Chapter 2
Theoretical Landscape

International student mobility was considered as a key component and result of the internationalization of higher education and it has also accelerated the development of this process as well. History told us that the earliest mobility of students and scholars could be traced back to the Middle Ages; however, did this mobility have the same meaning from medieval times to nowadays? To answer this question, we should start from the study of the contexts.

This part begins with a presentation of research work on conceptualizations and rationales of internationalization of higher education. Considering the widespread use of the term “internationalization” in different research fields and applied by researchers in different disciplines such as sociology, political science, economics, and education, this part of the literature is selectively presented for the purpose of constructing the conceptual framework for this study. Furthermore, the research work on the European version of internationalization is also presented to show the impact of the rising regionness on higher education development and a historical review is adopted to understand the ongoing development of European higher education in which student mobility has been playing a principal role.

The second section mainly references the research on the historical development of the dual system in French higher education and the challenges it is facing in the context of internationalization. It starts with a brief review of the creation of the dual system from social, political, and economic perspectives. By tracing back to some key historical sources, the creation and institutional growth of grandes écoles and several significant reforms in French university history are precisely and selectively elaborated. The second subsection mainly concerns how internationalization challenges the two groups of institutions in terms of governance, finance, and organization structures. The issue of how to survive the competition for international students both at national and international levels has become a very serious problem to deal with for this highly nation-state oriented dual system and some profound reforms may be required.

The last section is a brief introduction of previous research work on international student mobility. The review is composed of studies on students’ motivation to study abroad and university choice; international students’ intercultural
experience abroad; and some official reports published at national, regional, and global levels. I also present the results of my previous research on the international student experience in France and China. I intend to show the continuity of my research trajectory and the evolution of my research perspective in this study. Also, considering the lack of studies on the international student population in China, I try to present some students’ experiences in Chinese higher education institutions as well as in their daily lives. This can bring a small comparative element into the review.

2.1 Internationalization of Higher Education: International and European Vision

2.1.1 Global Context: Conceptualization and Rationales

Internationalization is not a new term to describe the development of higher education and it existed a long time ago. According to Teichler (2009), the term of reinternationalization is more appropriate to describe the recent development in higher education:

The claim that higher education is internationalizing or ought to be is somewhat surprising, because universities have long been considered one of society’s most international institutions (p. 95).

The growing interest and debates about internationalization during the last two decades have helped us develop new perspectives on internationalization and the heterogeneity of contexts produces different approaches to internationalizing higher education. Before getting into the research works on definition and rationales of internationalization in general, we present a historical perspective on internationalizing higher education on a global scale and this part of the review is mainly drawn from the work of Knight (Knight and De Wit 1995; Knight 2003a, b).

As Kerr stated in his essays on “The Nation-State and the Internationalization of the Enterprise of Learning” (quoted in Knight and De Wit 1995, p. 6), universities are by nature international institutions functioning in a national context and striving for the advancement of universal knowledge. After more than 800 years of development, higher education went through three important models or typologies (Kerr 1994; quoted in Knight and De Wit 1995, p. 6):

1. “A convergent model” of universal education
2. “A divergent model” in which higher education became an essential aspect of national identity development in service of the administrative and economic interests of the nation-state
3. “A partial re-convergent model” in which the national and transnational development of higher learning is supported by the nation-state
The international dimension of education was first represented by the pilgrimage of student elites and scholars in pursuit of the universality of knowledge in the Middle Ages. During the period from the end of the Renaissance to the second half of the twentieth century, a highly nationally oriented higher education appeared and was represented by the export of higher education systems from colonizing countries to their colonies and other developing countries and the international mobility of scholars and students on a small scale. From the end of the Second World War to the present day, the development of the internationalization of higher education was greatly influenced by certain political and economic factors in the world. In the early period after the Second World War, the two superpowers of the Cold War era, the United States and the Soviet Union, mainly controlled the international education market and international student mobility was more related to diplomacy than to academic and cultural cooperation. From the 1980s to nowadays, the collapse of communism, the rise of new economic powers (Japan, China, India, Brazil), the strengthening of the European Community, the increasing South–South cooperation, and so on, have led to more diversification in international education activities.

On the basis of the development of international activities in higher education, many researchers have analyzed the rationales of internationalization from political, economic, and cultural aspects in general. Knight and De Wit (1995) pointed out that different stakeholders in internationalization of education, such as “international, national and regional governments; private sector; institutions; faculty and students” (p. 9), have different ways of explaining the internationalization phenomenon. She also categorized the rationales of internationalization of higher education in two aspects in summing up the previous research work on this question.

On one hand, in terms of economic-political incentives, internationalization of education, mainly higher education, is considered as a “diplomatic investment in future economic relations and in future political relations” (p. 11) and it pushes economic growth and foreign policy development with technological development, and prepares the graduates with more international experience to improve their competitiveness in the global labor market. The financial interests produced by the higher tuition fees for international students that have been adopted in some countries (such as the United Kingdom and the United States), by the international technical assistance and advisory service, and by the collaborative educational programs have become one of the important driving forces of the internationalization of higher education.

Meanwhile, the commodification of higher education stimulates international academic mobility and commercial forces have occupied an increasingly legitimate and even dominant place in higher education (Kirk 2003; Altbach 2002; Altbach and Knight 2007). Moreover, with the changing profiles of international students from scholarship holders/elites to more self-supporting students, the sending countries have given students more freedom to study abroad and meanwhile, the host countries, particularly the top destinations facing the greatest demand from the market, have developed a more comprehensive system of educational
programs responding to international students’ needs. The more politically and diplomatically oriented student exchange has developed to a more economically driven mode.

The World Trade Organization (WTO) will provide a regulatory framework to encourage international trade in education and service-related industries as part of negotiating the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). (Altbach and Knight 2007, p. 291)

On the other hand, in terms of cultural-educational incentives, internationalization has a “cultural function” to play. For some nations in particular, this function was interpreted as the export of national, cultural, and moral values. Others considered that internationalization should reinforce the cultural function of the university and it was elaborated by the former director of UNESCO, Federico Mayor in the following way:

…[T]he cultural function of the European university goes hand in hand not only with its humanistic research, but also with its international dimension. To develop an awareness of the interdependence of peoples and societies in today’s world must be one of the basic functions of the universities. (Knight and De Wit 1995, p. 12)

For the institutions, internationalization of higher education pushes them to develop more international collaboration programs that provide the institution with more academic resources and enlarge its international social networks to help its own development. With regard to the academic aspects, the international and intercultural features introduced in the process of internationalization will stimulate the academic staff’s critical thinking and remind them of the complexity of the questions and perspectives that they are dealing with in their research. The internationalization efforts are meant to accelerate the mutual understanding and appreciation of the interdependence of nations in terms of social, economic, and political domains. Considering the influence on the faculty and students, international mobility, as one of the major activities of the internationalization of higher education, provides them with more chances to live and study in another culture. This intercultural experience has an effect both on their personal and professional development. For those less mobile faculty members and students, internationalization creates a globalized atmosphere in their study and teaching or research, which helps to increase their awareness and understanding of new developments in different fields in different countries.

The diversification of the rationales indicates that internationalization of higher education nowadays becomes more of a necessity than a choice. This leads to another key question: as the term “internationalization” has recently been frequently used in different research fields, does it mean the same thing when they use the term; in other words, what’s the definition of internationalization, the one that is employed in the conceptualization of this research?

In article, “Strategies for Internationalization of Higher Education: Historical and Conceptual Perspectives” (1995), Knight and De Wit listed some of the previous
definitions in other researchers’ works and analyzed them from four different approaches to internationalization: “activity, competency, ethos and process” (p. 16).

- The activity approach: In terms of categories or types of activities, exclusively focuses on academic activities
- The competency approach: In terms of developing new skills, attitudes, knowledge in students, faculty, and staff, focuses on the human dimension
- The ethos approach: Focuses on developing an ethos or culture in the university or college that values and supports intercultural and international perspectives and initiatives
- The process approach: Frames internationalization as a process that integrates an international dimension or perspective into the major functions of the institution

On the basis of these previous works, and considering the appearance of new phenomena of internationalizing higher education in recent years, Knight and De Wit produced their definition of internationalization of higher education and later developed it.

[... ] the process of integration the international dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of an institution of higher education. An international dimension is described as “a perspective, activity or program which introduces or integrates an international/intercultural/global outlook into the major functions of a university or college”. (1995, p. 15)

An updated definition was also proposed by Knight in 2003:

Internationalization at the national/sector/institutional levels is defined as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education.” (p. 2)

The evolution of the definition proposed by Knight implied the changes and challenges in the new context after years of development. The growing numbers of education providers and the diversification of their educational interests and approaches reinforced the necessity of the embodiment of an international, intercultural, and global dimension. Meanwhile, the more general terms such as “purpose, function, and delivery” are employed in order to respect the different profiles of education providers and their educational objectives. However, the terms “process” and “integration” stay in the new definition, which reaffirm the continuity of internationalization from a developmental perspective and its basic neutrality. Meanwhile, the term “integration” redescribes the process starting from the individual’s awareness to embedding the international and intercultural dimension into official commitments. Regarding the different emphasis of the definitions given by researchers, the present study is conducted on the basis of Knight’s theory of internationalization and considers that internationalization of higher education is a process starting from awareness or a positive attitude towards developing the international or intercultural dimension in higher education, followed by the endorsement of this attitude in an institutional/sector/national culture, putting the ideas into practice and reviewing the results frequently in order to get improvement.
2.1.2 Regional Context: Construction of European Higher Education Area (EHEA)

The previous section mainly concentrated on the theoretical development of rationales and the conceptualization of internationalization of higher education from a global perspective; in other words, it drew a general conceptual map for internationalization of higher education. However, the internationalizing process is highly contextualized in terms of sociohistorical and geopolitical development. Here in this section, the internationalization of higher education in Europe is closely examined by going through the important phases of higher education institutional development related to the mobility of students and scholars, particularly in the Middle Ages and after the Second World War.

Four volumes of *A History of the University in Europe*, edited by Ridder-Symoens (1 and 2) and Rüegg (3 and 4) and published by Cambridge University Press, have provided the main historical resources for the researcher to understand the origins of the modern university and the related questions that had been raised since its creation but still stay in focus today.

The university is a European institution; indeed, it is the European institution par excellence…it is a creation of medieval Europe, which was the Europe of papal Christianity…. it’s moreover the only European institution which has preserved its fundamental patterns and its basic social role and functions over the course of history … the university is a European institution because it has, in its social role, performed certain functions for all European societies. It has developed and transmitted scientific and scholarly knowledge and the methods of cultivating that knowledge which has arisen from and formed part of the common European intellectual tradition. It has at the same time formed academic elite, the ethos of which rests on common European values and which transcends all national boundaries. (Rüegg 2003, v. 1, p. xix)

Several key elements are well presented in this brief introduction to the European university. First of all, the university is an institution, more than an organization. Second, it keeps its fundamental patterns after centuries of development, which implies modifications and changes have been conducted in different socioeconomic contexts during different historical periods. Third, it has a social role to play that shows its tight relationship with the development of the whole society. Last but not least, the production and transmission of scientific and academic knowledge have been inherited as part of the European intellectual tradition and the whole academic ethos has been formed based on European values. All these elements are very helpful for us to understand the ongoing higher education system reforms in Europe and its relative issues.

The two oldest universities (Bologna and Paris) were created in Europe by the end of the twelfth century and in the early thirteenth century, and by the end of the fifteenth century a large number of universities were created in the whole of Europe. During this period of time, the mobility of the students and teachers, so-called European “academic pilgrimages” (Ridder-Symoens 2003, v. 1, p. 280) had developed into a phenomenal movement. Students and scholars traveled from one country to another, motivated by their eagerness to learn from the best scholars in
the most prestigious universities and some of them even studied in several countries. In addition to their passion for scholarly knowledge, what other elements exerted push and pull in this mobility? To answer this question, we have to concentrate on two main aspects: financial and academic. With regard to the financial support, the profiles of the few elite confirmed their social-economic privilege, which guaranteed all their expenses during the mobility. Moreover, some of the universities also offered scholarships. With regard to the academic support, Latin, the only language for teaching until the seventeenth century, common curricular design, and the delivery of common degrees in all European universities were identified as the fundamental accelerators for the development of this mobility. Even though the number of these few “elite” was not significant, we could still see its long-lasting impact on European society as a whole in terms of knowledge transmission and intercultural communication and understanding between different countries.

Besides their academic knowledge they took home with them a host of new experiences, ideas, opinions, and political principles and views. Also – and this is important – they brought back manuscripts and, later on, printed books. They had become familiar with new schools of artistic expression, and with living conditions, customs, ways of life and eating and drinking habits all previously unknown to them. As most itinerant scholars belonged to the elite of their country and later held high office, they were well placed to apply and propagate their newly acquired knowledge. (Ridder-Symoens 2003, v. 1, p. 303)

All the above analysis of European academic pilgrimages reminds us of the approaches that we still use nowadays to study student mobility and meanwhile, the principal factors that promote or influence mobility have been still functioning today.

In the following nine centuries, universities experienced different historical periods and their functioning models and development were greatly influenced by the nationalism of the societies, however, they survived and remain key institutions in Europe (Barblan 2011, v. 4, p. 572). By 1939, around 201 universities were created in Europe with 300 specialized institutions of higher education that prepared students for professions in the military, medicine (including veterinary medicine), agriculture, education, music, engineering, and commerce (Rüegg 2011a, b v. 4, p. 12) and the increasing number of the universities reinforced the idea of the nation-state development. The diversified national education programs, curricula, teaching in the national language, and national degrees destroyed the prerequisite conditions for student and scholar mobility. However, the outbreak of the Second World War acted as a turning point for the revival of student and scholar mobility.

The Second World War led to great economic depression for European countries and devastated the university landscape as well, particularly in Eastern Europe. The destructiveness of the war made the world realize two things: the importance of the development of science and technology and the importance of enhancing communication and mutual understanding among countries. Thus universities have become the main mission carrier to fulfill these two demands. In responding to the first demand, universities needed to form more competent and
diversified human capital for the overall development of sectors in society and a series of reforms were implemented: increasing student enrollment, introducing new learning subjects, diversifying education programs, short-cycle formation in particular, and developing the relationship between universities and the private sector, among others. In responding to the second demand, the globalization of university relationships has become a necessity and meanwhile, some supranational institutions were founded for the purpose of accelerating global stability, and economic and cultural development. Several exchange programs of professors and researchers were initiated, such as the Fulbright program in 1948 and the Humboldt Foundation in 1953 (Rüegg 2011a, b, v. 4), and Inter-University Cooperation Programs (ICPs) were also developed in the 1980s.

With regard to student mobility, we could see its imbalanced development at intra-European and international levels. In the 1950s and 1960s, the major concern of Europe focused on the reconstruction of society and economic recovery. At the international level, the circulation of degree-seeking international students was mainly the elites from developing countries to colonial and imperialist powers, mostly to the United Kingdom, France, and Germany. In the 1960s, with a changing relationship between the colonial world and developing countries, students from developing countries were offered more opportunities to study with scholarships in colonial countries, especially those students whose home countries had a strong cultural and linguistic relationship with the host countries. In addition, developing countries received more academic expertise and material support in order to improve their own institutions. At the European level, cross-border student mobility and intra-European study recognition were mainly promoted by the European Community, the most “active political actor” since the 1970s (De Wit 2002; European Commission 1994; Wächter et al. 1999; Teichler 2009). Multiple programs were implemented in the 1980s and 1990s, such as Erasmus implemented in 1987 for student mobility, European Course Credit Transfer System (ECTS implemented in 1989) for a uniform system of credit transfer, Tempus for assisting Eastern and Central Europe, and so on (Rothblatt 2011, v. 4, p. 271). After the treaty of Maastricht in 1992, various programs have been reconstructed or merged into two large programs: Socrates for education and Leonardo de Vinci for vocational training and Erasmus became a subprogram of Socrates. While maintaining scholarship for mobile students, the program has enlarged the investment in teaching staff mobility and curricula innovation. The success of Erasmus created a good educational atmosphere not only for mobile students but also for those domestic students who got benefits from the curricular innovation implanted with a “European dimension.”

The most important reform of the higher education system in Europe started in the 1990s and the construction of a European Higher Education Area (EHEA) was initiated by the well-known “Bologna Process,” which refers to the ongoing multinational reforms among some European countries (signatory nations) and intends to create a “barrier-free” (Papatsiba 2006) higher education area by establishing structural convergence. The whole process has been considered a turning point in
the development of European higher education (Haug 1999; van der Wende 2003; Papatsiba 2006). In the whole context of the Bologna process, increasing student mobility has been taken as the “uncontroversial” aim and one of the ultimate reasons for establishing EHEA (Papatsiba 2006, p. 97). In terms of economic development, students, the major human resources in the labor market, could enlarge their visions and enrich their professional and personal skills, which could be very helpful and productive for market development. In terms of civic development, the mobility experience could be a facilitator for reinforcing mutual understanding and forming their identity as European citizens (Papatsiba 2006).

Moreover, we should also be aware of an important external element that kept pushing the development of EHEA: competing with the American hegemony in higher education. As previously elaborated, the university model was invented in Europe and well developed for several centuries. The adoption and contextual adaptation were successfully implemented in the United States, particularly the further development of the combination of teaching and research and these elements made American higher education institutions more attractive and competitive (Rüegg 2011a, b, v. 4, p. 26). Thus, the construction of the EHEA could be one of the means to ameliorate the attractiveness of European higher education and improve its competitiveness for the best talents for study and research at the international level; in other words, it was a way to respond to the internationalization of higher education. Teichler (2009) employed the term “Europeanization” to define the ongoing reforms in higher education as the regionally oriented version of internationalization or globalization.

It is frequently addressed with reference to cooperation and mobility. Beyond that, this term also covers such issues as integration, convergence of contexts, structures and substances (European dimension, European culture, European higher education space) or to segmentation between regions of the world (“fortress Europe”). (p. 95)

In his definition, Europeanization is interpreted as a process of cooperation and harmonization in terms of contexts, structures, and contents in order to facilitate the intra-European mobility and improve the attractiveness of European higher education. Increasing the competitiveness of higher education at a national and European level and creating well-known institutions at a world level has become the driving force of Europeanization of higher education. However, we should also realize the difficulties, governance problems in particular, facing the universities in the Europeanization and internationalization process.

With the foundation of new universities and other higher education institutions and the spread of mass universities, the nation-state met great funding difficulties. Meanwhile, with the introduction of liberalism in higher education sectors and the transition to entrepreneurial management, universities had difficult choices to make: sticking to the ideology of higher education as a public good or adopting a market model in higher education.

Since the 1980s, we observed two different strategies implemented by the institutions related to their financing system: the British model and the traditional
European model, which definitely had great impact on international student mobility.

From 1919 onwards an autonomous university organ, the University Grants Committee, distributed the state’s contribution to the universities on the basis of submitted development plans and their implementation. The British universities thus had to compete with one another to finance their basic needs. The Jarratt Report of 1985 recommended the introduction of business-like administrative control systems. The British universities still gained their funding predominantly through competitive bids for public moneys, but the business methods introduced into their administration brought about greater transparency and planned fund-raising. (Rüegg 2011a, b, v. 4, p. 15)

The British government adopted the business-like model and started charging students tuition fees. International students enrolled in British universities could pay twice as much as local students, or even three times. According to the statistics published in the report “Overseas Students and Net Migration” in February 2013 (presented by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to Parliament), “Education exports (encompassing higher education and further education, schools, English Language Teaching and educational products and services) contribute more than 14bn£ to the UK economy each year.” However, most countries in Western Europe, in particular Germany, France, Italy, and Spain, have zero or low tuition fees which benefits both EU students and other international students without differentiation. They adopted a move towards greater collaboration and exchange and programs were designed to stimulate cooperation in research and development (R&D) and in education.

Regardless of the different functioning models of universities in Europe, we could still observe the remarkable achievement of student mobility. The international educational statistics on education in Europe, principally collected by UNESCO, OECD, and Eurostat (UOE), provide researchers with detailed data of student mobility. In 2002–2003, 1.1 million foreign students (EURODATA term 2006) were enrolled at institutions of tertiary education in 32 EURODATA countries (EURODATA term 2006). More than half of the foreign students came from outside EURODATA countries, among which around 40% were Asian students, 31% African students, 15% European students, 8% Latino-Americans, and 6% Northern Americans. Meanwhile, Chinese students occupied the top of the list of this foreign student population. With regard to the host countries, the United Kingdom, Germany, and France enrolled the largest numbers (more than 60%) of foreign students in EURODATA countries.

2.2 French Dual System: A Historical Product in the Global Context

The research in higher education development was mainly conducted from economic and management perspectives and focused on the challenges on the reforms of the system in the French case. In contrast to the measures that have
been implemented in the Anglo-Saxon countries (United States, United Kingdom, Australia, Canada) for raising the numbers of “paying” international students, reforms in the system in terms of teaching and research were considered as a major concern in France. As elaborated by Vinokur (2010), “France seems much less interested in increasing its share of the international market of HE teaching services than in developing a competitive R-D university-industry sector” (p. 205). This remark well described the priority of national higher education reform and in order to understand the rationales, we have to take into account the particularity of the system and its relationship with the nation-state and the private sector. The transformation to a knowledge economy and the globalization of production and transfer of science and technology have been challenging its traditional functioning system. Thus, France has taken the demand of internationalization as a kind of external resource for pushing the internal reforms in its national higher education (Vinokur 2010). The external impacts and potential internal reforms have mutually worked on each other and created a double role for France: norm-maker and norm-taker (Vinokur 2010).

As an international society member and participant in the construction of EHEA, France has been trying to figure out how to develop its own strategies for keeping its advantages in the international higher education service market. As one of the key members in the European Union, France has been active in promoting intra-European student/academic mobility and research and development collaboration. On the other hand, France has conformed to the demand of developing an international dimension in its higher education and the corresponding reforms have also been implemented.

In a comparative study on internationalization strategies in Europe, Frolich and Veiga (2005) explained that

[…] the internationalization of higher education is a complex, multidimensional and often fragmented process. The factors that foster or impede internationalization activities developed at an institutional level cannot be viewed only in the national and international context. There are influences deeply rooted in the normative and cultural insights, such as history and culture; academic and disciplines and subjects; the higher education institution’s profiles and individual initiatives; national policies; regulatory frameworks; finance; European challenges and opportunities; and globalization. (quoted by De Wit 2010, p. 5)

Some important perspectives can be drawn to interpret the internationalization of higher education from this comprehensive remark. First, there’s no doubt that the institution is the main actor in the internationalization game. In order to better understand an institutional strategy, we should not only contextualize it at the national or international level, but also consider it on an individual basis by taking into account its functional system (governance, finance, pedagogical, and research activities) and development history. Second, the implementation of different institutional activities during the internationalization process is deeply influenced by national culture and norms and the culture of an institution, as developed over time by generations of former leaders, sometimes plays a decisive role in nurturing its approach to strategizing internationalization. Finally, as a complex and multi-dimensional phenomenon, the process of internationalization will certainly meet
some ups and downs that may be expressed in various forms of cause–effect on
the basis of contexts at different scales. In this study, institutional strategy for the
attraction of inbound graduates was defined as the core question. Therefore, before
getting to the strategies, we should first clarify: “What kind of higher education
institutions are involved here?” The next section referenced mainly the historical
studies on the development of *grandes écoles* and universities (Magliulo 1982;
Musselin 2000, 2001, 2007, 2008, 2009). The following one reviews the studies on
major challenges faced by these two groups of institutions in the new context.

\[\text{2.2.1 Coexistence of Grandes Écoles and Universities:}
\text{Historical Heritage}\]

Few studies were conducted on higher education, universities in particular, before
the May 1968 movement. The “Héritiers” (Bourdieu and Passeron 1964) was con-
sidered a path-breaking contribution. The scarcity of research continued in the
1990s in terms of historical and sociological studies on French universities (Charle
and Verger 1994; Musselin 2001). However, this situation was totally changed
later. The review on the development of the dual system was mainly drawn upon
the studies conducted by Verger (2003), Magliulo (1982), and Musselin (2001,

“Universities” and “colleges” could be considered as two terms globally rec-
ognized and employed to describe higher education institutions. For international
students or scholars, the term “*grandes écoles*” seems to be confusing. The first
question they would like to know is “Are they universities or colleges?” or “What
are they?” The explanation and definition could be both simple and complicated
as well. For those who have some basic knowledge of French higher education,
the answer could be “They are elite schools.” But why are they elite schools, what
are the differences between universities and *grandes écoles* in France, and how
is the coexistence of these two types of institution explained? Finding answers to
these questions is definitely useful for promoting this group of institutions world-
wide, particularly for attracting international students and a historical review of the
rationale for the development of this dual system is a “must” beginning.

As noted previously, one of the oldest universities, the University of Paris, was
created in France at the end of the twelfth and in the early thirteenth century. Its
birth was considered as a compromise (Verger 2003, v. 1, p. 51) in the conflict
between different parties: the prolific private schools where the masters taught var-
ious disciplines and the ecclesiastical authorities.

The University of Paris was in fact a “university of masters”, a federation of schools in
which, while maintaining their personal authority over their own pupils within their par-
ticular schools, the masters, by means of their councils and their elected officers, col-
lectively administered the whole of the studium and abided by a common agreement as
regards all matters concerning teaching and examinations. (Verger 2003, v. 1, p. 52)
The powerful role of the masters and the federal nature of these institutions mentioned in this quotation had greatly influenced the development of the French university model even if the meaning of “university” was changed several centuries later.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries some “new institutions,” “écoles spéciales” (usually translated as special schools), the predecessor of “grandes écoles” were created by several French emperors in response to social demand in terms of science and technology development. In contrast to the disciplines that were taught in the universities (law, medicine, theology, grammar, arts, etc.), these institutions were more utilitarian and oriented to social and economic needs. The title of these institutions also implied the authorities’ intentions to professionalize education in order to cultivate civil engineers and administrative technicians for that epoch. They were designed on a smaller-sized scale compared to universities, which simplified the central management and control under the authorities. Two of the world’s oldest engineering schools were founded during this period of time, École des Ponts et Chaussées (1747; École des Ponts ParisTech nowadays) with specialization in civil engineering and École de Mines (1783) in response to the need for the exploitation of mines as a high-technology industry.

With the scale expansion of the special schools and their consolidation in the eighteenth century, for students, getting educated in these institutions became a guarantee of a privileged employment opportunity in the future. The graduates from these special schools greatly responded to the urgent needs in science, technology, and military fields.

During the French Revolution, the universities were closed and replaced by some special schools (Rüegg 2011a, b, v. 4, p. 10). The imperial university was founded during 1806–1808 by Napoleon Bonaparte and this new institution was designed on the basis of an extremely utilitarian and minimalist conception. The faculties of the Imperial University were simply divided into two categories: law and medicine, and letters and sciences, with one in each academe. The former aimed to provide education for the future professional practitioners of law and medicine and the latter prepared students for the pursuit of further studies. Therefore, the nationalization and institutionalization of different disciplines became the main reform results. The rules of an individual discipline were followed nationally which reinforced the relationship between peers in different institutions, however, the communication between different faculties was greatly reduced, which weakened the University’s autonomy in managing different faculties. According to V. Karady (quoted by Musselin 2001, p. 27), the novelty of this reform existed more in integrating the teaching units into a nationally centralized administration system than in creating more new institutions.

In the French model, given its final form by Napoleon, higher education dedicated to the training of higher civil servants and officers, and the academic profession under the control of the state, fell under a bureaucratically organized administration. The same bureaucracy regulated curricula and examinations in detail, supervised the political and religious conformity of teaching, and subjected the behavior of the staff to a
quasi-military discipline. This model was very successful in the meritocratic selection and specialized training of highly qualified officials. (Ruëgg 2011a, b, v. 4, p. 11)

Meanwhile, the number of these special schools increased somewhat under the reign of Napoleon Bonaparte. Napoleon also made some reforms to reinforce the nation’s centralized control of higher education so that it could be used as a tool to serve national objectives. He implemented a tuition fee policy for some special schools, appointed certain members to control the schools’ boards of directors, and modified entrance exams and teachers’ recruitment in these schools. The centralization trend in his reforms accelerated the emergence of the dualism in the higher education system.

During one century’s development (1816–1914), the number of special schools grew from 7 to 85 and this considerable expansion resulted in some changes in the schools’ geographical locations, their social identity, and the centrality of professional needs in their teaching activities. Geographically speaking, most of the oldest special schools were located in Paris, which reflected the centralized control and power of authorities over this sector of higher education. However, after 1816, a group of new special schools were constructed in some main provincial cities. With their proliferation in different geographical locations, some new institutions’ identities became more diverse. The diversification mainly resulted from the impact of economic forces on the management of the schools, which liberated public authorities from full financial responsibility for running these schools but also encouraged the creation of private institutions. Last but not least, social economic development greatly influenced the orientation of teaching programs in these schools and more and more business schools appeared. In spite of all the modifications, these institutions still remained small in scale and stuck to the adaptation of their teaching activities to professional needs. Meanwhile, the competitive entrance selection, nonfree tuition policy, and monopoly in employment opportunities for their graduates were inherited. All these criteria deprived nearly all working-class students of any opportunity to enter these schools which became officially the transmission center of social privilege. It was also during this period of time that grandes écoles became a more preferable title to describe these schools although école spéciale (special school) didn’t disappear completely until the end of the Second World War. According to Magliulo (1982, p. 67), the adoption of the new title grande école was more than a name change but implied the sociopolitical intentions for education reform. He indicated that the original reason of the name changing stemmed from the authorities’ counterproposals of establishing a unique higher education system at the end of the nineteenth century and the new name showed the eminence of these institutions and their superiority to universities. Meanwhile, in the pedagogical evolution in these institutions during the last three centuries, especially during the nineteenth and twentieth, their production objectives were oriented from specialist talents in a generalized field to generalist talents in a specialized field.

Being considered as social elites, the graduates of these special schools were expected to dedicate their knowledge and power to social and economic
development. The teaching courses in these schools were designed to combine both traditional courses, such as classical humanities, history, literature, and so on with some technical and professionalized courses, such as mathematics, physics, and other sciences. After the BAC (baccalauréat) exam at the end of high school, only top students were recruited to the preparatory classes whose objective was to help them succeed in the entrance tests in these special schools after two or three years’ preparation. The winners of the rigorous competition would study for two or three years in the special schools before getting a high-level job in the French civil service. The design of courses reflected the impact of social technology and science development on educational programs, which could be considered as the very beginning of the relationship building between training in academic institutions and demands from professional fields. On the other hand, the entrance selection revealed two distinctive coexisting characteristics in the students’ profile: academic elites and high social status. In other words, the privilege of being accepted in these schools wasn’t open to everyone. Excellent scores and high status family affiliation became the decisive criteria in the selection. This tradition even lasts today and the social inequality in the highly limited access to this elite formation still remains at the center of social discussion.

In the interval between two world wars, the diversion of social demands from a need for a high-level technical and administration elite to a great demand for qualified workers created a pause in the development of grandes écoles.

The title “university” was reborn in the official articles of law promulgated on July 10th, 1896 which helped academe to find its place in the French higher education system. According to Renant (quoted in Musselin 2001), it was the first time after the French Revolution that the term “university” reappeared in the administration language. The rebirth of the title was accompanied by reforms that were greatly influenced by the German university model created by Wilhelm Von Humboldt in the early nineteenth century and the basic principle of Humboldt model was to guarantee academic freedom in teaching and research and the “purity” of scientific research which should not be influenced by social-economic factors.

The driving force behind this emulation of the German mode was quite evident. The French authorities intended to achieve some development in the fields of economy, politics, and military defense by imitating the German universities whose scientific “products” greatly contributed to the reinforcement of German national power. However, they didn’t take into consideration the specific characteristics of the higher education system in France. In other words, French higher education was highly controlled and designed to maximize its service to the political needs of the authorities. Thus, academics couldn’t obtain genuine freedom over teaching and research. Furthermore, lack of communication and cooperation between different faculties made the reform even more impossible in France. Therefore, the reform at this period ended in failure for the reason that instead of distributing more liberty to universities, it reinforced the centralized control of the authorities.
Although universities regained their legal administrative identity, they were still incapable of functioning as an organic institutional body. If we compare the university as a complex system that can be divided into several groups and subgroups, the hierarchy between groups and subgroups could be interpreted as a vertical relationship and the communication among supragroups or suprasubgroups as a horizontal relationship. Universities of this period still inherited the previous tradition of a discipline-centered way of functioning and supradisciplinary cooperation barely existed. Moreover, the development plans of universities were oriented by the objectives of faculties. The management of the academic profession was representative of the overall situation at that moment. It was still discipline-oriented although with some diminution of government’s intervention, universities had more and more autonomy over the management of the careers of their academics. The dean of each faculty elected by his or her peers became the main actor in the development of disciplines and each faculty had its own rules or ways of management. Thus, the university existed as a nominal group of different faculties but each faculty functioned in its own way. This historical observation reminds us of the “power of masters and federation of different schools” in the University of Paris model. The exchange between peers in the same discipline from different universities appeared to be more frequent than the communication between different disciplines in the same university. This situation lasted till the student movement in 1968. As noted by Musselin (2007), 1968 could be seen as an official date for the rebirth of French universities as institutions, however, they were still very weak actors (Charle and Verger 1994; Musselin 2007, p. 713). Moreover, the inequality between different disciplines was obvious, which also influenced the prospects for the professional development of academics. Last, on the basis of the economic and political development in different regions and the degree of local authorities’ intervention, there was a strong geographical discrepancy between faculties.

After the Second World War, just as in other European countries, France was dedicated to promoting social and economic recovery from the destruction of the war. The Trente Glorieuses (glorious 30 years from 1945–1974) proved the effectiveness of the industrialization process, which helped France achieve a prosperous socioeconomic period of 30 years. Considering the development in the universities, the professionalization of education programs, particularly the growth of the short-cycle formation in this period ameliorated the image of universities and turned them into stronger competitors to grandes écoles. The positive feedback from employers greatly encouraged the professionalization process in universities. However, it threatened the recruitment and employment of the elites in grandes écoles. Therefore, in responding to the implementation of some professionalized specialties in universities, a profound pedagogical, organizational, and material modification was launched in grandes écoles in order to keep their attractiveness and competitiveness in the higher education market.

Nevertheless, a new social and economic crisis disrupted this prosperous development trend and introduced new problems to these two systems of institutions after 1974. Greatly influenced by the economic crisis, enterprises adopted the
strategies of internal qualitative development instead of scale expansion, which caused a large diminution in employee recruitment. The enterprises preferred internal promotion of working staff to hiring new graduates. The expansion of higher education and the reduction in employment opportunities caused serious diploma devaluation. Although the elites from *grandes écoles* were more preferable than the university graduates in the job market, the economic crisis still limited their development.

Meanwhile, compared with the *grandes écoles*, universities were facing more serious challenges with massification and democratization as well as constantly reduced funding from the authorities.

French higher education experienced a very strong quantitative evolution from the early 1960s to the late 1990s. During these four decades, under two major evolutionary waves, the registered student population increased sevenfold, from 309,700 to over 2.1 million (MEN: National Education Ministry 2002). The first wave appeared in the 1960s for the generation who was born between 1930 and late 1940. Even though higher education started to open its door to more candidates, it still remained as a form of relatively elite formation with less than 20% of the young generation who was born between 1948 and 1950 having higher education diplomas. The second wave arrived in the 1980s and lasted till the mid-1990s and for the generation who was born between 1960 and 1977, 43% graduated from higher education institutions. The student population in universities and *grandes écoles* both expanded during these 30 years. This fast demographic expansion was not specific to France but affected most developed countries to different extents.

The democratization of education could be considered as the foundation of this massification phenomenon and it was also defined as a historical turning point from elite privilege to education chances for the masses. A lot of research has been done from qualitative and quantitative perspectives in order to show whether democratization of education guaranteed the real equality for students in access to universities, such as social equality, sex equality, equality between different disciplines, and so on (Grémy 1984; Florens 1984; Merllié and Prévot 1999; Vallet 2001; Duru-Bellat and Van Zanten 1999; Merle 1996, 2002; Euriat and Thélot 1995, etc.). In addition to the aspect of democratization of higher education, three other important elements played important roles as well in the massification of higher education. The “shift to a post-industrial economy” and “the rise of the knowledge economy” (Altbach et al. 2009, p. v) indicated the transformation from a traditional industrial economy, such as manufacturing industries, to a knowledge-based economy, which means that with the development of ICT (information and communication technology), the power of knowledge seems more important than ever and universities where the knowledge is produced and transmitted shouldered more responsibilities than ever. Therefore, society requires more and more people to be educated in higher education institutions in order to keep up with the needs of social and economic development. On the other hand, the rise of the service industry implied that higher education could be treated more as merchandised service, which could be traded. The appearance of this new phenomenon resulted
in a very strong tendency towards the commercialization of higher education and made universities question their traditional ways of governance, organization, teaching, and research. In confronting these doubts and pressures, universities found no way out but reform in order to survive the imposition of harsh marketing rules.

The rapid increase in student enrollment needs called for support in financial, human, and physical resources, which unfortunately was far underestimated during this massification. The lack of physical infrastructure; inadequate student housing conditions; and insufficient quality assurance of teaching, learning, and research, all resulted in proportional school dropout rates and students’ academic failure. Thus, the growing population in higher education lowered academic standards to some extent. Meanwhile, students who didn’t succeed in finding a chance in domestic higher education chose study mobility to another country, which is considered as one aspect of the motivation for international student mobility.

In order to maximize the openness of education to people, a profound transformation in the higher education system was inevitable. As a result, came the creation and development of short-time professionalized training courses, adult education, lifelong learning, and some nontraditional educational forms, such as education at a distance and virtual education in universities. All those reform programs were put forward to respond better to social and individual demands. With regard to the professionalization of education in universities, IUT and STS (section technicien supérieur, University Technical Institutes) were created and they actually produced some positive results that met the social demand for highly qualified workers in science and technology domains for industrialization development during the Glorious Thirty period. Meanwhile, other forms of education (adult education, lifelong learning, education at distance, and virtual education) greatly relieved the constraints of traditional school age and presence requirement, which facilitated the formation or training of employees. The extended sense of “student,” the development of different forms of being educated, and the flexible study duration, the embodiment of the lifelong learning idea greatly motivated different groups of the population with diversified social and economic profiles.

The extension of study duration for students started after the end of the Second World War and became a more prominent phenomenon during the mid-1980s. The proportion of the baccalaureates increased to more than 60% in the mid-1990s, compared to 4% of the generation five decades earlier. According to INSEE (Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques; 2011), the number of students participating in the baccalaureate exam reached 627,520 in 2003 (success rate: 80.1%; 502,016) increased to 638,661 in 2006 (success rate: 82.1%; 524,341), dropped to 621,521 in 2008 (success rate: 83.5%; 518,970), and after a short increase in 2009 (625,713) it reached 621,215 in 2011 (success rate: 85.6%; 531,760). In spite of the decreasing number of the baccalaureate participants, the student population who were recruited in higher education institutions kept a moderate increase because of the rising proportion of successful entrants.

If we combine the statistics of the baccalaureate and the whole population, it’s easy to find that the big rhythm of demographic expansion has passed. However,
in response to the mass demand of access to higher education, the number of higher education institutions has still increased during these years. Therefore, a new situation was created in which these higher education institutions had to compete for the best candidates and divert their focus to a qualitative and durable development plan. The growth in the number of international students in France since the 1990s has compensated, to some extent, the deficit created by the decreasing local student population and the enlarged number of institutions.

From this overview of the chronological development of grandes écoles and universities, it’s obvious that there have been quite some divergences in the initiatives of their creation, and the level and orientation of their development.

According to MESR, «Sous l’appellation “grandes écoles” sont regroupées les écoles d’ingénieurs, les écoles normales supérieures (E.N.S.), les écoles de commerce et les écoles vétérinaires. Ces grandes écoles se caractérisent par le niveau élevé de leur diplôme (le plus souvent BAC +5) et par une forte sélection à l’entrée.» On the basis of this official description, we can easily identify the categories in the grande école family and identify the major characteristic of this group of institutions. The rigorous entrance selection can be considered both as a guarantee of recruiting the best students and of offering their graduates the best chances for employment with a high-level diploma.

- Écoles d’ingénieurs (Engineering Schools in Sciences and Technology)
- Écoles normales supérieures (elite higher education institutions in humanities, letters, education, economy, sciences, etc.)
- Écoles de commerce (Business and Management Schools)
- Écoles vétérinaires (Veterinarian Schools)

By re-examining the definition of grandes écoles given by MESR, we could find that the delimitation of study duration is missing. Corresponding to various specialties in different grandes écoles, the school years differ. Most important, with the democratization of higher education and the creation of parallel programs between universities and grandes écoles, more and more grandes écoles have started to accept high school graduates, especially business schools. Considering these differences, we can summarize the lengths of the courses into two periods (veterinarian schools not included): three years’ study for the candidates from preparatory class who succeed in the entrance selection or candidates from universities recruited by document application, and five-year consecutive study for high school graduate winners in the entrance selection in some grandes écoles.

On the basis of social, political, and educational aspects incorporated in the creation and historical development of grandes écoles, they could be described as comparatively small-scale institutions with high selectivity in the recruitment of students, close relationships with professional employment fields, and with imposed social responsibilities. Meanwhile, the grandes écoles are also very diversified and ranked differently in terms of their specialties, social identities, reputations, selectiveness, and graduates’ employment percentage.

According to Veltz (2007, p. 9), the grandes écoles system is confronted with a profound reform challenge for social, ethical, and efficiency reasons. The highly
restricted social categories and orientation towards producing homogeneous social elites put French higher education institutions in danger. The separation of research institutions and professionalized teaching institutions held back both scientific and technological development and the adaptability of its higher education system in face of the challenge of internationalization. As a result, together with universities, both types of institutions are meeting more challenges from the social development demands at the national and international levels and public criticism of their effectiveness, efficiency, reorientation, new missions, and accountability.

2.2.2 A Brief Review of Reforms in French Universities in the Last Decades

Many critics refuse the view that higher education should respond to the market and their principal argument relies on the fact that education is a public good in continental Europe, particularly in France. France has a tradition of antiglobalization (Meunier 2010; quoted by Hoareau 2011) for three reasons: avoiding the potential international competition in human resources and economy, the influence this would have on decreasing government authority, and strong opposition to the idea of globalization, which is seen as equal to Americanization (Hoareau 2011).

Researchers nevertheless think that under the national resistance to globalization and the neoliberal theory in France, some important reforms in higher education governance are still going on. Some researchers explain the French higher education system reforms with policy transfer theory, which was developed in the US context to describe the spread of policy ideas from one state to another (Walker 1969; Gray 1973; quoted in Hoareau 2011) and refer to “the process whereby one policy setting uses one or many elements from another policy setting” (Hoareau 2011, p. 224). The policy transfer in Europe is considered as a top-down transfer from European institutions to member states or from one state to another. On the basis of this theory, the French domestic governance mode is considered as a replication of the modes of governance and policy ideas inspired by international organizations. However, Musselin and Paradeise (2009) hold that the deep transformation of the French higher education system is more a very French process than a product influenced by European and international trends in the last two decades. Here in this study, we evoke two main aspects reflected in the previous reforms: the relationship between HEIs and public authorities, and the relationship between HEIs and the private sector.

As noted before, the current multidisciplinary universities were created after the suppression of faculties of the old republic by the Faure Act in 1968. However, as a young administrative organization, the discipline-based logic was still well preserved in central administration. Even after the replacement by the Savary Act in 1984, the management situation in the universities remained weak. The real change started from the introduction of the four-year contract in 1988 (Musselin
The government modified its traditional criteria for allocating funds to the universities and decided that a small proportion of the budget would be allocated through the negotiation conducted between the universities and the Ministry of Education in the frame of a four-year contract. This reform was passed with surprising ease without raising any conflicts from any parties. Musselin explained this resulted from the viability of the notion of contract (Musselin and Paradeise 2009) employed in this reform and different parties involved interpreted it in their own way. Musselin and Paradeise (2009) also pointed out that three major effects were witnessed in this contractualization reform.

First, the introduction of this contractual logic has modified the long-time discipline-based assessment and procedures of central administration and in order to validate a contract, they have to consider the feasibility and comprehensiveness of the project at the whole institutional level; on the other hand, the real dialogue between the Ministry and the presidents of the universities began, which has enforced the power of the presidents as the heads of the whole institutions. Second, this reform has changed the state–university relationship. The effect of the university presidents’ voices being heard has not only strengthened their authority inside the universities but also has changed the hierarchical relationship with the central administration. The contractual procedure has improved the transparency of university governance and the new relationship between state–university demands more openness and trust. However, it has also enforced the control from the state (Musselin and Paradeise 2009). Finally, the reform has created an opportunity for the heads of the universities to build up a collective institutional identity. The introduction of this contract affirmed the importance of the “university” as an entity and the authoritarian way of allocation from the Ministry became more flexible and negotiable. The redefinition of the state role to a certain level strengthened the universities’ autonomy and this contractual policy was just the beginning of a series of reforms for universities in the context of internationalization.

With regard to the relationships between the local public sectors (regions, departments, or cities) and universities, the Region–State 5-Year Contracts (CPER for Contrat Plan Etat–Région) started the investment of regions in public research organizations and universities. Many local authorities realized the important role of higher education in the development of the local economy and thus their funding is related to an expectation and a demand. In the 1990s, the programs “University 2000” and “U3M” (Université du troisième millénaire) were launched by the Ministry to associate local authorities and enterprises with the planning and funding of the universities in the regions. These contractual policies and programs resulted in the sharing of the higher education and research expenditures between different levels of administrations from ministries to municipal partners. The diversification of funding lessened the state-centered control over universities; however, it also increased the demand for collective competence from the universities in the negotiation of funds with different partners.

In 2006, the introduction of new law LOLF (Loi Organique relative aux Lois de Finance) officially announced the membership of France in the New Public
Management (NPM) family which has experimented within higher education in several countries since the 1980s. The LOLF, the law on the new public budgeting and accounting system, improved the transparency of the budget system and made it more efficiency-oriented.

Nonselective entrance and massification of higher education have tended to hamper the capacity to provide infrastructure for cutting-edge research (Benner 2011; Bégin-Caouette et al. 2016). Wishing to close the gap with other knowledge societies, some European countries have developed a strategy to concentrate research funding in the highest performing universities through “excellence initiatives” (Benner 2011; Bégin-Caouette et al. 2016). First invented in 2005 in Germany, the *Exzellenzinitiative* intended to motivate research institutions to compete to win prestigious “elite” positions (Nature 2010; Schmoch 2011). Similarly, the Innovation Platform was developed in 2003 in the Netherlands to promote efficiency and innovation (Marginson et al. 2008). France also followed a similar strategy to develop its research capabilities, the “2008 campus policy” with a €3.5 billion competitive fund and the *Initiative d’Excellence* in 2011 with a €7.7 billion budget in order to develop five to ten excellent research clusters (ANR 2010).

The contractual policy can be seen as a first move by the French central administration in charge of HE in the direction of a more “evaluative state”, relying on procedural rather than substantial intervention. (Musselin and Paradeise 2009, p. 30)

The recent introduction of the LRU (*Loi relative aux libertés et responsabilités des universités*, in 2007), which could be considered as following up on the university performance contract, reinforced the importance of university autonomy. Universities are expected to be able to define their own criteria of recruitment of students and employees and have independent fiscal control for reallocating resources according to their own criteria. Considering the long march of the fight for autonomy, the LRU redefined the different modes of orientation for universities’ development. On the basis of the content of this law, we can understand the unique national context in France and the demands of this internal context on higher education institutions. The main content is divided into five parts, among which the public service mission of higher education (*les missions du service public de l’enseignement supérieur*), university governance (*la gouvernance des universités*), and the new responsibilities of universities (*les nouvelles responsabilités des universités*) are listed as the top three. The orders of content seem to imply the roles of universities as both keepers and survivors in this era. Higher education is considered as a public service that shows its traditional mission of general culture transmission and civic education. As service giver, universities should keep this primary mission in mind. Then, the next two parts elaborate the necessity and obligation of reforms in the new contexts at international, national, regional, and local levels. According to the fourth annual report (published in 2011) after the promulgation of this LRU, even though the doubts and critics from the public involved still exist, an awareness of the irreversibility of this movement towards university autonomy has been unanimously reached. The LRU assured the universities of the
necessary autonomy for their social partnerships and particularly gave them major responsibility over their internal governance. However, the process of turning a legislative and regulative rule into customary practice is still in a testing period and universities need more support in order to make good use of their autonomy, which is clearly stated in the report:

La question qui se pose aujourd’hui est celle de la réalité de cette autonomie, de son appropriation par les universités et du rôle de l’État. Elle doit aller au-delà d’une simple autonomie de gestion afin de donner aux universités toutes les cartes leur permettant d’assurer leur triple mission et de fédérer toutes les forces en présence sur un même site. (Ponsot 2012, p. 5)¹

With regard to research, the creation of the CNRS (Centre national de recherche scientifique) in 1945 established the predominance of this public research organization and it recruits the best researchers to contribute mainly to scientific production. However, to some extent, its presence greatly influenced the research work conducted in the universities where the lecturing professors have to accomplish their teaching missions. The dual system of teaching and research resulted in French universities being badly depicted in the ranking systems, particularly in the first Shanghai Ranking in 2003. In order to improve the research-based performance, a series of research acts have been adopted: PRES (pôle de recherche et d’enseignement supérieur) in 2007 offering new territorial networking schemes including universities, grandes écoles, and the public research organizations; RTRAs (Réseaux thématiques de recherche avancées) for developing localized leading edge research with substantive funds; and the “Pôle de compétitivité” for grouping the industrial research and applied public research activities developed in universities and research organizations (Musselin and Paradeise 2009). Strong legal and financial incentives have been developed behind all these programs for pushing the HEIs and public research organizations’ scientific productivity and meanwhile, all the local and institutional, public and private stakeholders have been fully involved.

Autonomy is always accompanied by demands for accountability. The more freedom the universities enjoy, the more responsibility they have to shoulder and the more accountability they have to respond to external demands. Two important agencies were created: AERES (Evaluation Agency for Research and Higher Education, in 2007) for assessing and evaluating research and teaching in public higher education institutions and ANR (French National Research Agency, 2005–2007) for providing public funding for basic and applied research with evaluation.

Before ending this short review, we have to consider another important mission of HEIs: teaching. As previously stated, the harmonization of higher education

¹The question that arises today is that of the reality of this autonomy, ownership by the universities and the role of the nation-state. It must go beyond a simple management autonomy and the universities need to be given all the cards to ensure their triple mission and to unite all forces present on the same site (translated by the author).
structures inside Europe and the credit transfer system challenged the French HEIs, grandes écoles in particular. Moreover, structural convergence and incorporation have also been promoted between grandes écoles and universities and more professionalized educational programs were introduced in the universities (Dobbins 2012). Finally, the increasing connectedness between local authorities and HEIs, private sectors, and HEIs has also influenced the curricula designing and research project orientation.

Academic systems in other developed countries have been confronting similar forces of competition and social demand (Goedegebuure et al. 1994; Dill 1997). The transformation of the society from industry-based to knowledge-based has put higher education institutions in the center, as they are expected to respond to the increasing demands for scientific research and a highly skilled workforce, and the performance of the institutions could be decisive for the society’s economic competitiveness. Therefore, the effectiveness and efficiency of the higher education system has been continuously questioned and numerous changes and reforms have been demanded. University governance and the relationship between the nation-state and higher education institutions are considered as a very important element for the modernization of Europe’s universities (Estermann et al. 2011).

How far have the reforms succeeded? Musselin (2009) noted that since the foundation of the Imperial University of Napoleon four higher education laws have been passed in France (1896, 1968, 1984, and 2007) and the result was summarized as providing more autonomy for universities with its governance transformation. Moreover, she thought that the key to realize this objective was to transform the whole higher education system. The Autonomy Scorecard project was conducted by the EUA (European University Association) to assess the institutional autonomy situation in 26 European countries and offer updated information from “University Autonomy in Europe I” (Estermann and Nokkala 2009). The scorecard is intended to be used as a benchmarking instrument and a reference for national policies and higher education institutions. The university is scored in terms of organizational autonomy, financial autonomy, staffing autonomy, and academic autonomy. According to the Autonomy Scorecard 2010 (Estermann et al. 2011), French universities were ranked 16th in the medium low cluster (59 %) for organization autonomy, 22nd in the medium low cluster (45 %) for financial autonomy, 27th in the medium low cluster (43 %) for staffing autonomy, and 28th in the low group (37 %) for academic autonomy. It’s quite clear that the autonomy of French universities didn’t score well and lack of autonomy results in the inflexibility of the whole system to develop its own strategy for internationalization. If we cross the reform effort with the intra-European comparison statistics, it’s obvious to reach the conclusion that the reform hasn’t completely succeeded, and is even far from that.
2.2.3 A Brief Review of Studies on Grandes Écoles

Compared to the consecutive reforms that intended or succeeded in changing the French universities, it’s a bit strange to find a scarcity of studies on *grandes écoles*. While the French universities were occupied with fighting for their autonomy, what happened in the group of *grandes écoles*? In preparation for this part of our literature review, we searched again the books, articles, and other forms of scientific production related to the internationalization process of *grandes écoles*. The results were not very satisfactory and we summarize some of the long-lasting questions that have continued to fascinate researchers.

The first group of studies focuses on the development of the *grandes écoles* from a historical–social–political perspective, which is also referred to in my description of the dual system of French higher education earlier in this chapter. As noted before, the basic knowledge of this unique national institution is mainly drawn from the book by Magliulo (1982) published by the prestigious PUF (*Presses Universitaires de France*). Considering the publication date of this book, it’s crystal clear that the information needs to be updated a lot, especially with the economic transformation and the development of new technology and communication.

The second group of studies concentrates on access to the *grandes écoles* in terms of social equality and cultural diversity. In spite of the large expansion of postcompulsory education since the 1950s, the education reforms didn’t actually narrow down the social class inequalities in access to education (Brown et al. 2010). The education-based meritocracy is considered as a sustainable characteristic in democratic societies. It offers a justified resolution for managing the tension between egalitarian values and the ongoing reality of inequality, and it also corresponds exactly to a democratic ideology: the inborn equality and right to fight for one’s own position in society (Brown et al. 2010).

In 2001, Sciences PO (Paris) implemented a pioneering step towards cultural diversity by allocating numbers of places for high school students in the ZEP (*zone d’éducation prioritaire*: products of the positive discrimination politics in France) and this initiative has been imitated by more and more institutions in the group of *grandes écoles*. This kind of the gesture was greatly appreciated in society. According to Brown et al. (2010), the implementation of the policy came from a very good intention; however, it ignored what is required to decrease social inequality in access to education. This point of view brought us back to the theory of “*capital culturel*” in Bourdieu’s works. It also evoked “*aptitudes égales*” and “*visés égales*” (p. 166) transmitted similar information from Bourdieu (1989) with “*structure sociale*” and “*structure mentale*,” and all these terms implied the interaction between social status and education. The positive discrimination policies could change the forms of entrance to *grandes écoles*; however, in order to benefit from the forms of access, students must have the competences and meet the expectations. If we consulted the previous social inquiries into the family backgrounds of students in *grandes écoles* (Euriat and Thélot 1995; Bourdieu 1987; Alouby and
The theoretical landscape is quite clear and *tel père, tel fils* (Thélot 1982) is a good phrase to summarize the results. The family’s cultural, financial, educational, and social network situation have played very important roles in children’s educational and later professional development. If society couldn’t provide better conditions for the families’ evolution, the great intention of all the policies to diversify access to *grandes écoles* and promote the social ascension of the lower classes will just be like all luxury goods. They are too good to be true because we know we couldn’t afford them and even if we could have them, they are not opportunities we could really make good use of. The expression might be a little banal but the reality is vividly depicted. Therefore, the reforms on the elite formation couldn’t adopt an output-oriented logic but an input-oriented one.

The last group of studies, which is also the emerging one, focuses on the internationalizing process in some privileged *grandes écoles*. A recent research thesis was completed by Darchy-Koechlin (2012), a study of international student mobility in four *grandes écoles*: ENS, X, HEC, and Sciences PO. This study presented to us different models employed in its internationalization and the international student population studies and showed these international “talents” institutional experiences in the most prestigious French *grandes écoles*.

Before closing this small section, we would like to say a few words briefly on tuition fees. The coexistence of *grandes écoles* and universities in France is unbelievably accepted and respected, whereas their actual existence is completely contrary to the deeply rooted egalitarian value in French society (Musselin and Paradeise 2009). As noted before, even after decades of reform, the free-tuition fees and nonselection for the universities still remain because charging fees and selection definitely would bias the equality of opportunity and reduce the education opportunities of young adults from the lower social status families. This social consensus confirmed and strengthened the legitimacy of the elite formation and strong selectiveness in *grandes écoles* and mass civilized education in universities. However, we quote another example mentioned by Pechar and Andres (2011) related to welfare regime studies. In the liberal welfare regime, in the United States, for example, charging high tuition fees is considered as keeping social equity. As the rich families earn much more, lower tuition fees will be unfair for the other social class families considering the fact that some proportion of the taxes paid by the families have already been invested in education. If the universities charge lower fees, the rich families will get more benefit from it. This example is mentioned here not to show which logic is right or wrong but just to introduce another way of thinking. Moreover, the different tuition systems are always accompanied with corresponding student subsidies and it’s quite clear that social student subsidies are comparatively more limited in France than in the United States, student loan systems, for example.

This next section turns to the future of French higher education. The relationship between universities and *grandes écoles* has always been one of the hottest questions concerning French higher education. Among the several references related to this subject, it is very interesting to often find “l’impasse” (impasse; Picavet 2007) et “la fin” (the end; Veltz 2007) to describe the situations in which
the dual system are located and to indicate the structural problems created by the ideology of the *grandes écoles*. We could categorize the researchers’ views into two groups: the system has met serious difficulties and changes need to be done; and the model of *grandes écoles* should be terminated because it doesn’t correspond to the demands of the internationalization of higher education and the globalization of the economy. Or, to respond better to the international market demand, the *grandes écoles* should be brought closer to universities and to some extent, the creation of PRES (in 2007) was oriented to that direction.

We observed more and more bridges have been constructed to facilitate access to *grandes écoles* for university students. According to the public statistics published by CGE (*Conférence des Grandes Écoles*) in 2012 on the basis of the data collected from its member écoles in 2011, 54.56% of the total number of students were recruited in 2010 by the “concours” after the baccalaureate or after two years study at the CPGE (*Classes Préparatoires aux Grandes Écoles*), 45.44% by the so-called “voies passerelles” (parallel selection mode) among which the majority have conducted their study in the universities, and more than 5% of students have already obtained a foreign bachelor’s degree. The diversified methods of selection have offered comparatively more opportunities for students in pursuit of their elite formation even if the proportion still remains low. More important, the more frequent communication between *grandes écoles* and universities prepared for the internationalization of the whole higher education system. As noted before, the LMD structure and the ECT system were generated in the construction of the EHEA and it also influenced the educational program design and diploma offered in *grandes écoles*. Furthermore, the fusion of the higher education institutions of different levels is ongoing and in June 2013, the Minister of Higher Education and Research, Genevière Fioraso, signed three “contrats de sites” (site contracts) with Alsace, Lorraine, and Avignon, which proposed the fusion of universities and *grandes écoles* (engineering, business/management, etc.) public or private in order to push the intraregional institutions’ coordination, develop collective research projects, and maximize the allocation of resources and educational program offerings. This contract has replaced the PRES by communauté universitaire (University Community) and has been criticized by many researchers and institution leaders (*enseignementsup.blog.lemonde.fr*), among which the principal critic insists on the overly developed administrative body and lack of new mode of governance.

Another recent proposition in the Fioraso law has also raised a hot academic discussion: curriculum entirely in English will be soon developed on a large scale in French higher education institutions (*etudiant.lefigaro.fr*). This proposition is based on the expectation of increasing French shares in the international student market, particularly in attracting more nonfrancophone students (from actual percentage of 12–15% by 2017). Even though some French language defenders, especially researchers in letters, are not satisfied, this proposition was warmly welcomed by the CPU and CGE because in fact 30% of the courses are already in English in engineering schools, 80% in business schools, and with regard to university education programs, having a certain percentage of courses in English for
postgraduates majoring in sciences and technology or management is quite prevalent. Moreover, the importance of English is also predominant in research.

The last part of the studies focuses on the diversification of training programs in different grandes écoles and most research contributors are closely related to the different groups of grandes écoles, engineering schools and business schools in particular. The official definition of “grandes écoles” quoted before gives a very general description of internal classification. Meanwhile, the hierarchical positions inside the group also exist to distinguish one from the other in terms of their relationship with the different ministries, funding resources, legislative status, connectedness with the private sector, and graduates’ employment.

The different levels of privilege the grandes écoles enjoy are decisive for the degrees of competition in which they are put. It’s evident that the most nationally prestigious grandes écoles in France have no or few rivals from inside the country; however, they’re facing more competitors at the international level which means when they develop their institutional strategies, they’re more internationally oriented. Nevertheless, for most members in this group of grandes écoles, they’re not that “grande” and benefit from comparatively fewer resources than the “big” ones. For them, they have their own priorities on the list of strategies, such as gaining more share at the national level, developing a closer relationship with the local public and private sectors, and creating more job opportunities for their graduates.

Internationalization of educational programs aiming at helping students develop their international competences in grandes écoles, business schools and engineering schools in particular, started in the middle of the 1980s. The demands from enterprises and the support of the Foreign Ministry were considered as a “push” factor in the development and many intra-European programs were created. Many indicators were identified to evaluate the internationalization level of these institutions: international network building, double diploma agreements, curricula harmonization, development of joint diploma with foreign institutions, proportion of international students recruited, and percentage of foreign researchers in the research laboratories (Lazuech 1998). Although the indicators have been more diversified during these years, we could still tell the internationalization awareness and practice were far more developed in grandes écoles than in universities.

Universities and grandes écoles both are facing some serious challenges in the context of internationalization; however, we should also differentiate the nature of the problem. Sarkozy (2007) mentioned that the autonomy of the universities has been the key to succeed in the global economy, which is exactly what the universities had been going through during the last three decades and even if it’s still too early to predict the results of the LRU, we could consider it a good start. This first step is very important for the following reforms. On the other side, for the grandes écoles, they possess all the privileges as noted before, in terms of student resources, teaching quality, financial situation, human resources, infrastructure, and so on. Fifteen years ago, Lazuech summarized the two major questions in the internationalization of grandes écoles: how to achieve an international excellence for its national elite formation and how to gain a good reputation in the international market (1998, p. 66). Fifteen years later, we know they’re confronting more
than that. The professionalization of their teaching programs and the great responsiveness to the private sector are not enough in this new context and that explains why the third “mission” appeared: innovation, the challenges produced by the new mode of the knowledge-based economy.

2.3 International Student Mobility Research Review

Recruiting international students seems so natural nowadays and few have the interest to ask why. It was only around two decades ago that researchers started to get interested in international student mobility which was considered as a product of increasing cross-border education and a classic component in reinforcing the development of the internationalization of higher education (Teichler 2004; Altbach and Knight 2007; Knight 2004; De Wit 2010, 2011).

Why do international students want to study abroad? How do they choose the host country and institution? How do they live their experience abroad? Why do host countries/institutions want to recruit international students? How do they host international students? Finding the possible answers might help us better understand the complexity of international student recruitment. Numerous research works have tried answering these questions from different perspectives.

2.3.1 General Studies on International Student Mobility

First, to explain why international students seek education abroad, the “push–pull” model has often been employed to understand their motivation and choice of host country (Neice and Braun 1977; Cummins 1986; Lee and Tan 1984; Agarwal and Winkler 1985; Glaser 1978; Rao 1979; Altbach et al. 1985; Mazzarol and Soutar 2002; Chen 2007). For some of them, it is a good chance to broaden their cultural and intellectual horizons. For others, their main purpose in going abroad is to seek better education resources, especially for those who study a pioneering field that is academically underdeveloped in their home country, or for graduates of high academic level. All of these factors could be considered as “push” elements from their home countries. Meanwhile, there are “pull” factors that also have an impact on students’ choices of destination, such as the good reputation and strong academic influence of the host institution, which is definitely an attraction for students coming from abroad. In response to student mobility, some countries have raised the tuition fees for international students, whereas others have made favorable policies in order to attract high-skilled immigrants.

However, in recent years, we observed that sometimes the push factors could work in an untraditional way. The economic development in some Asian countries, such as China and the Republic of Korea, contributes to an increasing population of Asian students abroad. Better financial situations provide them with more
opportunities to study abroad. In a word, the push and pull theory explains the reasons for student mobility to some extent. However, it focuses mainly on the objective context. Student mobility can be interpreted not only as a phenomenon that reflects the politico-economic development of international society and the attraction of different cultures, but also as a matter of personal choice and agency.

Second, the international student’s intercultural experience has been another focus of research. Numerous studies and surveys have been conducted from different perspectives on the international student’s experience abroad in English-speaking countries concerning international students’ identity development (Pederson 1991; Hayes and Lin 1994; Appadurai 1996; Sen 1999; Marginson et al. 2010); international students’ linguistic proficiency and their social/academic integration (Yang et al. 2006; Hayes and Lin 1994; MacIntyre et al. 1998; Li and Gasser 2005; Hullett and Witte 2001; Matsumoto et al. 2004; Ward et al. 2004; Perrucci and Hu 1995; Marginson et al. 2010); international students’ financial situations and work (Abu-Ein 1995; Xia 1991; Cheng 1999; Li and Kaye 1998; Curtis and Williams 2002; Marginson et al. 2010); and intercultural relationship and network building (Church 1982; Triandis et al. 1988; Misra 1999; DiTommaso and Spinner 1997; Rosenthal et al. 2006; Brislin and Yoshida 1994; Demir and Tarhan 2001; Berry et al. 1989; Berry 1997; Marginson et al. 2010).

Papatsiba (2003) noted that mobility could be a project of constructing the self (trajectoire de la construction de soi) as well as a process of self-re-orientation. The process is characterized by self-re-identification, a reconsideration of one’s relationship with one’s original country and culture, a test of one’s adaptation abilities, and a reflection of openness and sociocultural tolerance. Furthermore, for a student, the principal purpose of mobility is to enrich one’s knowledge, broaden one’s worldview, and prepare for future professional life. Therefore, in spite of the differences in their social, financial, and educational backgrounds, to be flexible, proficient in the host language, and be active in social/academic integration, are the keys for international students to succeed in this experience. However, mobility experience can also be a double-edged sword. The cultural dialogue can help students enlarge their views and get a better understanding of a different social and cultural context; however, mobility sometimes might result in misunderstanding or stereotyping of the host country (Spencer-Rogers 2001; Fatima 2001; Lee and Rice 2007; Spencer-Rodgers and McGovern 2002; Li and Kaye 1998; Butcher and McGrath 2004; Li et al. 2002; Marginson et al. 2010). This contradictory situation explains why Murphy-LeJeune (2003) recommended inventing a new definition of the word “foreigner”, appropriate to contemporary social development. In her opinion, the combination of strangeness and familiarity perceived between actors from different cultures produces divergence along different dimensions (spatial, social, cultural, and symbolic) and the contemporary “foreigner” could be defined as an actor capable of adapting to new social situations. Her new definition of “foreigner” implied that international students should be foreigners of a new type in this era and equipped with diverse competences for their adaptation to their host country.
Finally, it is important to examine the official reports, documents, and statistics published by national, regional, and international organizations. The quantitative resources from these documents clarify the dimensions of international student mobility from a macro perspective, providing primary information on such aspects as demography, geography, education level and fields, and source and target countries, among others. Meanwhile, considering the diversity of difficulties and problems encountered by international students, some reports based on host countries’ policies and studies of students’ actual experience show us various possibilities to help them out.

### 2.3.2 Studies on International Student Mobility in France

Compared with the scientific contributions to international student mobility studies in English-speaking countries, French/French-speaking researchers’ works were a little behind. Most references in France have been produced by international postgraduates and PhD students (Coulon and Paivandi 2003). Among the existing literature (Master’s and doctoral theses and part of doctoral thesis not included), some reports introduced the general study and living situations of international students in France at a national level (Borgogno and Vollenweider-Andersen 1998; Salma 1999; Coulon and Paivandi 2003; Ennafaa and Paivandi 2008); some focused on the study of a specific student population, including their linguistic, academic, and social integration problems (Hu 2004; Mazzella 2009; Agulhon and Xavier de Brito 2009; Gaultier and Masselin 1973; Traore 1985; Guimont 1998; Amougou 1997); and some are more concerned about the challenges and opportunities for France in the context of the internationalization of higher education (Cohen 2001; Harfi 2005; Harfi and Mathieu 2006a, b).

The three main sections in this part summed up in general the research works related to the research subjects in this study. The first part of the presentation explained the theoretical framework for understanding the incentives of internationalization. The second part concentrated on the influence of internationalization at regional and national levels. This part started with the description of the process of the Europeanization of higher education, the construction of EHEA in particular, and the major evolution of standardization of systems inside Europe. Then, at the national level, the dual French higher education systems were reviewed from their creation and development process and followed by a summary of the big reforms of the system in the last three decades. The last part of this chapter mainly focused on international student mobility research and numerous studies of this phenomenon that have been conducted from different aspects including motivation-centered, experience-centered, and output-oriented research either from nation/institution or international student perspectives at the national, regional, or international level.

Before ending this part, some research results of my master’s thesis are presented, which show the importance of the contexts in the internationalization of higher education. A comparative study of international students’ experience in
China and France was conducted in 2010 that was based on the experiences of 16 international students in two universities in France and China. Three levels (micro, meso, and macro) of analysis were implemented on three phases of students’ experiences abroad (preparation phase, adaptation phase, and transformation phase) by considering students as individuals, and members of a family or community, and of a society. As host countries, France and China both have their distinctive advantages to attract international students in terms of culture, economy, and politics. Regarding the students’ adaptation to the host context, the macro environment sometimes creates barriers, such as the hosting policies, the provision of services, and social atmosphere. Meanwhile, the micro factors, such as students’ personality, experiences, cross-cultural adaptability, and study ability also help to understand the students’ adjustment process. It also shows that frequent exchanges between different countries help students develop an increasingly receptive mindset, while reinforcing their adaptive skills. With regard to the data analysis, the host country’s cultural–social–political features and students’ personal interests and future professional development concerns are considered as the main motivation for mobility. Meanwhile, different roles played by the students in this experience of mobility, as traveler, explorer, and investor, were also taken into consideration.

According to the interviewees’ discourses in this study, from the cultural perspective, the international students’ experience in their host country could be considered as a process of discovering and exploring the richness and diversity of cultural heritage. As a core component of culture, language holds the key to open the door of a country; therefore, the choice of a host country is above all language-oriented. It’s easy for students to choose a host country whose language system and culture is quite similar to theirs. Meanwhile, the image creation and information diffusion about the host country also have great influence on international students’ decisions of mobility. For example, high fashion, luxury products, romantic love, freedom, architecture, and so on are usually the fantasized elements of France for international students. From the economic perspective, the choice of mobility can be seen as a student’s personal investment, which follows the common rules of all investments and a background check of the intended investment field is a first step. From a social perspective, the government policies related to visa requirements, specifically those concerning financial requirements and employment opportunities are students’ major concerns. At the institutional level, the provision of service before and after students’ arrival has big influences on their decision and on account of the imbalanced level of development in host countries; all these differences do exist in various ways. From a future professional development perspective, considering the priority of science and technology in international collaboration, the production of new knowledge is placed on the top of the list in every country’s development policies. This has led, in turn, to a standardization of higher education, which makes higher education more accessible to international students, giving them more chances to obtain globally recognized qualifications. At the same time, the inflation of degrees has caused intense social competition and some devaluation of academic standards. As investors, international students have a clear idea of potential payback for their studies. For
those who can’t continue their study at home because of the extremely competitive atmosphere there, international mobility offers them a second chance. In addition, the degree devaluation in the job market in some countries pushes their students abroad for better working opportunities. With the development of economic globalization, students with an international study and work background are likely to have more leverage in the job market.

On the basis of the data analysis in this study, the interviewees considered that their mobility experience really helped them with their personal development. Studying abroad meant they had to deal with everything by themselves, which could be painful but encouraging. Starting from their daily life, they were in charge of the housework, cooking, arranging time schedules, personal consumption budget, and all the trivial problems that would have been taken care of by their parents at home. Then most significantly, they realized the importance of being independent and they drew lessons from what they experienced. Living in two cultures gave the students a new perspective on their original culture and society and, at the same time, it created the inevitable cultural conflicts corresponding to the distance between two cultural systems. Most of the students were very open-minded in facing cultural differences. Meanwhile, the contact with students from different cultures helped them develop their tolerance to different personalities and behaviors. The international students could also take advantage of the mobility experience to see the reality of the host country with their own eyes.

In addition, as explorers, their mobility was considered as a journey of self-development and world discovery for international students. The experience abroad strengthened students’ social and cultural identity as a product of their own country; and also the experience made them realize different ways of doing things and different interpretations of reality. By contact with people of different cultures, they had chances of learning in an international context. The opportunity of living in a new context made students think and reflect.

Last but not least, students’ motivation for studying abroad had an impact on their future orientation during the mobility. For some, the experience of mobility served them as a tool to find a job. For some, it was an important period of time during which they could figure out what they really wanted to do in the future. Their curricula vitae were more attractive with the mobility experience, which showed their future employer their ability to adapt and work in an international context and their linguistic competence. Meanwhile, mobility helped them make acquaintance with their future colleagues, familiarized them with the development level of certain fields, and led to opportunities for future cooperation.

Mobility abroad is both an academic and emotional journey for students, inasmuch as they will grow professionally and personally in a new environment. It gives students confidence in their strong points as they have the opportunity of practicing what they have acquired. It also helps them find out what they should learn and discover their potential, in terms of autonomy, adaptability, self-confidence, and communicative skills, in a brand new environment. At the same time, it brings them face to face with risks they may encounter in exploration of the unknown.
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