

INBOUND STUDENT MOBILITY INTO INDIA:
CONGENIAL FACTORS AND BUFFETING
ENVIRONMENT

MUHAMMED SALIM. A.P.*

Abstract

Internationalisation of higher education spawned to be the necessity of the epoch and need of the hour. The process of and airing on international student mobility has been flowered in the proem of higher education after the execution of fresh policies in nineties having effects on all spheres of life. International student mobility in the world has not been infrequent or much scant in the post liberalization era. The students came in to imbibe the delicacy of the high quality higher education system of a country bewrays the level of its maturity and moderation. This paper tries to assess the congenial factors and buffeting environment of inbound student mobility into India and explore India's potential in it. The study entirely reposes on secondary data which were collected from various magisterial published and unpublished sources. The data on student mobility were collected from the publications of Ministry of Human Resource Development and UNESCO Institute for Statistics and unpublished source of Association of Indian Universities. Coming back from the breakup of its declared tradition in hosting international students, India is now back on track of enrolling foreign students in significant number. The study found that even though majority of the origin nations are under developed, nations like USA, UAE and Saudi Arabia are also sending their nationals seeking study abroad to India in greater dimension for years. It was also found that quality of higher education has profound command on mobility of international students. Though quality is the most important factor for inbound mobility of foreign students, mobility could be transpired in its actual form only at the backing of certain other factors such as prosperity of the state, urbanization, competent infrastructure, quantity of higher education and technological quantum leap etc.

Key words: international student mobility, inbound student mobility, foreign students, quality of higher education, congenial factors, buffeting environment

* Assistant Professor in Economics, M.E.S. Mampad College, Malappuram-Kerala-India

1. Introduction

The globalization has raised the celerity and potency of international student flows and cross-border education all over the world. International student mobility (ISM) in the post globalization era marked a sharp rise by establishing the universal concept of education that knowledge has no border. Gwang-Jo Kim, Director, UNESCO Bangkok points out that ‘The number of students who chose to study abroad had increased from 1.3 million in 1990 to 4.3 million in 2011, demonstrating a new generation of mobile young people eager to learn and expand their horizons. Traditionally the flow of students has been towards English speaking countries, such as the United Kingdom, United States and Australia. However this pattern is changing with a sharp increase in the flow of and exchange of students in Asia and the Pacific, and the development of several education hubs in the region (UNESCO, 2013)’. ‘The extent of international student mobility is one of the key indicators of globalization and internationalization of higher education. The number of students enrolled in higher education outside their country of citizenship has risen dramatically from 0.6 million in 1975 to three million in 2007 (OECD, 2009)’. These two reports show that international mobile students increased only by 0.7 million by 15 years from 1975 to 1990. But thereafter, it surged into 4.3 million in 2011 registering an increase of 3 million by 21 years from 1990 to 2011.

The new economic reforms commenced in 1990s have multiplied and accelerated the process of student migration from and to the countries. As a temporary migration, issue of brain drain does not happen normally through ISM. Instead it heightens the resource base of certain economies by accommodating and redounding the bright foreign students. Even though international student mobility doesn’t address the problems of the great majority, it can’t be forgotten or contemned in the sense that it deals with quality of higher education rather than quantity or access. It also facilitated the movement of teachers and other professionals to work abroad. But the downside is that this mode can be accessed only by the elite sections of society. Although it is bound to remain popular, it cannot be counted on to solve the problem of access that faces the majority of our students (Paul, 2012). The changing nature of international student mobility can be viewed in two ways - growth and diversity. First, there has been an observable and continuing growth in both demand for overseas educational opportunities and capacity in higher education institutions (HEIs) worldwide. This increase is actively encouraged by the major stakeholders in higher education -governments, HEIs), employers and students (and their

families) - who recognize the personal and socio-economic benefits of mobility. Increasing international student mobility is also a policy of objective at supranational level, where national governments recognize the importance of inter-governmental and regional agreements to facilitate and encourage the mobility of students, researchers and academics. This growth has also been accompanied by intensified competition between countries and between providers in the recruitment of internationally mobile students, and an increase in the volatility of international student mobility, and thus the predictability overseas student flows (Woodfield, 2010).

2. Objectives

1. To assess the expedient and opponent of inbound student mobility into India.
2. To examine the factors fascinating mobility of international students into India.
3. To explore India's potential in inbound mobility of international students.

3. Methodology

The study entirely embraced on secondary data which were collected from certain magisterial published and unpublished sources. The data on international student mobility were collected from the publications of Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) and UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS). The study had to bank upon Right to Information Act, 2005 for collecting detailed data on mobility of foreign students into India from Association of Indian Universities (AIU). The study has widely employed simple statistical tools such as average, percentage, ranking, total and standard deviation for the analysis.

4. Inbound Student Mobility into India

India has a long history of hosting international students in its great education centres such as Nalanda University and Takshashila University. Takshashila University established around 2700 years back in Punjab region of Ancient India and known as the world's oldest university had a golden era of hosting over 10,500 overseas students. The students from many countries such as Korea, Japan, China, Tibet, Indonesia, Persia and Turkey poured into Nalanda University which was established in 12th Century AD in Bihar (Chinmaya Yuva Kendra, 2007). But India passed this golden era of learning and lost the prime role in inbound student mobility and shunted it for the other nations. This paper discusses India's seat in international student mobility and favourable and unfavourable factors for the international student mobility in India.

India's finesse is generally in favour of disseminating the inflow of students as a part of trans-national education to regain its lost dignity in hosting international students. 'India has traditionally been seen as a country that sends rather than receives international students, but a growing number of students from elsewhere are now choosing to study in India. Indeed, the 2012 Open Doors report from the Institute of International Education found that India had become the 11th most popular country for US students abroad. With the world's second largest population (after China), and a fast growing and ever-more influential economy, it's unsurprising that India's higher education systems has undergone rapid expansion over the past few decades. It is now one of the largest higher education systems in the world (after China and the US)- and to an outsider, perhaps one of the most complex. There are thousands of universities and colleges to choose from, of many different types, sizes, specializations and origins, some state-run, others private (QS, 2014)'.

4.1 Inbound Student Mobility: India Improving its Room

First fifteen years of post liberalization period witnessed a relatively lower inbound mobility of foreign students (FS) as compared to the outbound mobility. India had a long period of stationary state since 1960s to 2005-06. India hosted 5686 FS in 1965-66 slightly increased to 10,738 four decades later in 2003-04. It is clear that post liberalization period brought international students in visible form and instigated for brightening its international pertinences. India, being a smart part of globalization and internationalization of higher education sends its nationals to the rest of the world especially to English speaking countries such as USA, UK, Canada and Australia. But the same couldn't be repeated in receiving internationally mobile students. Nevertheless the 21st century accredits new anticipation to the nation by having the opportunity for hosting them in significant number. Growth of FS in India was not even associated with the poor growth of higher education in the country. But since then, India tried hard to entrench its position in accommodating overseas students. The table.1 shows that there has been a three times increase in the number of foreign students within a decade while the number of total internationally mobile students rose only by two times. The interesting thing is that though the growth rate of foreign students in Indian universities and colleges is absolutely unstable, India managed to have positive digits all the time except 2012-13 when the growth rate minimised to -5.07 per cent. On the basis of the favourable factors, Indian institutions are receiving international students in apparent scale. Percentage share of India in hosting FS

increased from 0.44 in 2004-05 to 0.77 in 2010-11. India's contribution in accommodating internationally mobile students stood at 0.77 per cent for three years from 2010-11. But India couldn't bring its share to even a single digit while India's share in overseas student supply all over the world was well above 5 per cent for ever since 2005. India hosted 18,206 FS on a ten year average basis from 2003-04 to 2012-13 with an annual average growth rate of 13.13 per cent while that of world is just 7.04.

Table.1 Trend and share of inbound student mobility

Year	Mobile students in India		Total mobile students in the world		Share (%)
	No.	Growth(%)	No.	Growth(%)	
2003-04	10,738	-	2,455,250	-	0.44
2004-05	13,267	23.55	2,728,480	11.13	0.49
2005-06	14,456	8.96	2,652,068	-2.80	0.54
2006-07	18,391	27.22	2,800,470	5.60	0.66
2007-08	21,206	15.31	2,965,840	5.91	0.71
2008-09	21,778	2.70	3,369,242	13.60	0.65
2009-10	23,446	7.66	3,422,868	1.59	0.68
2010-11	27,531	17.42	3,572,840	4.38	0.77
2011-12	33,156	20.43	4,265,455	19.39	0.77
2012-13	31,475	-5.07	4,113,789	-3.56	0.77
Average	18,206	13.13	3,250,531	7.04	0.52

Source: 1) Computed from the data accessed from AIU data base

2) The UNESCO Institute for Statistics, Global Education Digest-various issues

3) MHRD, AISHE 2010-11 and AISHE 2011-12

4) www.uis.unesco.org/Education/International-student-flow –Official website of The UNESCO

Institute for Statistics

‘One of the major reasons for lower inbound mobility ratio is lower number of collaboration of Indian HEIs with international HEIs due to three reasons: Firstly, approval systems and bureaucratic processes are not clear and/or not conducive to international collaboration. Secondly, information about the Indian HEIs find it difficult to assess the quality and reputation of new partners in India. Finally, restrictions in academic collaborations around

curriculum, recognition of qualifications and credits, and funding can be barriers (British Council, 2014). But the British Council perceives that international collaborations of certain Indian HEIs viz. Manipal University, University of Mysore, University of Bangalore, Visweswaeraya Technological University and Surathkal University in Karnataka, University of Pune and Symbiosis International University in Maharashtra, Osmania University in Andhra Pradesh, Delhi University in Delhi and Annamalai University in Tamil Nadu with foreign institutions have really augmented the presence of overseas students in India in recent years. Although not in the category of inbound student mobility, the data of international students enrolled in Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU) under distance mode have been included in the list of FS in India. It constitutes significant share of total FS as 963 FS in 2004-05, 3000 in 2005-06, 3925 in 2006-07, 4468 in 2007-08 and 5861 in 2008-09 were enrolled under this easy mode of student mobility (AIU, 2014). Although there is a trend towards intensified competition in ISM (at both national and international levels), mutually beneficial collaborative and cooperative partnerships remain a major feature of international education, particularly within different regions but also inter-regionally (OECD, 2004).

4.2 India: Destination of the Third World

Student decision making on choosing destination depends on push and pull factors. 'From a student perspective, push factors include their own desires to study or travel abroad for personal development; to enhance their employability; or to eventually migrate to their chosen study destination. From a government perspective push factors can include a desire to improve the country's educational and research capacity through students' application of the skills and experiences gained abroad to support national socio-economic development, or a desire to help foster connections and build relationships in other countries to help meet foreign policy goals. This often means that the students are encouraged to study abroad via scholarships and other student support packages, especially at postgraduate level (Woodfield, 2010)'. He also lists pull factors at national and institutional levels. At national level, there are a number of 'pull' factors that focus on the relative attractiveness of the study destination related to the motivations can act as enablers, or barriers, in student decision-making. Such factors can be inherent to a country as a whole (for example, language, shared culture or religion, cultural diversity, climate, location, safety, or living costs). At the institutional level, there are other pull factors which can be based on quality perceptions, credit transfer regulations, location, institutional marketing and

internationalization strategies, financial incentives, and the student support infrastructure that institutions are able to provide.

Since push factors weaken pull factors in India, it couldn't host more than 14-15 per cent of its outbound mobile students. Besides the fact that the nations choosing India as the destination for study abroad are mostly low income countries or those who known in the label of 'under-developed' jobs at quality or excellence they receive from Indian higher education sector, employability they get after education and amenities they inherit during they stay. We would realise from the Table. 2 that Asia dominates in supply of foreign students in India. Among top five senders of FS to India, UAE is the only nation with the title of emerging economy. Of these, HDI ranking of Nepal, Bhutan and Afghanistan are deplorable like India while Iran has a much better rank. Of the other five senders of FS viz. Ethiopia, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, USA and Saudi Arabia, Ethiopia lies at the bottom of the list of countries by HDI while USA came at top ten. While Sri Lanka has lower HDI, Malaysia procured the place in the middle of the list and Saudi Arabia has better index. Even though the great majority of the countries of origin of FS belonged to the Asian continent, share of Eastern Asia consists of developed nations like Japan and Republic of Korea and emerging economy like China was negligible. At the same time major catchment area of Indian universities are South & Central Asia consists of Nepal, Iran, Afghanistan and Bhutan, Western Asia consists of UAE and Saudi Arabia and Eastern Africa consists of Ethiopia and Kenya. The prosperous zones like Europe and Oceania contribute a meagre share in inbound student mobility into India. The table. 2 unveils the dominant share of a few nations especially Nepal, Iran, UAE, Bhutan and Afghanistan in inbound mobility. Nepal and Iran are the regular and evergreen senders of foreign students into the country without falling below 1000 students per year. Even though developed or emerging economies such as the USA, the UAE, Saudi Arabia and Malaysia came in the list of top ten origin nations, a great majority of FS in India were from impoverished and impecunious nations.

Following an announcement made by the Hon'ble Prime Minister of India in 2005, the Indian Council for Cultural Relations (ICCR) become responsible for implementing a special scheme for Afghan students. From the very next year onwards, the number of Afghan students coming to India has multiplied many times. Afghanistan sent just 35 students in 2004-05 jumped to 2235 in 2011-12 (Table. 2). Nepal procured first in the list of top senders in 2009-10 by sending 3208 FS and never conceded to any one thereafter. They alone sent 18.32 per cent of FS

in 2010-11, 19.14 per cent in 2011-12 and 17.41 per cent in 2012-13. Completion of contentions and melting of snow among India and Nepal in the 21st century have flourished the bi-lateral relations again and sends its students to India significantly. Gulf nations have laudable and time-honoured relation with India. Iran, UAE and Saudi Arabia have procured place at top ten senders of FS by sending FS at an annual average of 2235, 1294 and 601 respectively.

Table. 2 Top Ten origins of foreign students in India

Country	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	Avg.
Nepal	1352	1411	1878	1821	1711	3208	5044	6346	5481	3122
Iran	1120	1264	2180	2669	2972	2861	2589	2329	2131	2235
UAE	1500	2034	1878	1560	1726	906	490	802	748	1294
Bhutan	286	378	531	487	680	1486	2166	2660	2274	1216
Afghanistan	35	65	422	976	1192	2086	2166	2235	1599	1197
Ethiopia	226	302	1033	1289	1937	1585	518	298	426	846
Sri Lanka	582	530	466	997	742	695	878	1207	1115	801
Malaysia	108	204	268	310	337	625	830	1765	1726	686
USA	398	483	615	396	419	627	1015	983	782	635
Saudi Arabia	419	551	771	835	1043	842	262	382	303	601
Total	6026	7222	10042	11340	12759	14921	15958	19007	16585	12633
Others	7241	7234	8349	9866	9019	8525	11573	14149	14890	10112
Grand Total	13267	14456	18391	21206	21778	23446	27531	33156	31475	22745

Source: 1) Computed from AIU data base

2) AISHE of various issues published by MHRD

3) www.uis.unesco.org/Education/International-student-flow –Official website of The UNESCO Institute for statistics

5. Quality and Mobility in India's HEIs

Table. 3 envisaged that inbound student mobility into HEIs is the best outcome of quality measured as per reputed world university rankings. All world university rankings commonly use academic reputation, staff-student ratio, faculty citations, presence of Nobel Laureates and field

medal winners and international staff and student ratio. 'Though the higher education sector is relatively small in relation to future needs, its record in terms of quality and standards of performance leave much to be desired. In global rankings of universities, very few Indian institutions find a place (Paul, 2012)'. Paul evaluated that in terms of published papers (an indicator of research output), India has slipped down from the eighth place in 1985 to the fourteenth in 2006. Thus though we have a few outstanding colleges and other higher education institutions, the vast majority do not meet international standards of quality and excellence. According to some observers, the entry of self-financing private colleges in a big way has exacerbated this problem. This in turn has negative implications for the acceptance of our degrees and of the graduates of the system in other countries and markets. World university rankings are the best available index to measure quality of higher education. Global competitiveness report can also be made use for analysing quality of higher education.

5.1 Ranking of Universities & Mobility

Table.3 marks that inward mobility of students are highly in favour of quality of higher education measured as per university ranking. But inbound mobility of students is not the perfect outcome of quality. It's shown in the table that top 10 destination states of FS in India have 88 per cent of the top 50 universities or university level institutions and 73 per cent of the top 100 universities hosted 95.24 per cent of total FS enrolled in India. It elevates the arguments that occupancy of inward mobile students and quality of higher education are the dominations of a few states. Highest number of top rated institutions was located in Tamil Nadu where the number of FS hosted is not the highest while Karnataka hosted highest number of FS where the number of top rated institutions is not highest. It's surprising that Karnataka and Tamil Nadu together hosted more than half of the FS located only 36 per cent of the top 50 institutions and 26 per cent of the top 100 institutions. It reveals that there are several other factors affecting mobility other than quality. Top 5 destination states viz. Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh and Delhi hosted 81.67 per cent of FS and located 64 per cent of top 50 and 49 per cent of top 100 universities. It intensified the argument of concentration of FS in a few states. Maharashtra hosted 14.68 per cent of total FS in India carried 20 per cent of top 50 and 14 per cent of top 100 universities. Another factor for raising the doubts about the relation between quality of higher education and quantity of mobile students is the presence of Sikkim in the list of top 10 destination states and its absence in the list of top 50 and 100 universities in India.

There are several other states unable to find a place in the list of top 10 destination states but possessed a space in the list of top institutions such as Assam, Uttarakhand, Kerala, Jharkhand, Himachal Pradesh, Rajasthan, Goa, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh and Jammu & Kashmir. It necessitates making an attempt to find common features and advantages of the top destination states of FS in India.

Dispersion from the average or expected value is highest in Karnataka where standard deviation is 13.84 which is greater than the total of the top 10 destinations. It indicates accumulation of FS in Karnataka who are attracted by many other factors besides quality of higher education. But all other states have smaller values of SD. The value of SD is lowest in Maharashtra and Punjab (0.53) shows closer relation between quality and mobility. The SD of the top ten states is 11.34 lies just below that of Karnataka indicate that quality is not the only factor but exists many other factors along with quality.

Table.3 Top 10 destination states of FS and share of top universities/university level institutions in India, 2011-12

Rank	Destination state	Number of FS	Share (%)	Top 50 Universities	Top 100 Universities	SD
1	Karnataka	12,508	37.73	8 (16.00)	12 (12.00)	13.84
2	Tamil Nadu	4,866	14.68	10 (20.00)	14 (14.00)	3.28
3	Maharashtra	4,242	12.80	6 (12.00)	13 (13.00)	0.53
4	Andhra Pradesh	3,580	10.80	3 (6.00)	3 (3.00)	3.93
5	Delhi	1,878	5.66	5 (10.00)	7 (7.00)	2.22
6	Uttar Pradesh	1,725	5.20	5 (10.00)	7 (7.00)	2.42
7	Punjab	1,055	3.18	2 (4.00)	3 (3.00)	0.53
8	West Bengal	807	2.43	3 (6.00)	10 (10.00)	3.79
9	Sikkim	496	1.50	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0.87
10	Gujarat	417	1.26	2 (4.00)	4 (4.00)	1.58
Total		31,574	95.24	44 (88.00)	73 (73.00)	11.34

Source: 1) MHRD. AISHE 2011-12

2)Webometrics Ranking of Universities

Note: 1) SD= Standard Deviation

2) Figures in brackets show percentages of top 50 and 100 universities

Quality and mobility can be analysed in another way. It is interesting to note that more than 80 per cent of the FS in India were enrolled in universities which ranked with in top 50 Indian universities by Webometrics Ranking in 2012. A great majority of such students were enrolled in a few institutions such as Manipal University, University of Mysore and Bangalore University in Karnataka, University of Pune in Maharashtra, University of Delhi and IGNOU in Delhi, Osmania University in Andhra Pradesh, Banaras Hindu University and Aligarh Muslim University in UP and Bharathiar University and University of Madras in Tamil Nadu. This proves that quality has unbreakable leverage on mobility of international students.

5.2 Ranking of Colleges & Mobility of Foreign Students (FS)

As mentioned above, quality of higher education has a tendency to attract FS and inward mobility is the primary outcome of quality which is usually measured in terms of ranking. It's shown from the Table.4 that 82 per cent of top 50 Arts Colleges, 86 per cent of top 50 Science Colleges and 82 per cent of top 50 Commerce Colleges were located in top 5 destination states which accommodated 81.67 per cent of FS in India in 2011-12. Even though there is perfect match with the share of FS in top destination states and quality of education, state-wise distribution of FS was not exactly in accordance with the distribution of top colleges. Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh possessed inward mobile students and top rated colleges in almost equal proportion. Tamil Nadu hosted 14.68 per cent of total FS in India and located 14 per cent of top arts and commerce colleges and 20 per cent of top science colleges. Andhra Pradesh hosted 10.80 per cent of FS and located 12 per cent of top 50 colleges. Karnataka procured a lion share of FS with 37.73 per cent had only 12 per cent of top 50 arts and commerce colleges and 14 per cent of top science colleges. As against this, Maharashtra hosted 12.80 per cent of FS and located a greater share of 22 per cent of top arts and commerce colleges and 26 per cent of top science colleges. According as Delhi hosted just 5.66 per cent of FS procured a remarkable share 22 percent of top arts and commerce colleges and 14 per cent of top science colleges.

Table.4 Top 5 destination states and their share in top 50 Colleges in 2011-12

Rank in no. of FS	State	Share (%) of total FS	Top 50 Colleges		
			Arts	Science	Commerce
1	Karnataka	37.73	6 (12.00)	7 (14.00)	6 (12.00)

2	Tamil Nadu	14.68	7 (14.00)	10 (20.00)	7 (14.00)
3	Maharashtra	12.80	11 (22.00)	13 (26.00)	11 (22.00)
4	Andhra Pradesh	10.80	6 (12.00)	6 (12.00)	6 (12.00)
5	Delhi	5.66	11 (22.00)	7 (14.00)	11 (22.00)
Total		81.67	41 (82.00)	43 (86.00)	41 (82.00)
Grand total		100	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)	50 (100.00)

Source: 1) MHRD. AISHE 2011-12

2) The India Today-Nielson Survey 2012. www.indiatoday.in/bestcolleges

Note: Figures in brackets show percentages of total

The discussion on quality of higher education and mobility of FS in India gives us different pictures. Maharashtra, the inevitable part of the nation and its higher education system has lot to be idealised with a state like Karnataka which hosted FS three times higher than that of top ranked colleges in India. But we will realise the non-capitalized potential of Maharashtra which hosted FS just half of the share of top ranked colleges. Delhi is another state with lower share of FS and greater share of top ranked universities and colleges in India. Since quality of higher education had not exactly resulted in mobility in many states, it is necessary to explore several other factors augmented the inward mobility of students in the top destination states.

6. Other Favourable Factors in Top Five Destination States

Quality of higher education resulted greatly in inward mobility in India. But imperfect match between these two raises the need for exploring other factors accelerating the pace of mobility of international students. Following factors or features were identified common for the top five destination states of India. Quality accompanied by prosperity of a state, presence of top populous cities and presence of number of universities and colleges will have ascended effect on mobility.

6.1 Prosperity of the states: Prosperity or richness of a state shows its base and ability in hosting FS and catering their needs. Prosperity of a state can be measured by Gross State Domestic Product (GSDP). 38.59 per cent of India's GDP in 2011-12 was contributed by the top five destinations. Maharashtra is the richest Indian state by means of GSDP has the 3rd rank in hosting FS in India. Third richest state Andhra Pradesh occupied 4th rank in hosting FS. Tamil Nadu is the 2nd top destination occupied 4th place in income. Even as a Union Territory, Delhi

managed to be 11th in the list of richest states and 5th among top five destinations (Ministry of Finance, 2014).

6.2 Urbanization: Inbound mobility of students was largely induced by the presence of populous cities especially metropolitan cities. A large portion of universities and colleges was located in urban areas where the FS have easy access and teeming mind to use the urban amenities. It's interesting to know that top five Indian populous cities are located in top 5 destination states of FS viz. Mumbai in Maharashtra, New Delhi in Delhi, Chennai in Tamil Nadu, Bangalore in Karnataka and Hyderabad in Andhra Pradesh respectively. Karnataka has 2 of top 50 populous cities of India out of which Bangalore occupied largest number of colleges. Tamil Nadu has three of top 50 populous cities lies at second in the list of top destination states. Maharashtra is the state with largest number of top populous cities in India with 12 and bagged third among top five destinations. Andhra Pradesh with three of top 50 cities including Hyderabad occupied 4th in the list of top five destinations. Delhi with the status of second populous city found its space at 5th among top five destination states. Totally 21 of top 50 populous cities in India were located in top 5 destination states (Ministry of Home Affairs, 2014).

6.3 Quantity of HEIs: The distribution of universities and colleges in the states has naming effect on inward mobility. 33.42 per cent of total universities and 43.52 per cent of total colleges in India were located in top 5 destination states in 2011-12. It evinces the enhanced size of higher education in these states. Karnataka occupied 6th and 4th ranks in locating the number of universities and colleges respectively lies at top of the top 5 destination states. Tamil Nadu attained 2nd rank in hosting FS possessed 1st rank in locating universities with 59 and 6th rank in locating colleges with 2309. Maharashtra was 3rd in the list of top 5 destination possessed 5th rank in locating universities with 44 and 3rd rank in locating colleges with 4603. Size of higher education was significant in the state of Andhra Pradesh with 7.32 per cent of total universities and 13.80 per cent of total colleges in India. Andhra Pradesh was 4th in the list of top destination procured 3rd rank in locating universities and 2nd rank in locating colleges in India. Delhi, the National Capital Territory of India was managed to be 5th in the list of top five destination and 10th rank in locating universities. Furthermore these five destinations together accounted for 33.42 per cent of the total universities and 43.52 per cent of total colleges in India (MHRD, 2014).

7. Inward Mobility of Foreign Students: Inauspicious Climate in India

Inward student mobility as an indicator of quality education and fitting environment, Indian higher education has so far proved its inability and backwardness in meliorating these three. India could not capitalize its large size of land, greater share of world population, superior size of higher education, larger share of public authority in higher education, invasive presence of private agencies in higher education, larger size of the economy and pride past of ancient universities in espousing international students. Above all, India has never succeeded in redounding its rich heritage and long tradition in fascinating them. India has the third largest number of HEIs of which its universities and colleges add up to 35,000, just below those of the US and China. The Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) of India's higher education, however, is a mere ten per cent. Thus poor access for its nationals in its domestic higher education institutions might have roped its aspiration to afford access to foreign nationals. Poor world ranking of India's HEIs and its poor employability, India's poor global competitiveness, poor infrastructure, lack of efficiency and innovation, soaring domestic violence and insecurity have altogether contributed to descend in hosting foreign students.

'Down one position, India now ranks 60th, continuing its downward trend that began in 2009. With a GCI score essentially unchanged since then, India has been overtaken by a number of countries. Once ahead of Brazil and South Africa, it now trails them by several places and is behind China by a margin of 31 positions, while Russia (64th) has almost closed the gap. India continues to be penalized for its very disappointing performance in the basic drivers underpinning competitiveness, the very ones that matter the most for India given its stage of development (WEF, 2013)'. It cast light to the unwelcome air in India and jab at the need for intensive diligence from the whole community.

7.1 World Ranking of Universities: Delving India's Status: It was clear from the Table.1 that India hasn't an influential role in hosting FS which enrolled a mere 0.77 per cent of total internationally mobile students in 2012. India couldn't bring its overbalance in outbound mobility to inbound mobility so far. Poor ranking of Indian universities or university level institutions instigated for its negligible share in hosting FS. Webometrics ranking 2014 unveils that only 4 universities from India booked their tickets in the top ranked category of 1 to 1000. The ranking range of 8001-9000 accommodated most number of Indian universities i.e. 52 followed by 47 universities in the ranking range of 7001-8000, 44 in 4001-500, 37 in 5001-6000, 36 in 9001-10000, 35 each in 3001-4000 and 6001-7000. The majority of Indian universities or

university level institutions haven't been seated even in top 10,000 world universities. Half of the India's universities leaked from top 10,000. It shows that Indian higher education system lack competitiveness and excellence. An interesting but imaginably fact is India's share of top rated world universities are increasing slightly and steadily as ranking range expands. India's presence among top 1000 universities is shadowy which cannot be easily distinguished. Only 0.4 per cent of the top 1000 is from India just moved to 0.9 per cent among top 2000, 1.3 per cent among top 3000 and 1.85 per cent among top 4000. India's share in top 5000 universities is a mere 2.36 per cent. 598 universities in India were not able to attain the category of top 5000 universities evinces that 93 per cent of India's total universities lies at abyss of substandard (Webometrics Ranking, 2014).

7.2 Higher Education and Training: Deplorable Status of India: 'Quality of higher education and training is crucial for economies that want to move up the value chain beyond the simple production processes and products (WEF, 2013)'. It bestirs the role of higher education as an important indirect contributor to the nation's income and awakens its role in arousing growth rate. India's rank in higher education and training lies at 80s or 90s throughout the last five years. India's five year average rank is 88.4 out of 148 countries. India's inability in nurturing pools of well-educated workers who can perform complex tasks and adapting to the changing environment which are required for the today's globalized economy is reflected in our poor share of inbound mobile students (WEF, 2010-2014).

7.3 Health and Primary Education: Lack of Strong Foundation: A healthy environment is necessary for the large inflow of international students. Thus investment in providing health services is crucial not only for raising the productivity of the nation's workforce but for creating a silk route for easing the mobility of international students. Quantity and quality of primary education is needed for creating a strong foundation for secondary and tertiary education. India's ranking in these two primary indicators lies extremely backward at 104 in 2010-11 slightly improved to 98 in 2014-15. The five year average ranking of 101.2 unveils our backwardness in health and education indicators like high infant mortality rate and maternal mortality rate, low life expectancy, illiteracy, poor enrolment ratio and high dropout ratio (WEF, 2010-2014)

7.4 Inadequate Infrastructure: 'Extensive and efficient infrastructure is crucial for ensuring the effective functioning of the economy, as it is an important factor in determining the location of economic activity and the kinds of activities or sectors that can develop within a country. Well-

developed infrastructure reduces the effect of distance between regions, integrating the national market and connecting it at low cost to markets in other countries and regions (WEF, 2013)'. India lacks an efficient and competent infrastructure that gratifies international students. Ramshackle and narrow roads, extreme pressure on public transportation system and insanitary public places etc. beget disruptions on possible entry of FS. India's overall infrastructure ranking lies at 80s out of 148 countries throughout the five years since 2010-11. The five year average ranking is 86.2 making it operoseness for the mobility of FS into India's higher education institutions (WEF, 2010-2014).

7.5 Macroeconomic Environment: Unending Instability & Poor Income Per capita:

Macroeconomic stability and optimum size of the economy accrue the foundation for supporting all activities and furnish all arrangements to conserve the internationally mobile students. India has high macroeconomic instability which has poor ranking of above 100 since last 4 years. The year 2010-11 gives well being for Indian economy as it has attained a decent growth rate and made a fast recovery after the less affected global recession. Meanwhile Indian economy fell in to the deep pit of economic recession and is making acute attempts to recover from the same through *make in India* campaign. Moreover, International Monetary Fund (IMF) data shows that India's per capita income is among the lowest in the world and is lowest among BRICS in 2013. In 2013-14, India's ranking was poorest ever since the last five years i.e. 110 out of 148 countries due to unstable and inadequate growth rate. India's five year average ranking of 97.6 shows the relevance on reclaiming for harvesting the desirable outcome of the Central Government scheme (WEF, 2010-2014).

7.6 Technological Readiness: India's Delayed Relay: How a nation is adapting latest technology and how it is advanced over the home nation are important for a foreign student seeking to study abroad. Technological readiness measures the agility and ability of a nation to march with advanced countries. India's circumstance is deplorably as its ranking run along aback frequently from 2010-11. India's collapse from 86 in 2010-11 to 121 in 2014-15 marks its inability to hold out in the present day world. Its average ranking is also not granting consoles since it lies at 98.8 (WEF, 2010-2014).

7.7 Peace and Internal Security: Intermittent Unrest: Peaceful condition is required for the free flow of foreign students along with quality of higher education and other factors. India's status is extremely pathetic in offering a secure life for its residents. Internal unrest turned out of

large communal riots like Bombay riots in 1992-93, Sopore riots in Kashmir in 1993, Chamba massacre in Himachal Pradesh in 1998, Chittisingpura massacre in Jammu & Kashmir in 2000, Amarnath pilgrimage massacre in Jammu & Kashmir in 2000, ferocious Gujarat pogrom in 2002, Naroda Patiya massacre in Gujarat in 2002, Akshardham Temple attack in Gujarat in 2002, Varanasi bombings in 2006, Doda massacre in Jammu & Kashmir in 2006, Kandhamal riots in Orissa in 2008, Mumbai massacre in 2008, Dantewada bus bombing in Chattisgarh in 2010, Assam violence in 2012 and Muzaffarnagar riots in UP in 2013 and other smaller riots and non-murder crimes like theft, burglary, hurt, molestation, rape and robbery put India at the bottom stage of peace. India's five year average ranking in terms of internal peace is 140.8. Slipped down from 133 in 2010, India is at 144 out of 162 countries in 2014-15. Whichsoever, external terror attack and internal unrest led the nation to the seafloor of peace (IEP, 2010-014).

8. Inward Student Mobility: Favourable Factors in India

Despite of all these inauspicious factors that keep FS away from India, certain auspicious factors were also spotted that resulted in hosting of a mere 0.77 per cent of total internationally mobile students. It throws light on factors glamorizing them viz. large size of market, innovation, diversified culture, long tradition, political stability and quality of regulatory system.

8.1 Third Largest Market!: India's giant size of the market resulted out of its huge population is the most important factor inducing inflow of FS in the country. India bagged 3rd rank from Japan in 2011-12 and continues its domination just behind US and China thereafter. Global Competitiveness Reports from 2010 to 2014 mark that India's average ranking in terms of market size is 3.2. It's important to note that all top ten markets in the world except India viz. US, China, Japan, Germany, UK, Russia, France and Italy respectively together hosted 59 per cent of total international mobile students in the world in 2012 and included among top ten destinations of FS.

8.2 Innovation: Fresh Anticipation: India, despite of a factor driven economy managed to be ranked in top 50 countries in terms of innovation. Even though fallen from 39 in 2010-11 to 49 in 2014-15, its five-year average ranking from 2010 to 2014 is 41.6 (WEF,2010-2014). 'Innovation is particularly important for economies as they approach the frontiers of knowledge and possibility of generating more value by only integrating and adapting exogenous technologies tends to disappear (WEF, 2013)'. An innovative economy marks its capability and potential in dispelling the quandary of obscurity over inward mobility.

8.3 Political Stability of the Largest Democratic State: India, the largest democracy in the world also known for stable governments and governance. Freed from instability arises out of military assault and dissidents' rebellion, India offers a systematic way of governance needed for entry of FS despite of its poor global ranking in terms of global peace and security. India ranks at 20s throughout the four years since 2010-11 shows its stability in ranking of political stability despite of its inefficiency and corruption in governance (World Bank, 2013).

8.4 India's Declared Tradition: India has a long political, spiritual, social, economical and cultural tradition which would influence the foreigners to have a close contact with. Different dynasties ruled India in ancient, medieval and modern periods, presence and contributions of great philosophers and educationists like Mahathma Gandhi, Rabindranath Tagore, Aurobindo Ghosh and Swami Vivekananda, peaceable and gladsome co-existence of different religious devotees, adhesion of hundreds of different languages, economic domination of pre-British India and existence of prestigious Thakshashila and Nalanda Universities in ancient period brought our notability abroad.

9. Conclusion

India could not be the chief recipient of international students even it's been a dazzling state on many respects. India has not yet been able capitalize its great accomplishment over its declared tradition and culture. Despite of its glistening upsurge, it became a cheerless presence in hosting FS. Universities and Colleges have to work hard to elevate the levels of higher education since the quality is deplorable and infrastructure is inadequate. Only a sound and wide higher education system can easily and sufficiently attract and cheerily and satisfactorily accommodate foreign students. Though India sits on the fence in terms of its diversity and predominates in terms of geographical region, population, outward student mobility and tradition, it lagged behind many of the countries in terms of quality of higher education, quantity of inward student mobility and distinction of infrastructure. The fact that India's emerging domination in outward mobility of students at the backing of changed economic scenario doesn't account for corresponding outcome in inward mobility mounts certain critical concern over its poor competitiveness in terms of quality and supporting infrastructure. Even though India fronts in hosting foreign students among the whole nations except China only, origin of the foreign students in India is mostly the third world. It both affirms India's incapability in excellence of higher education and inadequate infrastructure on the one hand and

its body blow in gaining from internationalization and globalization of higher education on the other. Though quality is the most important contributory factor for mobility, other factors such as health and primary education, technological backing, macroeconomic environment, market size, internal peace and security, innovation, training, India's declared tradition and prestigious status of largest democracy also have some sort of solidity to sway the mobility of international students inward or outward.

Reference

1. British Council. (2014). 'THE INDIAN STATES: opportunities for International higher education collaboration'. Great Britain. December 2014.
2. Chinmaya Yuva Kendra. (2007). 'Awakening Indians to India'. Mumbai: Central Chinmaya Mission Trust.
3. ICEF. (2014). 'Summing up international student mobility in 2014'. Accessed at www.Monitor.icef.com/2014/02 on 08/12/2014.
4. Indiatoday. (2014). 'India Today-Nielson Survey of India's Best Colleges'. Accessed at www.indiatoday.intoday.in./story/india-today-nelison-best-colleges. Noida.
5. Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP). (2010-2014). 'Global Peace Index Annual Report'. Sydney: IEP.
6. Ministry of Home Affairs. (2014). 'Census India 2011'. New Delhi.
7. Ministry of Finance. (2014). 'Economic Survey 2013-14'. New Delhi.
8. OECD. (2004). 'Internationalisation and Trade of Higher Education: Opportunities and Challenges'. Paris: OECD.
9. Paul, Samuel. (2012). 'Internationalization of Higher Education: Strategic Implications'. In *Globalization and Higher Education in India*, eds K.N Panikkar and M. Bhaskaran Nair, pp. 25-36. Delhi: PEARSON.
10. Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) Limited. (2014). 'QS University Ranking'. Accessed at www.topuniversities.com/qs-world-university-rankings. United Kingdom.
11. UNESCO. (2013). 'The International Mobility of Students in Asia and Pacific'. UNESCO Bangkok.
12. Webometrics Ranking. (2014). 'Ranking Web of Universities'. Accessed at www.webometrics.info/en/Asia/India.
13. WEF. (2010-2014). 'Global Competitiveness Report'. Full data edition. Geneva

14. Woodfield, Steve. (2010). 'Key Trends and Emerging Issues in International Student Mobility (ISM)'. In *Globalization and Internationalization of Higher Education*, eds Felix Meringe and Nick Foskett, pp. 109-124. New York: Continuum Publishing Group.
15. World Bank. (2014). *The World Wide Governance Indicators 2013*. Washington DC.

