions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Countries in Asia serve as a source of outbound students

China and India are dominant markets across all fields of study

Top key global student segments are largely Business or Engineering
QUESTION 6

What proportion of Chinese students studying overseas study ‘Business’ courses?

Access the survey by going to sli.do
Enter the ID - #AIEC
Product preferences differ across the top five global source countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>834,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>288,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>99,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>95,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>93,431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remaining fields of study

- Health
- Sciences
- Humanities
- Math and comp. science
- Engineering
- Business

**China**
- Business: 32%
- Engineering: 17%
- Math and comp. science: 10%
- Humanities: 7%
- Sciences: 9%
- Health: 2%

**India**
- Business: 18%
- Engineering: 31%
- Math and comp. science: 10%
- Humanities: 7%
- Sciences: 5%
- Health: 1%

**South Korea**
- Business: 16%
- Engineering: 15%
- Math and comp. science: 13%
- Humanities: 7%
- Sciences: 4%
- Health: 1%

**Germany**
- Business: 21%
- Engineering: 26%
- Math and comp. science: 7%
- Humanities: 4%
- Sciences: 4%
- Health: 1%

**Nigeria**
- Business: 20%
- Engineering: 26%
- Math and comp. science: 6%
- Humanities: 12%
- Sciences: 13%
- Health: 1%

Business is the dominant preference for international students from China.

Indian outbound students are distributed evenly across three fields of study.

The South Korean market is fairly evenly distributed – but Business is the largest.

Sciences and Business are popular preferences for German outbound students.

Nigeria has a relatively high proportion of Engineering and Business and Health students.
The preference of Chinese students studying in Australia does not reflect global trends for Chinese students studying overseas

Over a half of Chinese students in Australia study Business, whereas this is balanced for other destinations.

Business is the dominant preference for international students from China (32%), but other fields are significant – Engineering (17%) and Maths and Computer Science (10%).

Business is declining as a share of the global total Chinese students (37% to 32% from 2014 to 2017), with increases in other fields.

In contrast – over 50% of Chinese student study in Australia (2017). This may represent strength of Australian Business program or comparative weakness in other fields (particularly in STEM).
Indian product preference for study in Australia, differ from Indian preferences elsewhere

IT product preferences in Australia reflect global student preferences, but Business concentration is distinct for Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Study</th>
<th>All Indian outbound students (estimate)</th>
<th>Indian students in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health professions</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math and comp. science</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Global product preferences

Indian outbound students are distributed evenly across a wide number of fields of study – with around 30% in Engineering and Maths/Computer Science and 18% in Business.

Global trends

Two largest fields have grown as a share – Engineering and Maths/IT – while Business flattened (18.5% to 17.5%).

Alignment to Australia’s trends

Indian students in Australia study in a more concentrated set of fields – 45% in Business. While Computer Science is in line with global splits, Engineering is comparably under enrolled – only 12% of all students.
There are differences in the quality or reputation of the higher education institutions students from these countries study at.

A larger proportion of outbound students from mature source countries attend higher quality institutions compared to outbound students from newly developed source countries.

Proportion of students in the UK and Australia studying at a Top 500 Institution, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mature source countries</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Newly developed source countries
## Ten key groups emerge through the clustering based on where the segment cohort have similar characteristics

### Three key decision dimension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster group</th>
<th>A. STUDY LEVEL (\text{Orientation to PG-level further study})</th>
<th>B. INSTITUTION (\text{Strong emphasis on high quality institutions})</th>
<th>C. DESTINATION (\text{Attracted to major country or city destinations})</th>
<th>Selection of student segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pursuers</td>
<td>![important]</td>
<td>![not important]</td>
<td>![important]</td>
<td>China – Business, India – most fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Academics</td>
<td>![important]</td>
<td>![very important]</td>
<td>![not important]</td>
<td>China – Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learners</td>
<td>![not important]</td>
<td>![very important]</td>
<td>![important]</td>
<td>China – most other fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High-performers</td>
<td>![important]</td>
<td>![very important]</td>
<td>![important]</td>
<td>South Korea – Sciences and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Researchers</td>
<td>![important]</td>
<td>![not important]</td>
<td>![important]</td>
<td>South Korea – Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Global-adventurers</td>
<td>![not important]</td>
<td>![very important]</td>
<td>![important]</td>
<td>Vietnam – Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. City-explorers</td>
<td>![not important]</td>
<td>![not important]</td>
<td>![important]</td>
<td>South Korea – Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Neighbours</td>
<td>![not important]</td>
<td>![not important]</td>
<td>![not important]</td>
<td>Nigeria – Engineering, Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reputation-seekers</td>
<td>![important]</td>
<td>![very important]</td>
<td>![important]</td>
<td>China – Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Destination-seekers</td>
<td>![important]</td>
<td>![not important]</td>
<td>![important]</td>
<td>Turkmenistan/Belarus – Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key
- ![Very important]
- ![Somewhat important]
- ![Not important]
Understanding the impact of *country specific policy responses* on student mobility
The third case study focuses on impacts of policy changes on inbound student mobility

What we already know
Policy responses by government can have a significant impact on the preferences of students, parents and agents in overseas study destination.
Performance in source countries differs significantly for destinations – indicating factors beyond market demand are at play.

What is the focus of the research
Seeking to understand the causation between introduction or changes to policy and student numbers studying in a destination country
Identification of lessons for the sector based on experiences of other countries in implementing and revising policy changes
Analysis undertaken for the South Korea, Vietnamese, Nigerian and Indian markets
There are a range of policy settings that can influence student’s preference for a destination – which can flow through to overall student mobility patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student considerations</th>
<th>What does my student visa entitle me to do?</th>
<th>How difficult is it for me to extend my visa or undertake further study/work?</th>
<th>What are my options for permanent migration?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPLICATION PROCESS</strong></td>
<td><strong>VISA ENTITLEMENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>EXTENSION AND PATHWAYS</strong></td>
<td><strong>MIGRATION OUTCOMES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key policies may include:</td>
<td>Key policies may include:</td>
<td>Key policies may include:</td>
<td>Key policies may include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• English language and academic requirements.</td>
<td>• Work rights (time and type).</td>
<td>• Post-study work settings (type and length).</td>
<td>• Pathways to permanent residency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstration of financial capacity for study purposes.</td>
<td>• Spouse and family.</td>
<td>• Process for applying for further study.</td>
<td>• Pathways to citizenship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vetting students as ‘genuine’.</td>
<td>• Travel restrictions while studying (inside and outside country).</td>
<td>• Employer sponsorship policies.</td>
<td>Changes to incentivise student may include: Policies that align student visa settings and pathway to permanent residency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Processing times.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Length of time able to stay post study.</td>
<td>Changes to disincentivise student may include: Policies that restrict access to permanent residency or provide no opportunity for long-term stay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to incentivise student may include:</strong> Fast-tracking applications through reduction in requirements on applicant/agent; increasing acceptance rates.</td>
<td><strong>Changes to incentivise student may include:</strong> Policies that increase the number of hours a student can work during their studies.</td>
<td><strong>Changes to incentivise student may include:</strong> Policies that increase length of time following graduation student can stay in country or ability of student to become employed in country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to disincentivise student may include:</strong> Increasing the burden or length of the application process through increase demonstration of financial capacity or additional vetting processes.</td>
<td><strong>Changes to disincentivise student may include:</strong> Policies that place additional restrictions on students while they are studying – in terms of mobility or employment.</td>
<td><strong>Changes to disincentivise student may include:</strong> Not allowing student to work after study or burdensome processes for further study in the country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If we consider India as an example...

...policy instability over the past ten years has driven three distinct phases

**Market share flow**

- **2009 to 2012**
  - Phase A: Australian downturn in 2009, results in net losses to UK and Canada
  - Australia: Increased share from 2% to over 7%, gaining 18,000 students
  - Canada: Impacted, down to 6%

- **2012 to 2016**
  - Phase B: UK changes to visas result in decline; Australia and Canada benefit
  - Australia: Student numbers increased (+30,000), but share did not change
  - Canada: Benefit from favourable settings

- **2016 to present**
  - Phase C: Favourable Canadian settings results in further gain in share
  - Both Australia and Canada benefit from increased market share

**Winners and losers**... **Canada** was the net winner over this period – increasing share from 2% to over 7%, or an extra 18,000 students from 2004 to 2016. **UK** was most impacted over the period (down to 6%). **Australian** student numbers increased (+30,000), but its share did not.
QUESTION 7

In 2010, 15% of all tertiary outbound Indian students studied in Australia, what proportion did so in 2012?
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Australian policy changes had a large impact on the number of Indian students studying in Australia and resulted in increased numbers to UK and Canada.

Australia reduced skilled stream to Migration Program in 2009 and introduced reforms to skilled migration in February 2019.

This as well as other factors outlined in the 2011 'Knight Review' impacted Australia’s relative attractiveness.

There was a clear flow on effect to the UK and Canada (who has made changes to post-study work visa and visa processing respectively).
Implementation of restrictive UK policy settings and turnaround on Australia’s visa policy leads to reversal of student flow to the UK in 2009

The UK implemented changes in its immigration settings following the 2010 General Election, including tighter visa settings and closing the post study work rights introduced in 2009.

In 2012, Australia reverses many of its policies as it implements recommendations from the ‘Knight Review’ resulting in a flow back to Australia.

Canada again increases their inbound student numbers as a direct result of the changes.
Favourable Canadian policy settings since 2016 has resulted in further increase in market share of Indian students

Canada introduces a path to permanent residency for international students in 2016 and introduces streamlined visa processing for key countries in 2018 (impact yet to be seen)

In contrast, the UK has removed part time work rights for international students, tougher visa rules and requirements for increased demonstration of financial capacity (2018).

Only in the past month has it re-introduced post-study work rights, the impacts of which won’t be seen for another year or two.
Four lessons on international student policy settings

1. **Different policy types appear to have different levels of impact.** Based on the case study topics the biggest changes in student flows were tied to changes in policy settings which restricted or enhanced to work after study.

2. **Changes in policy settings, especially in visa, work rights and academic requirements, can have a large impact.** These support positive flows, where favourable changes can result in increasing student numbers, and negative flows, resulting in a declining number of students.

3. **Subsequent policy changes, if quick, can lessen the damage but are unlikely to reverse the change.** The UK and Australia’s differing policy response shows that reverting policy settings can minimise the damage. Australia reverted policy settings and bounced back, while the UK *doubled down* and declined.

4. **Different markets react in different ways to changes in policy settings.** As an example, India was very volatile across the period. This is likely due to drivers in this market being tied to price, migration outcomes and the influence of agents on the market.
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QUESTION 8

Do you have any reflections on the three case studies presented?
QUESTION 8

What are the issues or topics you would like to see this data set used for next?
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Demonstration of global student flow tool