In 1982, Clark Kerr wrote about the many opposing directions in which university administration is pulled at any given moment (Kerr, 1982/2001). The same can certainly be said for government. In addition to such demands as greater funding and access to higher education from student groups, proof of educational quality from professional sectors, increased innovative research from industry, and now demonstration of teaching excellence from funders, internationalisation is one more facet of higher education that commands public policy attention.

What exactly internationalisation means, however, differs according to various stakeholder groups: for students and educators, it may mean rendering a campus or curriculum more diverse, with students and readings from other countries; for higher education institutions, it may mean ensuring immigration policies facilitate the arrival of overseas students, researchers, and faculty; or for employers, it may mean preparing the future workforce to function effectively in a global economy. In the higher education literature, the understanding of internationalisation as a process has remained constant since at least 1993 (Zha, 2003), with scholars continually adding nuances over the years (e.g., De Wit, 2015; Knight, 2006, 2012, 2014).

In Canada, at the public policy level, internationalisation has tended to be synonymous with international education, and international education has further tended to be synonymous with international student recruitment. To wit, in the country’s first-ever International Education Strategy (Department of Foreign Affairs, 2014), the main thrust of the document was attracting international talent, with an inbound recruitment target of over 450,000 international students by 2022 (p. 22). What has so far received less attention in Canada, however, in the international higher education policy sector, has been the question of outbound student mobility (OSM): international experience abroad for Canadian university students.
In Canada, education lawmaking is the exclusive responsibility of each province, as per Article 93 of the country’s founding document, the Constitution Act, 1867 (Department of Justice, 2013). However, according to Article 91 of the same document, “Regulation of Trade and Commerce” and “Naturalization and Aliens” fall under the legislative authority of Parliament, therefore, the federal government. How then is international higher education public policy developed in Canada in this seemingly grey legislative zone? Whereas a case can be made for federal involvement in policies regarding the recruitment and retention of international students to Canada, under both the Trade and Immigration portfolios (Article 91), who are the policy leads and policy influencers on the issue of outbound student mobility?

This paper presents original conceptual designs that map the OSM policymaking landscape in Canada at the systems level, comparing activity at the federal (national) level with that at the subnational levels, notably in Ontario and Quebec (the provinces with the highest university-level enrolment). It looks at the various sectoral actors involved in higher education public policymaking in each jurisdiction as well as those actively vying to influence OSM policymaking within their borders. It then further explores the various value propositions given to OSM by each sectoral actor in order to both (a) identify the competing or contradictory demands put on international education and higher education policymakers within each jurisdiction, and (b) determine the extent to which policy and advocacy are aligned or misaligned at each systems level.

Whereas the value or benefits of outbound student mobility (OSM) have been analysed at the student experience level (Brooks & Waters, 2009, 2010; Brooks, Waters, & Pimlott-Wilson, 2012; Waters & Brooks, 2010; Waters, Brooks, & Pimlott-Wilson, 2011), as well as at levels of institutions (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014; International Association of Universities, 2005; Knight, 2003) and practitioners (e.g., Engel, Sandström, van der Aa, & Glass, 2015), they have been less so at the public policy level. Additionally, the existing literature on internationalisation in Canada examines the process against the historical backdrop of the Canadianization movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s (Cormier, 2004, 2005; Jones, 2009) or through a critical lens (Beck, 2012), considers mobility trends in an academic subsector (Knight & Madden, 2010), explores the domestic student experience in the context of internationalisation-at-home (Ngobia, 2011), or investigates international-education policymaking in a multilevel governance structure and also through the experiences of international students on Canadian campuses (Trilokekar, 2016;
Trilokekar & Rasmi, 2011; Trilokekar & Shubert, 2009). There is virtually no macro-level scholarly research on Canadian outbound student mobility nor is there an analysis of systems-level policies as they pertain to this outward movement of Canadian students. This qualitative study aims to fill that gap.

Over the last 18 months, 33 semi-structured interviews as well as five focus groups were conducted with senior public servants as well as leaders of key advocacy groups at both the federal and provincial levels. Each participant was asked open-ended questions about their views on and experiences with outbound student mobility policy development and advocacy in Ontario, Quebec, or Canada as a whole. Publicly-available English- and French-language governmental and stakeholder program, policy, and advocacy documents from 2005 to 2016 were also examined.

Drawing on analytical approaches found in the French tradition and using social discourse analysis (Angenot, 1989, 2004), the study then attempted to decode the notion of “value” as it pertained to OSM. The central hypothesis in this study was that the concept of value would show itself to be situated within one or more of the following political philosophical or economic theories: realism (Morgenthau, 1948/1993; Nye, 2004, 2014), neoliberalism (Hayek, 1941/2009, 1944/2006, 1947), or cosmopolitanism (Held, 2003, 2010; Held & McGrew, 2002; Kant, 1795/1917). A conceptual matrix was developed to map the concept by theory, jurisdiction, and participant, with allowances for emerging typologies.

Preliminary results suggest considerable value and public policy alignment between government and leading advocacy groups at the intra-jurisdictional level but distinct understandings of the value of OSM inter-jurisdictionally.

Given that Canada’s outbound student mobility rate has not surpassed 3.5% since 1969 and that it is the only country in the G7 to have not established an outward student mobility target or strategy, can it truly be said that government and policymakers are balancing stakeholders’ expectations or are they simply passing the buck?
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