

VISA AND IMMIGRATION TRENDS: A COMPARATIVE EXAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENT MOBILITY IN CANADA, AUSTRALIA, THE UNITED KINGDOM, AND THE UNITED STATES

ANITA GOPAL

This comparative study examines visa and immigration regulations for international students and focuses on macro-level policy trends during the past five to ten years in four English-speaking countries: Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The study highlights the trends and motivations to recruit international graduate students as valuable skilled labor and potential designer immigrants in order to compete in the global economic market. Based on the analysis of policy documents and secondary data, it was found that there is a weak connection between higher education institutions and national security or customs and border protection agencies and the role that they play on international education. Also, the ease and expense of obtaining a student visa greatly influences international student enrollment trends.

Introduction

International student mobility especially at the graduate level (master's and doctoral) has become an important policy issue in the internationalization of higher education due to the global movement of international students across borders. International students are moving across national borders in greater numbers than ever before to seek advanced degree opportunities due to a shortage of graduate programs in their home countries; to increase their employability in their home countries or abroad; to expand their intellectual, social, and economic opportunity through migration; and to obtain access to Western culture and its tools, as this is valued in the global job market (Altbach & Reisberg, 2013; Banks & Bhandari, 2012; Gopal, 2013). Moreover, Perna, Orosz, & Jumakulov (2015) point out that "educational attainment, an indicator of the human capital accumulated by a population," is inextricably linked to a nation's level of prosperity and "global economic competitiveness" (p. 85).

At the same time, the impetus of countries and universities recruiting international students is a complex issue and has become an increasingly commercial endeavor (Altbach & Reisberg, 2013). Many countries and institutions around the world rely on international student enrollment as a way to generate revenue and bolster their economies (Banks & Bhandari, 2012). Universities also view international student recruitment as a reliable and independent source of much-needed income (Hawthorne, 2012). For example, it is estimated that in 2010, international student revenue generated more than \$6.9 billion to the Canadian economy (Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade [DFAIT] & Roslyn Kunin & Associates, Inc., 2012). International student revenue in Australia increased "from \$500 million in 1995 to \$4.1 billion in 2011," boosting the Australian economy and accounting for 17% of university revenue (Universities Australia, 2013, p. 56). In 2011–2012, all non-United Kingdom international students contributed over £39.9 billion (£36.40 billion generated from universities and £3.42 billion generated from off-campus expenditure) to the U.K. economy (Universities UK, 2011). In 2012–2013 international students contributed "24 billions (sic) dollars to the economy" in the United States (Harris, 2014, p. 2). During the 2013–2014 academic year,

international student revenue generated 26.8 billion to the United States economy (NAFSA: Association of International Educators, n.d.). In light of budget cuts to higher education in these Western countries, this type of revenue is much needed, and diversifying income streams such as through international student enrollment has become an imperative.

While international students contribute in a variety of ways to the host country and its higher education institutions (e.g., internationalizing the student population, advancing research and technology, enriching social and cultural perspectives in the classroom), there has been limited examination around policies at the higher education level to recruit international students as part of their internationalization initiatives and the connection to visa and immigration policies at the nation level. This article seeks to address this gap and offers a comparative examination of visa and immigration regulations in four English-speaking countries receiving nearly 50% of international students combined: Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Visa and immigration policy trends during the past 5 to 10 years will be discussed. This article begins by discussing the trend of international student mobility and then outlines current visa and immigration policies during the past five years in each of the four countries. The article then discusses how current trends in visa and immigration regulations can contribute new ideas in international higher education and the implications for future research in this area.

Trends in International Student Mobility: International Students as Designer Migrants

International students are highly skilled workers and have often been referred to as "designer migrants" (Hawthorne, 2012). She and Wotherspoon (2013) point out that host countries are interested in recruiting international students because they tend to enroll in science, technology, engineering, and math programs and account for "a high proportion of enrollment in advanced research programs" (p. 2) highlighting their potential contributions to the host country's economy, especially if they remain after completing their degrees

(She & Wotherspoon, 2013; Jandl & Suter, 2006). Moreover, they integrate within the host nation's job market easily since they are familiar with the host culture during their study period (Hawthorne, 2012; She & Wotherspoon, 2013; Sweetman & Warman, 2012). International student recruitment policies, particularly at the graduate level, have become a tool as part of the global competition to attract highly skilled international students. These policy changes have been propelled by a combination of factors such as the need to (a) compete in the global international student market; (b) keep pace with aggressive recruiting strategies by many countries around the world to host more international students; and (c) negotiate the expanding economies of countries like China and India that not only provide more higher education opportunities for their own students, but also host an increasing number of international students (Banks & Bhandari, 2012). Many countries also hope to attract international students by formalizing the link between higher education degree attainment and skilled migration, especially in scientific and technical fields.

Despite the interest of higher education institutions in the Western world to recruit international students, each host country has its own specific international student visa and immigration policies and regulations that are carried out (Cornelius & Tsuda, 2004). In some countries, "governments have implemented a variety of measures to reduce unwanted immigration," while others have adopted pathways to immigration and residency for international students (Cornelius & Tsuda, 2004, p. 4). Hawthorne (2012) points out that enrolling international graduate students has become a trend to produce designer immigrants on the path to "two-step migration," which means that they can qualify for permanent residence and then citizenship in their host country upon obtaining their graduate degrees. As a result, new trends in the distribution and flow of international students have emerged due to strict regulations around national border security and anti-immigration sentiment (Hawthorne, 2012; Thomas & Inkpen, 2016). For example, the United States and the United Kingdom, in particular, have long attracted large numbers of international students, but these countries have turned their focus toward securing

their borders and curbing immigration, making it more challenging for international students to pursue their studies. Other countries, such as Canada and Australia, have responded to these trends by relaxing their immigration policies for international students since they view these students as a benefit to the growth of their economies.

International Student Policy Frameworks

CANADIAN IMMIGRATION TRENDS

International students have become a key piece to Canada's immigration strategy (Gopal, 2014; Government of Canada, 2014). According to Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC, 2010), the government's priority is to recruit highly skilled newcomers (e.g., India, China) who are likely to succeed in Canada and to promote its economic growth, long-term prosperity, and global competitiveness. International students, who pursue their studies in Canada, are an ideal population because they would have already been integrated into Canadian society.

Recognizing that international students are vital to Canada's growth and nation building, the CIC has set out to transform Canada's immigration system to one that is faster, more flexible, and tailored to students' needs—a major distinguishing factor from other countries such as the United Kingdom and the United States. Immigration policies and programs have been specifically created to make it easier for international students to study, work, and become permanent residents in Canada, particularly for graduate students, provided they completed their master's or doctoral degree at a Canadian University (Gopal, 2014). In 2008, the Canada Experience Class stream was introduced, which allows skilled foreign workers or foreign graduates of Canadian higher education institutions who have been working in Canada on a temporary basis to apply for permanent residency without having to leave the country (CIC, 2013).

In order to strengthen Canada's status as a welcoming destination for international students, it has instituted a series of new policies and regulations. As of June 1, 2014, full-time international students who are pursuing their studies at a designated educational institution that leads to a degree, diploma, or certificate program can work off campus for up to 20 hours per

week during regular academic sessions and full time during regularly scheduled breaks and holidays without a work permit (CIC, 2015). International graduate students who have completed their degree programs can also apply for a Post-Graduation Work Permit. CIC has extended this open work permit from two years to three years, enabling international students to work for any Canadian employer in any industry with no restrictions and gain work experience needed to qualify for permanent residency. After three years, permanent residents may apply for citizenship.

International graduate students can also apply to the Provincial Nomination Program (PNP) for permanent residence in Canada either during their master's or doctoral program or upon completion of their degree, provided they meet the minimum criteria (e.g., personal financial support, degree completion, minimum residency). This program is designed to promote immigration policies suited to a province's particular needs (e.g., the demand in Quebec for French-speaking workers). As a result of the PNP, the provinces have been given a greater role in the selection of economic immigrants intending to settle in a specific province. In 2012, approximately 80,000 "economic immigrants" were nominated or selected by the provinces, with the Province of Quebec accounting for approximately 40,000 selections (CIC, 2015). Quebec is the only province that has its own immigration process and programs and chooses its own economic immigrants (CIC, 2015). All of the other Canadian provinces have the option to nominate immigrants. In 2014 and for the foreseeable future, the numbers of immigrants to be granted permanent residence under a PNP or selected by the Province of Quebec is expected to increase (CIC, 2015).

In February 2015, a portion of the PNP became aligned with the federal Express Entry System, a complete electronic selection system that is designed to select skilled workers for immigration to Canada (CIC, 2015). Immigrants can also apply to the federal Skilled Worker Program (under the Express Entry System), which uses a points-based metric, where criteria such as education, work experience, age, language ability, and adaptability are used to evaluate the likelihood that an applicant will successfully settle in Canada. An applicant must score 67 points under the current points

system in order to meet the threshold for admission (CIC, 2015).

International students are considered to be the ideal immigrants because they have been acculturated to their host country during their university degree program and are ready to enter the labor market and start paying taxes. In an article by Tamburri (2013), Jennifer Humphries (Canadian Bureau for International Education, vice president of membership, public policy, and communications) opines that international students are "golden" because by the time they have earned their Canadian credentials, they would have already integrated into Canadian society and demonstrated their adaptability (Humphries, 2013, as cited in Tamburri, 2013). Humphries further states that Canadian higher education institutions include information about immigration policies in their marketing materials that conveys to international students that opportunities are available for permanent residency or long-term work after graduation. Concurrently, the material emphasizes that students' primary reason for coming to Canada should be to pursue their studies.

It is clear that Canadian visa and immigration regulations are linked to the country's mandate to recruit talented international graduate students, who have the option of pursuing permanent residence and working in Canada. The Canadian government has also introduced its first international education strategy, with the goal of profiting from the lucrative global international student market in order to compete with other popular international student destination countries—such as the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, France, and Germany—and attract more international students (Government of Canada, 2014). Canada's International Education Strategy calls to double Canada's international students from 239,131 in 2011 to 450,000 by 2022. The Canadian higher education sector welcomes this growth because international students are considered to be ideal immigrants, they provide a source of human capital and skilled labor for Canada's aging workforce, and they contribute to Canada's growing economy (Nuthall, 2014). The International Education strategy highlights the importance of providing resources to Canadian immigration authorities and other stakeholders to ensure that

students attending higher education institutions have a smooth transition and access to accurate immigration information. The strategy also stresses the importance of Immigration Canada engaging the education sector in providing professional development and certification programs for international student advisors on immigration regulations, who can then provide students with immigration-related advice (Nuthall, 2014).

AUSTRALIAN IMMIGRATION TRENDS

Since the launching of the Colombo Plan in 1951, Australia has enjoyed a long history of engaging international students and is considered to be an innovator in international student recruitment (Adams, Leventhal, & Connelly, 2012). Australia is also advantaged geographically because it is one of the only Western English-speaking countries (apart from New Zealand) in the South Pacific and attracts many international students from Asia (Universities Australia, 2013). For example, Australia has emerged as a major exporter of education in order to draw the Malaysian market, with the United Kingdom as the second major exporter (Milligan et al., 2011, p. 844). From 2005 to 2007, Australia implemented the Study Migration Pathway as part of its skilled migration program to attract international students. As a result, many students from India came to Australia to pursue Technical Vocation and Education Training (TVET) programs (e.g., degrees in technology, trade industry, retail). TVET enables students to gain qualifications for various types of employment and specialized skills to help them in the workforce. TVET is offered through a national system of public and private Registered Training Organizations/Educational Institutions that deliver “certificates, diplomas, advanced diplomas, and vocational graduate certificates and diplomas” (Baird, 2010, p. 62). TVET programs are critical to the Australian economy for the development of the national workforce and as a major export industry for international markets (Baird, 2010). In 2008, there was a 51% annual growth in enrollment in TVET programs, compared to 8% in the tertiary sector (Adams et al., 2012). Australia’s immigration policy, which linked permanent residency with acquiring an Australian degree, led to exponential growth over a number of years in international student enroll-

ments—especially among Indian students—in a range of vocational education programs. Additionally, the surge of student growth was also attributed to fraudulent study incentives, and the situation was exacerbated by the lack of oversight by regulatory authorities to control unethical practices by some student recruitment agents, which allowed some private providers to go unchecked (Wheelahan, 2012).

Australian TVET educational institutions experienced unsustainable student growth due to fraudulent study incentives (Adams, 2010; Wheelahan, 2012). As a consequence, this growth spawned poor-quality educational programs that lacked quality assurance, accountability, and regulatory structures. Also, the massive influx of Indian international students led to attacks on these students, which were highly publicized in the Australian media. These attacks, combined with fraudulent institutional practices, resulted in the collapse of the international student market from India and the demise of TVET colleges, and damaged Australia’s higher education reputation and international student market in general (Wheelahan, 2012). This series of events led to stricter regulations concerning the international student visa program such as proof of international students’ source of financial support (Wheelahan, 2012). It also led to the creation of the Australian Skills Quality Authority, which regulates the TVET sector’s educational providers and accredited courses (Baird, 2010).

By August 2010, offshore visas for international students had fallen by a third, while demand for vocational-sector courses had substantially dropped by 59% (Wheelahan, 2012). In 2011, the Australian government implemented new visa and quality assurance regulations for higher education providers (Milligan et al., 2011). It provided international student graduates with guarantees to stay for two years for those with bachelor’s degrees, three years for master’s degrees, and four years for doctorates. It also allowed graduate students to work on and off campus up to 20 hours per week (Hawthorne, 2012). The Australian government introduced a Streamlined Visa Processing (SVP) system for university students, which it expanded in 2013 to include nonuniversity providers and then to advanced diploma programs with institutions in the higher education and TVET sectors in 2015 in order to

attract more overseas international students (Australian Government, 2014).

Because international education is a large industry in Australia, there is a high level of Commonwealth federal government involvement. Commonwealth legislation requires “any education provider seeking to deliver an international education course to register with the Commonwealth Register of Institutions and Courses for Overseas Students (CRICOS)” (Chow, 2012, p. 9). A requirement of registration is that “all registered institutions contribute to the Provider Registration and International Students Management System (PRISMS),” which closely interfaces with the Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC) (Chow, 2012, p. 9). Through PRISMS, higher education institutions notify DIAC of each student’s acceptance into a program, prior to the student applying for a student visa (Adams et al., 2012). A benefit of the PRISMS system is the collection and distribution of timely market data by Australian Education International (Chow, 2012; Milligan et al., 2011). DIAC also provides monthly reports on student visa applications and grant trends, providing invaluable information about likely prospective enrollments.

Similar to Canadian trends, Australia recognizes that the ease and expense of obtaining a visa will play a key role in a country’s ability to attract international students. In 2015, Australia welcomed a groundbreaking number of international students. In a joint statement, Peter Dutton, the minister for immigration and border protection, and Richard Colbeck, minister for tourism and international education, indicated that “almost 230,000 student visas were granted in 2014–2015, up 2.6% on the previous year” (Australia, 2015, p. 1). Moreover, the introduction of a new international student visa framework beginning in 2016 is set to enhance Australia’s competitiveness in the international education market, stimulate the economy, and improve integrity in visa processing, and make it easier for overseas students to study in Australia (Australia, 2015).

U.K. IMMIGRATION TRENDS

In contrast to the visa and immigration trends in Canada and Australia, the United Kingdom has increasingly tightened its visa and migration policies during the past ten years due to the protection

of jobs for U.K. citizens, securing of the border, and anti-immigration sentiment (BBC News, 2011; Pitel, 2015; Universities UK, 2011). The Highly Skilled Migrants Programme (2002–2008) was phased out, which allowed highly skilled individuals to immigrate to the United Kingdom to look for work without being sponsored by an employer or to start a business. This program was changed to the Points Based System (PBS) in 2008, which was designed to curb immigration and downsize foreign workers to match the declining number of skilled vacancies and to protect jobs for U.K. citizens (Dobson & Salt, 2009). The PBS system is composed of five tiers (Dobson & Salt, 2009). Tier 1 allows people from non-European Economic Area countries to seek work in the United Kingdom, including highly skilled workers and post-study students. Tier 2 is designed for skilled workers, while Tier 3 is for low-skilled workers from the European Union. Tier 4 is for non-European Union students who come to study in the United Kingdom, and Tier 5 is designed for various types of temporary workers, usually within the European Union.

In April 2010, Theresa May, Former Home Secretary and Minister for Women and Equalities and newly elected Prime Minister as of July 2016, released a proposal outlining ways in which to secure the U.K. border and curtail immigration by reforming the student immigration system. May (2010) proposed to raise the level of courses students can study, introduce tougher entry criteria for international students and their dependents, ensure that international students return to their home country after their academic course completion, limit the entitlements of students to work and sponsor dependents, simplify procedures for checking low-risk applicants, and apply stricter accreditation procedures for education providers in the private sector (U.K. Border Agency, Immigration Group, 2010). These stricter procedures also encompass tougher English language skill requirements and an increase in the amount of credibility check interviews in terms of students’ immigration history, educational background, and financial support.

Up until 2012, non-European international students graduating from a higher education graduate program were able to remain in the United Kingdom for up to two years, but as part of May’s effort to curb immi-

gration, the government discontinued the Post Study Work scheme (Universities UK, 2011). These proposed changes make it more challenging for international students from non-European countries to qualify for a work permit to stay in the United Kingdom after graduation. Such policies do not promote permanent residence or postgraduate or labor retention and have mainly impacted overseas recruitment of students from India, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia (Gopal, 2014). Milligan et al. (2011) comment that these recent policy changes could cost U.K. universities one billion pounds in fees and compromise future research capabilities, particularly in the science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) fields, and pose a hindrance to the commitment to internationalization within the higher education sector.

In 2014, May made it clear that non-EU foreign students are to “return home immediately after finishing their courses” in an effort to reduce net migration to less than 100,000 after a series of scandals relating to foreign criminals and migrants who overstay their visas (Pitel, 2015, p. 11). Pitel (2015) points out that students will also be required to apply for a new U.K. visa in their home countries after graduating if they want to change their course of study or apply for a work permit. She also notes that non-European Union international graduate students can stay in the United Kingdom only if they find a graduate-level job that pays 24,000 pounds per year. London’s Mayor, Boris Johnson, has opposed May’s proposed immigration policy and believes that foreign students are indispensable because they contribute seven billion pounds to the British economy every year through tuition fees and living expenses (Pitel, 2015). Moreover, foreign students pay up to 27,000 pounds more than British students.

Former prime minister David Cameron’s speech on the U.K. government’s immigration policy in April 2011 echoed May’s concerns of controlling immigration in the United Kingdom. He pointed out that “immigration has long been too high” with net migration from nationals of countries outside of the European Union to the United Kingdom totaling 198,000, which should be controlled (BBC News, 2011, pp. 3–4). Cameron indicated that the skills levels for Tier 2 visas would be raised so that it will

be available only to graduate-level occupations. Cameron stated, “If you’re good at your subject, can speak English and have been offered a place on a course at a trusted institution—you will be able to get a visa and study here” (p. 10). Unlike Canada’s and Australia’s desire to enroll international students and implement expedited visa and immigration regulations, the United Kingdom has made a political stance to reduce international student enrollment to ensure that its citizens gain employment.

U.S. IMMIGRATION TRENDS

Similar to the United Kingdom, the United States has made shifts around its visa and immigration policies. In 2003, international student enrollment in the United States was 586,323. It then dropped to 572,509 in 2004 (for the first time in over 30 years) and dropped again in 2005 to 565,039 (Bollag, 2004; Gürüz, 2008). These declines were attributed to the effects of post-9/11 immigration policies such as the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) and the unwelcoming treatment of visa applicants (Danley, 2010; Lee & Rice, 2007).

In 2003, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) was created and solidified the link between border security and terrorism. It implemented SEVIS, which was introduced across universities in the United States (Danley, 2010). The creation of both DHS and SEVIS was designed to centralize the control and monitoring of international students and scholars holding nonimmigrant visas and to track and monitor educational institutions (Danley, 2010; Rosser, Hermesen, Mamiseishvili, & Wood, 2007; U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, 2014). However, national security concerns took precedence over the needs and goals of educational institutions and the students coming to the United States to pursue their education and “eroded the status and leadership of U.S. higher education around the world” (Danley, 2010, p. 72). Danley (2010) points out that universities and professional educational associations such as NAFSA: Association of International Educators and the American Council on Education objected to SEVIS because higher education institutions were required to collect and report on international students and scholars. University scholar services had to reconcile how to maintain the “univer-

sity's ability to attract and admit international students" while simultaneously protecting international students' rights during the implementation of the new SEVIS procedure (Danley, 2010, p. 66). The U.S. government then worked to reduce student visa processing times and restore visa approval rates to pre-9/11 levels (Bollag, 2004; Danley, 2010). These actions seemed to be effective, as student numbers began to rise once again in 2006, reaching 582,984 (Gürüz, 2008).

However, some of the best international students are deciding not to study in the United States because of strict security measures, visa regulations, and visa processing times, particularly males from the Middle East between the ages of 16 and 45, who endure tougher scrutiny because of perceived ties to terrorist groups (Danley, 2010; Jacobson, 2003). For example, students from Muslim countries are choosing to pursue their studies in more welcoming countries with relaxed immigration regulations such as Canada and Australia.

Yet despite this discouragement and the lack of an official international student recruitment strategy, the United States still remains a popular study destination. The United States is particularly focused on enrolling highly talented international graduate students in the STEM professions pursuing their master's and doctoral degrees (Grodén, 2014; Gürüz, 2008). Unlike in the United Kingdom, international graduate students and graduates of American colleges who are residing in the United States on student visas are entitled to gain work experience in their field of study (Fischer, 2016). Specifically, Fischer (2016) explains that international students are permitted to complete one year of optional practical training under the F-1 student visa classification as part of their graduate program (p. 1). Fischer further states that graduates in selected disciplines from accredited colleges can extend that period to 36 months (p. 1).

Much like the United Kingdom, U.S. immigration law requires international students to leave the country once they graduate. In fact, before international students receive their F-1 student visas, they must prove that they intend to return to their home countries upon finishing their degrees. Those who would like to stay must find an employer that is willing to sponsor them for an H-1B work visa, in which there is a yearly quota.

In 2009, "62% of foreign doctoral students remained in the U.S. on temporary visas 5 years after graduation," with the majority being from India and China (Maskus, Mobarak, & Stuenkel, 2013, p. 563). Each April, the United States grants approximately 65,000 H-1B visas (nonimmigrant visa), plus 20,000 for applicants with master's degrees or higher. In April 2014, after receiving 172,500 applications within the first week, U.S. Citizen and Immigration Services stopped accepting these applications (U.S. Department of Homeland Security). Approximately 35% of those coveted H-1B visas were given to F-1 visa holders in 2010, which implies that there is at least a steady stream of F-1 visa holders who are trying to obtain permanent residence (Harris, 2014; Wassem, 2012). Holding an F-1 visa may become a path to migration to the United States for international students, but this could be a 10- to 15-year process.

Unlike policies in Canada and Australia, there is no direct path for permanent residence after graduating from a U.S. university or gaining permanent residency. Harris (2014) argues that students who graduate with advanced degrees in the STEM fields should be permitted to stay in the United States to prevent the loss of human capital and to boost the future of the American economy (p. 2). Interestingly, higher education institutions and their international student services and scholar offices have very little input in such matters since their main function is to prepare visa documents for international students (Gopal & Streitwieser, 2016).

Discussion

Canada and Australia have maintained welcoming visa and immigration policies in order to attract highly skilled international students to their region and compete for their share of the student market. In contrast, the regulations in the United Kingdom and the United States are much stricter. The United Kingdom is unique in its hesitancy to accept labor and immigration from countries outside of the European Union and is largely focused on securing its borders (She & Wotherspoon, 2013). Likewise, the United States is distinct in its practice of managing the flow of international students since the U.S. government is highly vested in tightening border security and protecting its homeland.

Due to the events of 9/11, the United States no longer maintains an open-door immigration policy. It appears that the regulations in the United Kingdom and the United States have little observance of internationalization trends (Milligan et al., 2011).

There is very little connection between higher education institutions and the role that Homeland Security or Customs and Border Protection plays on international education, although some effort has been made in Canada and Australia toward creating a linkage between higher education institutions' recruitment of international students and visa and immigration regulations (Milligan et al., 2011). For example, Johnstone & Lee (2014) point out that in 2011, the Council of Ministers of Education in Canada (CMEC) aligned with the Federal Ministers of Immigration to work on "seamless connection between education and immigration" (p. 16). Moreover, in the executive summary "Bringing Education in Canada to the World, Bringing the World to Canada," an education marketing plan was developed to promote international education, which involved some input from higher education institutions in cultivating this plan.

More often than not, higher education institutions in the United Kingdom and the United States appear at times to be an extension of homeland security—enforcing regulations and tracking students and their visa status (Alden & Schwartz, 2012), and these implications have not been sufficiently examined. Gopal and Streitwieser (2016) explain that "welcoming greater numbers of international students to U.S. campuses in the post 9/11 era means addressing increasingly strict federal compliance guidelines, which has expanded the immigration related workload that international student services and scholar (ISSS) offices have to deal with considerably" (p. 1). Gopal and Streitwieser further point out that the majority of ISSS offices in the United States focus mainly on preparing and tracking visa documents to comply with federal immigration regulations (p. 1). ISSS offices, particularly in the United States, are not always able to keep up with changing immigration policies, and there are many stories of students being denied reentry or enduring secondary screening and questioning. For example, a Saudi Arabian student at the University of Colorado at Denver who graduated with his master's degree

intended to pursue a PhD after returning from vacation in Saudi Arabia. An employee at the university was not familiar with new federal security policies and did not register the student's return to the United States or enroll him in courses. After discovering the error, the student went to the immigration office, where immigration officials stated different policies and procedures, and the student was nearly arrested (Jacobson, 2003). The student was so shaken that he decided instead to get his PhD in Britain.

The tightening of visa and immigration regulations in the United Kingdom and the United States is also causing a shift in international student mobility trends for particular groups of international students. Chen (2007) states that visa and immigration policies are an important factor for particular groups of international students. For instance, Chinese students prefer to pursue their degrees in the United States, but due to difficulties in obtaining a student visa, they choose to go to Canada instead due to the ease and speed of the Canadian visa process and proximity to the United States (pp. 764–765). Students from Muslim countries are also choosing to study in Canada and Australia, as opposed to the United Kingdom and the U.S.

As research on international graduate student migration has begun to emerge (Hawthorne, 2012; Sweetman & Warman, 2012), there is a pressing need to examine the connection between immigration and globalization (Alden & Schwartz, 2012). It is also important to move beyond the common issues of visa tracking, SEVIS reporting, and other compliance procedures and move beyond the discourse of recruiting skilled international students. For instance, international students need more support services to ensure their academic success, as they often do not receive a level of support that is commensurate to the difficulties they experience (Gopal & Streitwieser, 2016). There is a need for more training and support to understand the challenges that international students face, in addition to surveying from international students the type of support they need. International students travel a long way to pursue their studies and must build new lives in a foreign country (Green, Marmolejo, & Egron-Polak, 2012; Sondhi, 2011), which should be recognized in the visa and immigration process. Host nations should work to balance these concerns (She & Wotherspoon, 2013). In

order to do this, it is important to examine the future of international student recruitment and the intersection of immigration and visa policies in the context of national security and border protection. The ease and expense of obtaining a visa will certainly play a key role in a country's ability to attract international students.

References

- Adams, T., Leventhal, M., & Connelly, S. (2012). International student recruitment in Australia and the United States: Approaches and attitudes. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of international higher education* (pp. 399–417). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Alden, E., & Schwartz, L. (2012). Faster, safer, smarter: A modern visa system for the United States. *Council on Foreign Relations*, 12, 1–4.
- Altbach, P. G., & Reisberg, L. (2013). The pursuit of international students in a commercialized world. *International Higher Education*, 73, 1–30.
- Australia. (October, 2015). Visa changes “set to lure more foreign students.” *University World News*, 388, 1–2.
- Australian Government. (December, 2014). Future directions for streamlined visa processing: Report and recommendations. Department of Immigration and Border Protection. Retrieved from <http://www.border.gov.au/ReportsandPublications/Documents/reviews-and-inquiries/future-directions.pdf>
- Baird, B. (2010). Stronger, simpler, smarter ESOS: Supporting international students: Review of education services for overseas students (ESOS) Act 2000. Australian Government: Canberra, Australia. Retrieved from https://internationaleducation.gov.au/Regulatory-Information/Education-Services-for-Overseas-Students-ESOS-Legislative-Framework/ESOS-Review/Documents/ESOS_Review_Final_Report_Feb_2010_.pdf
- Banks, M., & Bhandari, R. (2012). Global student mobility. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of international higher education* (pp. 379–399). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- BBC News. (2011, April 14.). In full: David Cameron immigration speech. *BBC News Politics*, pp. 1–12. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-13083781>
- Bollag, B. (November, 2004). Enrollment of foreign students drops in U.S.: Visa restrictions and competition blamed for first decline in 32 years. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(13), 1–5. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com>.
- Chen, L.-H. (2007). Choosing Canadian graduate schools from afar: East Asian students' perspectives. *Higher Education*, 54(5), 759–780.
- Chow, P. (2012). *U.S. and Australian international student data collection: Key differences and practices*. New York, NY: Center for Academic Mobility Research, Institute of International Education.
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC). (2010). Government of Canada announces 2011 immigration plan. Retrieved from <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/mediareleases/2010/2010-11-01a.asp>.
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC). (2013). Provincial nominees. Retrieved from <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/immigrate/provincial/>
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC). (February, 2015). Immigration to Canada through a provincial program. Canada Immigration Newsletter. Retrieved from <http://www.cicnews.com/2015/02/immigration-canada-provincial-program-024553.html#ZOyqZAQoJALhL7AI99>
- Cornelius W. A., & Tsuda, T. (2004). Controlling immigration: The limits of government intervention. In W. A. Cornelius, T. Tsuda, P. Martin, & J. Hollifield (Eds.), *Controlling immigration: A global perspective* (3rd ed., pp. 3 – 50). Chicago, IL: Stanford University Press.
- Danley, J. V. (2010). SEVIS: The impact of homeland security on American colleges and universities. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 146, 63–73.
- Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) & Roslyn Kunin & Associates, Inc. (2012, May). Economic impact of international education in Canada—an update. Retrieved February 26, 2015, from http://www.international.gc.ca/education/report-rapport/economic-impact-economique/index.aspx?lang=eng&menu_id=873
- Dobson, J., & Salt, John. (2009). Pointing the way. Managing UK immigration in difficult times. *People and Place*, 17(2), 16–29.
- Fischer, K. (2016, March). New federal rule will avert deportation for thousands of students. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. 1–2.
- Gopal, A. (2015). *Lecture: Exploring the link between visa and immigration policies and international student recruitment*. Retrieved from University of Toronto, Comparative International Development Seminar Series: <https://www.oise.utoronto.ca/cidecl/>
- Gopal, A. (2014). Canada's immigration policies to attract international students. *International Higher Education*, 75, 19–21.
- Gopal, A., & Streitwieser, B. (2016, January). International students, support structures and the equity question. *Inside Higher Ed*, pp. 1–2. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/world-view/international-students-support-structures-and-equity-question>
- Government of Canada. (2014). *Canada's international education strategy: Harnessing our knowledge advantage to drive innovation and prosperity* (Cat. No.: FR5-86/2014) Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Retrieved from <http://international.gc.ca/global-markets-marches-mondiaux/assets/pdfs/overview-apercu-eng.pdf>

Green, M. F., & Marmolejo, F., & Egron-Polak, E. (2012). The internationalization of higher education: Future prospects. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of international higher education* (pp. 439–457). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Groden, C. (2014, December). Dear international students: Thanks for your tuition. Now go home. Love, Uncle Sam. *New Republic*, pp. 1–4. Retrieved from <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/120463/immigration-law-discourages-international-students-working>

Gürüz, H. K. (2008). *Higher education and international student mobility in the global knowledge economy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Harris, L. (2014, September). Education and immigration: Why keeping international students is a good thing for the economy. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/lauren-harris/education-and-immigration_b_5609706.html

Hawthorne, L. (2012). Designer immigrants? International students and two-step migration. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of international higher education* (pp. 417–437). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jacobson, J. (November, 2003). Foreign-student enrollment stagnates: New security measures lead to declines among Muslim countries. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. 1–6. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com>

Jandl, M., & Suter, B. (2006). *Comparative study on policies towards foreign graduates: Study on admission and retention policies towards foreign students in industrialized countries*. Vienna, Austria: International Centre for Migration Policy Development.

Johnstone, M., & Lee, E. (2014). Branded: International education and 21st century Canadian immigration, education policy, and the welfare state. *International Social Work*, 57(3), 209–221.

Lee, J. J., & Rice, C. (2007). Welcome to America? International student perceptions of discrimination. *Higher Education*, 53(3), 381–409.

Maskus, K. E., Mobarak, A. M., Stuen, E. T. (2013). Doctoral students and U.S. immigration policy. *Science*, 342(6158), 562–563.

Milligan, L., Pachauri, A., Jha, S., Zhou, T., Sondhi, G., & Rounsaville, C. (2011). Cutbacks in student immigration: A nail in the coffin for higher education in the UK? *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 41(6), 839–856. doi:10.1080/03057925.2011.617426

NAFSA: Association of International Educators (n.d.). NAFSA International student economic tool. Retrieved from: <http://www.nafsa.org/Content.aspx?id=34242>

Nuthall, K. (2014, January 18). International strategy aims to double foreign students. *University World News*, 303, 1–4.

Pitel, L. (2015, January 8). Let foreign graduates stay in the UK says Boris. *The Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/news/politics/article4316993.ece>

Perna, L. W., Orosz, K., & Jumakulov, Z. (2015). Understanding the human capital benefits of a government-funded international scholarship program: An exploration of Kazakhstan's Bolashak program. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 40, 85–97.

Rosser, V. J., Hermesen, J. M., Mamiseishvili, K., & Wood, M. S. (2007). A national study examining the impact of SEVIS on international student and scholar advisors. *Higher Education*, 54(4), 525–542. doi:10.1007/s10734-006-9015-7

She, Q., & Wotherspoon, T. (2013). International student mobility and highly skilled migration: A comparative study of Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom. *SpringerPlus*, 2, 132.

Sondhi, G. (2011). Should I go or should I stay?: The making of a 'good' or 'bad' international student migrant. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 41(6), 839–856.

Sweetman, A., & Warman, C. (2012). Former temporary foreign workers and international students as a source of permanent immigration. *Canadian Public Policy*, 40(4), 391–407.

Tamburri, R. (March, 2013). Changes to immigration rules are a boon to international student recruitment. *University Affairs*, 1–3. Retrieved from <http://www.universityaffairs.ca/news/news-article/changes-to-immigration-rules-are-a-boon-to-international-student-recruitment/>.

Thomas, K. J. A., & Inpen, C. (2016). Foreign student emigration to the United States: Pathways of entry, demographic antecedents, and origin-country contexts. *International Migration Review*, 1–32. doi:10.1111/imre.12265

Universities Australia. (2013, February). An agenda for Australian higher education 2013–2016: A smarter Australia. Universities Australia. Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from [https://www.universities-australia.edu.au/ArticleDocuments/209/An Agenda for Australian Higher Education2103_2016.pdf.aspx](https://www.universities-australia.edu.au/ArticleDocuments/209/An%20Agenda%20for%20Australian%20Higher%20Education%202013-2016.pdf.aspx)

Universities UK. (2011, February). Universities UK response to the student immigration system—a consultation, pp. 1–41.

U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. (2014, October). Student and Exchange Visitor Information System. *SEVIS by the Numbers: General Summary Quarterly Review*.

U.K. Border Agency, Immigration Group. (2010, December). The student immigration system: A consultation. ISBN 978-1-84987-378-9

Wassem, R. E. (2012). Immigration of foreign nationals with science, technology, engineering, mathematics (STEM) degrees.

Congressional Research Services. Retrieved from <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42530.pdf>

Wheelahan, L. (July, 2012). Public-private in higher education and TTVET—a report from Australia (pp. 1–25). LH Martin Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Management. Melbourne, Australia: University of Melbourne.

Wheelahan, L. & Moodie, G. (2010). *The quality of teaching in VET: Final report and recommendations* (pp. 1–71). LH Martin Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Management. Melbourne, Australia: University of Melbourne. Retrieved from <http://www.lhmartininstitute.edu.au/research-and-publications/research/1-study-on-the-quality-of-teaching-in-vet>.

Anita Gopal is a Postdoctoral Research Associate and Adjunct Lecturer in the College of Education at the University of Maryland, College Park. Dr. Gopal holds a

PhD in education from Queen's University and an MA in educational technology from Concordia University. Her scholarship focuses on the socialization and retention of domestic and international graduate students, international student mobility and visa policies from a comparative perspective, organizational structures and policymaking within higher education institutions in the context of internationalization, and international student enrollment. Dr. Gopal has presented her research nationally and internationally. She is the author of Academic Experiences of International Graduate Students: The Canadian Perspective in the Context of Higher Education. Her work has appeared in journals such as the International Journal of Teaching and Learning, International Higher Education, University World News, and Inside HigherEd.