

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education

Number 28 Summer 2002

International Issues

- 2 Knowledge and Education as International Commodities
Philip G. Altbach
- 5 Trade Creep: Implications of GATS for Higher Education Policy
Jane Knight
- 7 New Challenges for Tertiary Education: The World Bank Report
Jamil Salmi
- 9 Means Testing in Developing Countries
Thomas Wolanin

Special Focus: Private Higher Education Developments

- 11 The Private Universities of Bulgaria
Snejana Slantcheva
- 13 Working at a For-Profit: The University of Phoenix
Kevin Kinser

Countries and Regions

- 14 A New Higher Education Framework in Spain
José-Ginés Mora
- 15 A Science University for Okinawa? A Bad Idea
Philip G. Altbach
- 16 Lost Opportunities and Massification in China
Rui Yang
- 18 Trends in International Student Flows to the United States
Hey-Keung Koh
- 21 Cuba and the Link Between Education and Transformation
Jesús M. García del Portal

Reaction and Response

- 22 More on the Pseudouniversity and Its Consequences
Thomas J. LaBelle

Departments

- 23 Higher Education Research in Latin America
Alma Maldonado-Maldonado
- 25 News of the Center
- 26 New Publications

Knowledge and Education as International Commodities: The Collapse of the Common Good

Philip G. Altbach

Philip G. Altbach is J. Donald Monan, SJ professor of higher education at Boston College and director of the Center for International Higher Education.

A revolution is taking place in education. Education is becoming an internationally traded commodity. No longer is it seen primarily as a set of skills, attitudes, and values required for citizenship and effective participation in modern society—a key contribution to the common good of any society. Rather, it is increasingly seen as a commodity to be purchased by a consumer in order to build a “skill set” to be used in the marketplace or a product to be bought and sold by multinational corporations, academic institutions that have transmogrified themselves into businesses, and other providers. Nowhere is this trend more clearly exemplified than in the current debate about GATS, the General Agreement on Trade in Services, now taking place internationally within the World Trade Organization. The commodification of education will have major implications for how we think about schooling and the university, the ownership and transmission of knowledge, and indeed the role of citizenship in modern society. The implications are immense, both for nations and for the globalization and internationalization of education.

There are positives and negatives in this new dispensation, just as there are in the broader globalization agenda of which education is a part. Globalization is probably both inevitable and unstoppable, and much of it is positive as well. Yet there are many problems associated with globalization, from environmental degradation to growing inequalities within societies and internationally. The problem with the current debate about globalization is exactly the same as with discussions of its educational implications—the pros see only a bright future of economic integration, while the cons focus only on the negatives. Neither has a balanced vision that takes into account pitfalls and possibilities.

In the knowledge industries, of which education is a central part, globalization is already a key feature. We see implications in the growing use of the Internet for communication as well as for the marketing of knowledge products of all kinds, in the strengthening of a global labor force of highly skilled personnel, in the use of English as a widespread medium for scientific communication and increasingly of advanced training in many fields, and in other ways. Indeed, higher

education has been internationalized since the very beginning of universities in medieval Europe, when there was a common medium of instruction, Latin, and both students and professors routinely moved from country to country. Now, perhaps 2 million students study outside their home countries, and a world market already exists for faculty and researchers. The Internet has greatly expanded the international flow of knowledge. One might ask why higher education needs to be subject to the legal strictures of the WTO when internationalization is taking place anyway at a pace and under conditions generally suited to the higher education community.

The challenge for us is to understand both the context and the implications of the globalization of the knowledge economy. My purpose here is to point to some of the problems created or exacerbated by current trends. The picture is certainly not entirely negative, but a balanced perspective requires careful analysis of the downside—viewpoints often not articulated in the rush toward the global future.

Underlying this discussion is a conviction that education at all levels is *not* simply a commodity to be bought and sold in the marketplace. An education system provides the skills needed for economic success, but it also builds the underpinnings of a civil society and of national participation. An understanding of the past, of culture, and of democratic values, among other things, is part of education, and these elements cannot be subsumed in some global marketplace. They are integral to any society, and are part of the patrimony of a people. Similarly, university-level basic research, certain curricular offerings, and other elements of academic work do not lend themselves easily to commercialization. In other words, there are values of the national and social common good that must be protected and preserved in a globalized educational environment. Protecting culture, intellectual independence, and the values of a civil society are simply not on the same level as free trade in automobiles or equal access to markets for soybeans—or even to the other service-related activities that are included in the GATS agenda. To pretend that all intellectual “products” are simply to be bought and sold on a commercial market is an oversimplification that contributes to giving globalization a bad name among growing segments of the population. Ensuring that an accounting firm, for example, has free access to international markets or that software is not pirated is simply not the same as protecting an educational system.

Some Potential Downsides

Maintaining standards or even accurate information in a globalized academic environment is problematical. Ensuring appropriate academic standards in a national

higher education system is a major challenge. The United States and many other countries do this through accrediting systems that provide reasonably accurate information concerning numbers of colleges and universities, degrees offered, facilities available, and the like. It is difficult enough to ensure minimal standards, track the growing number of “degree mills,” and in general to maintain minimal standards at the national level—doing so internationally seems unworkable. Not only would data be difficult to obtain, but agreement on appropriate standards is unlikely. The European Union’s efforts to “harmonize” aspects of higher education in the EU countries in order to create a “common currency” of higher education are proving to be a major challenge—even though the EU has considerable power and resources to ensure compliance. Tracking academic programs and degrees, not to mention maintaining quality standards, on a global basis is extraordinarily difficult. It is especially problematical when many of those seeking to enter the global marketplace are motivated by a desire to earn a profit rather than by an educational mission.

We are at the beginning of the distance revolution in higher education.

We are at the beginning of the distance revolution in higher education. There are already a considerable number of degree and training providers who use information technology and distance methods to offer programs. As IT becomes more sophisticated and the curriculum better developed, distance offerings will become more numerous. Already, “open universities” using mainly distance means of course delivery enroll well over 3 million students worldwide—the large majority in the developing world. Seven out of the 10 largest distance learning institutions are in developing countries. If national authorities are unable to exercise significant control over institutions providing distance higher education in their countries through national accrediting arrangements, degree recognition, and similar measures, quality control becomes impossible.

Open markets, at least in higher education, reinforce the inequalities that already exist. If educational borders are completely open, the strongest and wealthiest education providers will have unrestricted access. Countries and institutions that cannot compete will find it difficult to flourish. This means that developing countries and smaller industrialized nations will be at a considerable disadvantage. Local academic institutions will find it difficult to compete with providers that choose

to set up institutions in their country. Foreign providers will focus on the most profitable segment of the market—today including business and management studies, information technology, and a few others—and leave the rest to the local institutions. Such fields as the basic sciences, requiring expensive laboratories and other equipment and offering little immediate profit-making potential, not to mention support for libraries, will be ignored by the foreign providers.

There is a precedent for this. Several decades ago, the major industrial nations with the support of multinational publishers were able to tighten up international copyright rules and open up national publishing to the international market. What happened is that in many developing and middle-income countries, local publishers found it difficult to compete and were purchased by the multinationals or went out of business. While books continued to be supplied to local markets, something was lost. The multinationals were especially interested in the lucrative textbook market, largely ignoring less profitable general publishing. The result was that local publishers could not compete with the multinationals in the textbook market and were unable to afford to publish general books. Decisions concerning what books to publish were sometimes made in Paris, London, New York, or Amsterdam. Profits were exported rather than being reinvested in the local market. University-level textbooks were increasingly imported from abroad rather than being produced locally. Valuable expertise was lost. It is also the case that foreign capital became available and that publishing standards were sometimes improved. But the loss of independence and autonomy was significant. Higher education will find itself in exactly the same position—with its most lucrative markets creamed off by the multinationals and unable to afford to support the basic functions of the universities.

While it can be argued that science is by its nature international, higher education has a central role for nations and societies that goes beyond science and beyond training for specific careers. What may be relevant for the United States in research or training may be inappropriate or at least irrelevant for Ghana or China. If countries no longer have the ability to control the basic elements of the curriculum, the language of instruction, the pedagogical philosophies, and other key elements of the delivery of higher education much is lost. Further, if the most profitable aspects of higher education, such as management studies, are creamed off the top of the academic enterprise by foreign providers, local universities will be left with the least popular—and profitable—fields of study. These institutions will find it more difficult to compete and will be unable to offer a

full range of academic specialties. Further, they will have neither the funds nor the infrastructures to engage in scientific research—thus abandoning the research role that is central to educating the best scientists and scholars and leaving research in the hands of the wealthiest universities in the major industrialized nations. In a way, the profits that the rich universities may earn in the developing countries can further strengthen their research profile and contribute to the already existing inequalities in research worldwide.

The New Neocolonialism

In the bad old days of the Cold War, much was made of the efforts by the major powers to dominate the hearts and minds of the world. The Soviet Union, the United States, and others spent lavishly on student exchanges, textbook subsidies, book translations, institution building, and other efforts to dominate the world's academic leaders and intellectuals. We are in an entirely new era of power and influence. Now, multinational corporations, media conglomerates, and even a few major universities are the new neocolonialists—seeking to dominate not for ideological or political reasons but rather for commercial gain. The result is the same—the loss of intellectual and cultural autonomy by those who are less powerful. In the Cold War era, power politics was the motivation. GATS helps to establish open markets for knowledge products of all kinds so that the new neocolonialists will have unfettered access to world markets. In a way, developing countries were better off in earlier times—at least they could choose among feuding superpowers and could, if they had the will, keep external influences at bay without risking their entire participation in the world economy.

The new neocolonialism works through the knowledge providers who are selling a variety of products on the world markets. These products include academic programs of all kinds, offered as “twinning” arrangements with local universities or business enterprises, branch campuses offering degrees and certificates from abroad, IT-based academic degrees, corporate training programs, and a myriad of others. There are some “high end” providers currently involved in the international trade in training and certification. These include, among others, the University of Chicago's business school in Spain, Pennsylvania's Wharton School initiative in Singapore, and several coalitions of Western universities. There are many more lower prestige or unknown academic institutions and companies in the international educational marketplace offering “products” of completely unknown quality and relevance. All of these providers have one thing in common—the profit motive. Academic collaboration, intellectual exchange, and internationalization are

ancillary to the main purpose of the enterprise—money. Often, the programs that are exported are “off the shelf” offerings designed for students in the industrialized countries. The relevance of such offerings for developing countries is, at the very least, questionable because education is not country neutral. Both pedagogy and curricular content must take into consideration local conditions, traditions, and learning styles. Foreign providers are often unwilling to spend the money necessary to do this. While the new neocolonialism is profit- rather than politics-driven, the end result is the same. Countries and academic systems and institutions in the developing countries become dependent on rich and powerful foreign providers.

This is an argument against forcing those who are less powerful to be subject to a dramatically unequal marketplace.

What Is To Be Done?

This is neither an argument against the internationalization of knowledge nor against collaboration. Inevitable inequalities between the well-established, wealthy, and powerful universities of the North and the less-well-endowed universities of the South are also recognized. This is an argument against forcing those who are less powerful to be subject to a dramatically unequal marketplace, one that will rob academic institutions and systems of the right to make decisions about curriculum, quality standards, and a variety of other educational factors. It is an argument in favor of recognizing that education in all of its many forms is not a simple commodity but a central part of a culture and of a society and deserves to be treated differently than other parts of the marketplace.

In reality, we are not doing too badly right now. The heavy hand of GATS and the WTO is not needed in the educational sphere. International educational transactions of all kinds are at an all-time high. Some countries, such as Singapore and Malaysia, have opened their doors to foreign universities, but have done so on their own terms. Others, such as Argentina, are seeking to understand the impact of foreign providers and to regulate them appropriately. China is slowly opening its doors to overseas academic institutions and programs. The United States is trying cope with adapting its well-established accrediting system to American colleges and universities offering programs overseas. Australia is aggressively marketing its educational products overseas. The European Union is moving toward the

harmonization of its divergent academic systems. An unprecedented number of students travel abroad for study, and there is a functioning global market for highly educated personnel. The world is moving toward internationalizing higher education by using the energies of academe and responding to market needs. At the same time, those on both side of the equation have the power to shape educational transactions.

A new treaty that will have the power to force countries with quite different academic needs and resources to conform to strictures inevitably designed to serve the interests of the most powerful academic systems and corporate educational providers will only breed inequality and dependence. Intellectual globalization is alive and well now and does not need the straitjacket of GATS and the WTO. We should be moving toward a globalization based on equality rather than a new neocolonialism. ■

Trade Creep: The Implication of GATS for Higher Education Policy

Jane Knight

Jane Knight is an associate faculty member at the Comparative, International and Development Education Centre, Ontario Institute of Studies in Education, University of Toronto, 252 Bloor St. W., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1V6, Canada. E-mail: <janeknight@sympatico.ca>.

The General Agreement on Trades in Service (GATS) plus other regional trade agreements are testimony to the increased emphasis on trade and the market economy in this era of globalization. GATS is the first legal trade agreement that focuses exclusively on trade in services—as opposed to products. It is administered by the World Trade Organization, a powerful organization with 144 member countries. Education is one of the 12 service sectors covered by GATS. The purpose of GATS is progressively and systematically to promote freer trade in services by removing many of the existing barriers. What does this mean for higher education?

The current debate on the impact of GATS on higher education is divided, if not polarized. Critics focus on the threat to the role of government, the “public good,” and the quality of education. Supporters highlight the benefits that more trade can bring in terms of innovations through new providers and delivery modes, greater student access, and increased economic gain. The purpose of this article is to discuss both the risks and

opportunities that GATS brings to higher education and to identify some issues in need of further analysis.

Trade in Context with other Trends

Trade liberalization is firmly enmeshed with other issues and trends in higher education, which complicates the task of isolating the implications emanating from trade alone. These trends include the growing number of private for-profit entities providing higher education opportunities domestically and internationally; the use of information and communications technologies (ICTS) for domestic and cross-border delivery of programs; the increasing costs and tuition fees faced by students at public and private institutions; and the need for public institutions to seek alternate sources of funding, which sometimes means engaging in for-profit activities or seeking private-sector sources of financial support.

These trends are evident in both developed and, to some extent, developing countries. How does the existence of the GATS relate to these trends? While GATS may contribute to a commercial approach to education and lead to expanded use of electronic or distance education, it cannot be held responsible for the emergence of these trends. In fact, it is important to acknowledge that the business side of transnational or cross-border education was alive and well before the advent of GATS. Supporters of more trade in education services celebrate the existence of the GATS to maximize the benefits of these new opportunities. Critics emphasize the risks associated with increased trade—believing that it leads to more for-profit providers, programs of questionable quality, and a market-oriented approach—which are seen to challenge the traditional notion of education as a “public good.” The following sections identify questions and issues that need to be explored in terms of the impact of trade liberalization and GATS on policy directions for higher education.

Student Access

Government and public education institutions have keenly felt the responsibility of ensuring access to education. In many, if not in most, countries this is a challenging issue as the demand for higher and adult education is steadily growing, often beyond the capacity of the country to provide it. This is one reason why some students are interested in out-of-country educational opportunities, and more providers are prepared to offer higher education services across borders.

When increased trade liberalization is factored into this scenario, the question of access becomes complicated. Advocates of freer trade maintain that consumers, or students, can have greater access to a wider range of education opportunities at home and abroad. Nonsupporters of trade believe that access may

be more limited because trade will commercialize education and consequently escalate the cost of education and perhaps lead to a two-tiered system. This raises a fundamental question regarding the capacity and role of government with respect to providing open or limited access to higher education and the question of funding.

Quality assurance of higher education is in some countries regulated by the sector and in others by the government.

Funding

Many governments have limited budget capacity or at least lack the political will to allocate funds to meet the escalating costs of higher education. Can international trade provide alternate funding sources through new providers? Advocates of trade in education services would answer “yes.” Or, does it mean that public funding will be spread across a broader set of domestic and foreign providers because of GATS rules, such as national treatment and the unanswered question of whether public funding is seen as an unfair subsidy. Furthermore, does the presence of foreign providers signal to government that they can decrease public funding for higher education, thereby jeopardizing domestic publicly funded institutions. Does international trade in education advantage some countries, such as those with a well-developed capacity for export, and disadvantage others in terms of funding or access?

Regulation of Foreign or Cross-Border Providers

The development of a regulatory framework to deal with the diversity of providers and new cross-border delivery modes becomes more critical as international trade increases. In some countries, this will likely mean a broader approach to policy—involving licensing, regulating, monitoring both private (for-profit and nonprofit) and foreign providers in order to ensure that national policy objectives are met and public interests protected. More work is necessary to determine how domestic or national regulatory frameworks are compatible with or part of a larger international framework and how they relate to trade agreement rules.

Recognition and Transferability of Credits

New types of education providers, new delivery modes, new cross-border education initiatives, new levels of student mobility, new opportunities for trade in higher education—all this can spell further confusion for the recognition of qualifications and transfer of academic

credits. This is not a new issue. While trade agreements are not responsible for the creation of this confusion, they contribute to making it more complicated and also to making resolution more urgent. National and international recognition of qualifications and the transfer of credits have already been the subject of a substantial amount of work. The UNESCO Global Forum on International Quality Assurance, Accreditation and the Recognition of Qualifications is currently focusing on this important issue.

Quality Assurance and Accreditation

Increased transnational education activity and new legal trade rules require that more attention be given to the question of quality assurance and accreditation of cross-border education programs and providers. It is clear that national quality assurance schemes are being challenged by the complexities of the international education environment. Not only is it important to have domestic or national policy and mechanisms, it is equally important that attention be given to developing an international policy approach to quality assurance and accreditation. Can coherence between a domestic or national system and an international policy framework actually strengthen national quality schemes rather than weaken them? Clearly there are risks and opportunities associated with this issue, but to do nothing is a risk in itself.

Quality assurance of higher education is in some countries regulated by the sector and in others by the government, to a greater or lesser degree. The key point is that authority for quality assurance, regulation, and accreditation for cross-border delivery needs to be examined and guided by stakeholders and bodies related to the education sector and not left in the hands of trade officials or the market.

Mobility of Professionals

GATS is facilitating the mobility of professionals to meet the high demand for skilled workers. This impacts many of the service sectors and has particular implications for the mobility of teachers and scholars in the higher education sector. In many countries, the increasing shortage of teachers is resulting in active recruitment campaigns across borders. Since many teachers and researchers want to move to countries with more favorable working conditions and salaries, there is real concern that the most-developed countries will benefit from this mobility of education workers.

Culture and Acculturation

Last, but certainly not least, is the issue of culture. Education is a process through which cultural assimilation takes place. Concern about the homogenization of cul-

ture through the cross-border supply of education is expressed by GATS sceptics. Advocates maintain that a new hybridization and fusion of culture will evolve through increasing mobility and the influence of ICTs. In fact, they believe that this has been happening for decades and is a positive development. Once again, the divergence of opinion shows that there are new opportunities and new threats to consider, especially on the question of acculturation.

The Dominance of Trade

Finally, it needs to be asked whether trade liberalization has the potential of dominating the higher education agenda. There is a risk of “trade creep,” where education policy issues are being increasingly framed in terms of trade and economic benefit. Even though domestic challenges in education provision are currently front and center on the radar screen of most countries, the issue of international trade in education services will likely increase in importance, perhaps at the expense of other key objectives and rationales for higher education—such as social, cultural, and scientific development and the

role of education in promoting democracy and citizenship.

At this stage, the questions outnumber the answers about the impact of GATS and trade liberalization. The questions are complex as they deal with technical and legal issues of the agreement itself; education policy issues such as funding, access, accreditation, quality, and intellectual property; the larger political or moral issues for society such as the role and purpose of higher education and the tension between the “public good” or “market commodity” approach to education. GATS is new, complex, untested, and a work-in-progress. It is, therefore, difficult to understand or predict its impact. The one thing that is certain, though, is that the higher education sector needs to be better informed and more involved in the debate and provide advice to trade officials about potential unintended consequences or possible opportunities.

This article is based on the report *Trade and Liberalization and Higher Education: The Implication of GATS*, prepared by Jane Knight for the Observatory of Borderless Higher Education: <www.obhe.ac.uk>.

New Challenges for Tertiary Education: The World Bank Report

Jamil Salmi

Jamil Salmi is coordinator of the World Bank's Tertiary Education Thematic Group. Address: World Bank, 1818 H St. NW, Washington DC 20433, USA. E-mail: <jsalmi@worldbank.org>. This article is dedicated to the memory of Tom Eisemon, in appreciation of his intellectual leadership and innovative contributions to the World Bank's work in higher education.

In the global environment, developing and transition economies face significant new trends affecting not only the shape and mode of operation but also the purpose of tertiary education systems. Among the most critical dimensions of change are globalization, the increasing importance of knowledge as a main driver of growth, and the information and communications technologies (ICT) revolution.

Both opportunities and threats arise out of these new challenges. On the positive side, the role of tertiary education in the construction of knowledge economies and democratic societies is now more influential than ever. Tertiary education is central to the creation of the intellectual capacity on which knowledge production and utilization depend and to the promotion of lifelong learning practices. Another favorable development is the

emergence of new types of tertiary institutions and new forms of competition, inducing traditional institutions to change their modes of operation and delivery and take advantage of opportunities offered by ICT. But this technological transformation also carries the danger of creating a growing digital divide among and within nations.

At the same time, most developing and transition countries continue to wrestle with difficulties produced by inadequate responses to long-standing challenges faced by their tertiary education systems. Among these unmet challenges are the sustainable expansion of tertiary education coverage, the reduction of inequalities of access and outcomes, the improvement of educational quality and relevance, and the introduction of more effective governance structures and management practices.

Purpose and Structure of the Report

The main purpose of the new World Bank report is to analyze the role of tertiary education in building up a country's capacity to become a knowledge society. The main messages are as follows: (1) social and economic progress is achieved principally through the advancement and application of knowledge; (2) tertiary education is necessary for the creation, dissemination, and application of knowledge, as well as for building technical and professional capacity; (3) the tertiary education systems of most developing and transition countries

are not adequately prepared to play this role, which places these countries at risk of being further marginalized in a highly competitive economy; (4) the state has a responsibility to put in place an enabling framework to encourage tertiary education institutions to be more innovative and responsive to the needs of a globally competitive knowledge economy and to the changing labor market requirements for human capital; and (5) the World Bank can assist its client countries in drawing on international experience and in mobilizing the resources needed to improve the effectiveness and responsiveness of their tertiary education systems.

The Rise of Market Forces

Although public funding remains the main source of support for tertiary education in most countries, it is being channeled in new ways and supplemented increasingly by nonpublic resources. Both changes bring market forces to bear in ways heretofore uncommon in the financing of public institutions. New financing strategies have been put in place in the public sector to generate revenue from institutional assets, mobilize additional resources from students and their families, and encourage donations from third-party contributors. Many governments have encouraged the creation of private institutions to ease pressures on the public purse and satisfy pent-up demand.

At the same time, governments are attempting to make the provision of public tertiary education more responsive to the new education and training needs of the economy, the shifting demands of employers, and the changing aspirations of students. They have supplemented the traditional budget transfer mechanisms with resource allocation formulas to foster greater institutional autonomy and better performance. Governments have also established quality control and enhancement mechanisms.

In many countries, the presence of private institutions has brought about more diversity and choice for students while serving as a powerful incentive for public universities to innovate and modernize. From an equity viewpoint, however, increased choice has benefited only those able to pay tuition or with access to financial aid. In many cases, the absence of scholarships and loans has led to increased disparities.

Rationale for State Support of Tertiary Education

Continued government support of tertiary education is justified by three important economic considerations. First, that tertiary education investments generate major external benefits that are crucial for knowledge-driven economic development, including the long-term returns from basic research and technology development and

the social benefits accruing from the construction of more cohesive societies. Second, imperfections in capital markets limit the ability of individuals to borrow sufficiently for education, thereby reducing the participation of meritorious but economically disadvantaged groups in tertiary education. Third, tertiary education plays a key role in support of basic and secondary education, thereby buttressing the economic externalities produced by lower levels of education.

In a lifelong learning perspective, student mobility can be encouraged by open systems.

The Evolving Role of the State

As their direct involvement in the funding and provision of tertiary education diminishes, countries rely less on the traditional state control model to impose reforms. Instead, they bring about change by guiding tertiary education institutions with a coherent policy framework, an enabling regulatory environment, and appropriate financial incentives.

Countries and tertiary education institutions willing to take advantage of the new opportunities presented by the knowledge economy and the ICT revolution must take the initiative in launching meaningful reforms. While no blueprint exists for all countries, a common prerequisite may be a clear vision for the long-term development of a comprehensive, diversified, and well-articulated tertiary education system.

The second important dimension of government intervention is the creation of a regulatory environment that encourages innovations at the level of individual institutions as well as private-sector initiatives to expand access to tertiary education. Key dimensions of regulation are the rules for establishment of new institutions (private and virtual), quality assurance mechanisms, financial controls on public institutions, and intellectual property rights legislation. In a lifelong learning perspective, student mobility can be encouraged by open systems based on the recognition of relevant prior experience, degree equivalencies, credit transfer, tuition-exchange schemes, access to national scholarships and student loans, as well as a comprehensive qualifications framework.

The third modality of state intervention involves the funding mechanisms and financial incentives applied to steer tertiary education institutions toward quality, efficiency, and equity goals. These include allocation

formulas linking resources to measures of institutional performance, encouragement of resource mobilization by institutions, competitive funds for investments in quality improvement, and student financial aid.

Strategic Framework for Future Bank Support

Investment in tertiary education is an important pillar of development strategies emphasizing the construction of democratic knowledge societies. The World Bank can play a central role in the process in a number of ways. Under the right circumstances, the Bank may play a catalytic role by facilitating policy dialogue on tertiary education reforms. This can be accomplished through information sharing and analytical work in support of national dialogue and vision formulation efforts.

Three vital lessons that have been learned from past and current tertiary education reform projects are that comprehensive reforms are more effective, sensitivity to stakeholders and the local political economy of reforms is vital, and integration of positive incentives for change can be pivotal. Based on these lessons, World Bank support to client countries should be appropriate to a country's specific circumstances, predicated on strategic planning at national and institutional levels, focused on promoting autonomy and accountability, geared toward enhancing institutional capacity, sequenced with a time horizon consistent with the long-term nature of capacity enhancement efforts, and sensitive to local political considerations.

While most strategic options outlined above are relevant to middle-income countries, important distinctions are warranted for transition countries, low-income nations and small countries. The leading options for improving tertiary education in the transition countries of Eastern Europe and Central Asia include introducing more-flexible and less-specialized curricula, promoting shorter-term programs, creating a more adaptable regulatory framework, and establishing systems of public funding that encourage institutions to respond to market demands for quality and diversity.

A tertiary education development strategy for low-income countries would include three priorities: building capacity for managing and improving the basic and secondary education system, including the training and retraining of school teachers and principals; expanding the production of qualified professionals and technicians through a cost-effective combination of public and private nonuniversity institutions; and making targeted investments in strategic fields of advanced training and research in chosen areas of comparative advantage.

Priorities to address the tertiary education needs of small states are subregional partnerships with

neighboring small states to establish a networked university, strategically focused tertiary education institutions that address a limited number of the nation's critical human skill requirements, negotiated franchise partnerships between the national government and external providers of tertiary education, and government-negotiated provision of distance education by a recognized international provider.

Globalization and the growth of borderless education raise important issues that affect tertiary education in all countries but are often beyond the control of any one national government. Among those challenges are the new forms of brain drain resulting in a loss of local capacity in fields critical to development, the absence of a proper international accreditation framework, the absence of legislation for foreign tertiary education providers, the lack of intellectual property regulations governing distance education programs, and barriers of access to information and communications technologies. The World Bank will work with its partners in the international community to promote an enabling framework for these global public goods, which are crucial for the future of tertiary education. ■

Means Testing in Developing Countries

Thomas Wolanin

Thomas Wolanin is a senior associate at the Institute for Higher Education Policy in Washington, D.C. Address: Institute for Higher Education Policy, 1320 19th St., NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036 USA. E-mail: <tom@ihep.org>.

Many underfunded institutions of higher education in developing nations are considering the imposition or the increase of tuition fees. To prevent the exclusion of academically qualified, low-income students, various student financial aid schemes that target assistance on low-income students are being contemplated. Other nations interested in improving social equity and fairness have established financial aid programs for students who would not otherwise have access to higher education. These programs require means testing to determine which students should receive aid.

"Family" Responsibility?

The decision to distribute aid to students based on means testing first requires determining whose means are to

be tested. Should a student's family be responsible for the higher education costs of the student? What constitutes a "family"—the nuclear family or a more extended family? Should there be an age of the student beyond which the family no longer has the responsibility to help pay tuition fees (21, 30, or 40 years)? What should be done in cases where the student and the student's family are estranged from each other—that is to say, there is no "family" relationship?

What portion of the family's resources should be available to support the student? This is another way of asking what standard of living the family should enjoy before its resources are directed to supporting the student's higher education costs.

All of these questions raise difficult political issues and touch on important and sensitive cultural values. In addition, there are practical issues of verification and documentation—such as birth, marriage, and death certificates and court records to establish, for example, whether a student is an orphan, how many other siblings the family is supporting, and whether a claim of family estrangement is genuine or just economically convenient. Therefore, the quality of public records and the ease of accessing them in developing countries are important constraints on means testing.

The quality of public records and the ease of accessing them in developing countries are important constraints on means testing.

Standard Questionnaires

The actual process for gathering information about the financial and family circumstances of the student and the student's family is usually by means of a standard questionnaire. One obstacle to gathering useful information by questionnaire in developing countries is that the income and assets of a substantial segment of the population may be in kind rather than in cash or cash equivalents.

A second and even more important issue is how to determine that the information about the income and assets of the student and the student's family is true and accurate. How can the information provided on a questionnaire be verified? One possibility is to compare the information provided on the means testing questionnaire with the information provided to the government for purposes of collecting either a national income tax or contributions to a national pension system. However, many developing countries have neither a

national income tax system nor a contributory public pension scheme. Or, the income tax system and public pension scheme may only cover a small segment of the workforce or the official information may not be dependable.

Social Indicators

An alternative method for means testing is to use various social indicators to distinguish those who have the ability to pay tuition fees from those who do not. One example of the use of such social indicators is the application for financial aid at the Pedagogical University in Mozambique. In addition to asking for information about family income, the application requires information about the occupation of the student's parents or guardian, whether the student's home has running water and electricity, and whether the student relies on public transportation. Another example is a study of students at Makerere University in Uganda, which defined family income categories in terms of the number of years of schooling of the father and whether he had access to an official or a personal vehicle.

The assumption behind the use of such indicators is that the social status and lifestyle that they signify are correlated with family income and assets available to pay tuition fees. However, the use of such social indicators in determining ability to pay tuition fees also presents some significant practical problems. First, verifying the accuracy of the information with respect to these indicators is very labor intensive. Staff from the Pedagogical University of Mozambique visit the neighborhood and home of the applicant for student financial aid. The staff asks people in the neighborhood, the parish priest, and others whether the information provided is accurate as well as inspecting the quality of the home itself. At the American University in Kyrgyzstan—which collects similar information from applicants for scholarships—university staff sometime actually visit the family and count the size of its flock of sheep. The confirmation of information in this manner is very time consuming and expensive.

A second limitation of the use of social indicators in determining ability to pay tuition fees is that it is by its nature highly subjective. The best that can probably be hoped for is a judgment that the student and the student's family have no ability to pay or have some ability to pay tuition fees. Social indicators are likely to be unreliable in deciding which family can pay 10 percent of tuition fees or 50 percent, versus 100 percent.

The process of verifying information about families' ability to pay could be made more manageable by only verifying the accuracy of the information for a sample of those who apply. The efficacy of sampling or spot-

Special Focus: Private Higher Education Developments

checking depends on the severity of the penalty for cheating, the certainty that the penalty will be applied if cheating is discovered, and the thoroughness of the verification of the sample.

Conclusion

The use of means testing at the University of the Philippines represents a good summary example. Adrian Ziderman and Douglas Albrecht report in *Financing Universities in Developing Countries* (1995): "To assess financial need, the university has had to move beyond income tax returns, which often understate true ability to pay. . . . (A)pplicants must complete a twelve-page questionnaire which asks about family assets, parental occupation and education levels, and location of residence. The questionnaire itself does not stop dishonest applicants, but home visits and harsh disciplinary actions are believed to make applicants answer questions more truthfully. Home visits verify the accuracy of most reports. Several students have been expelled from the university for giving false information."

In sum, means testing for purposes of student financial aid in developing countries is subject to a number of serious practical difficulties that call into question its viability. It is particularly burdensome if attempted for large numbers of students or for student applicants drawn from across a large country. Therefore, the implementation of increased tuition fees in developing countries is likely to be hard to achieve in ways that are economically efficient and socially fair. ■

The Private Universities of Bulgaria

Snejana Slantcheva

Snejana Slantcheva is a fellow of the Open Society Institute, Budapest, Hungary. E-mail: <slantcheva@yahoo.com> or <slantcheva@policy.hu>.

Over the past decade, Bulgarian private universities have managed to establish themselves as a separate, distinct sector of the Bulgarian higher education landscape. In Bulgaria, where 247,000 students are educated at 42 universities and 46 colleges, 11.3 percent of those enrolled are at private universities.

The First Decade

Nonstate initiatives in Bulgarian higher education became possible immediately after the fall of the communist regime in 1989. The first private universities appeared in 1991, following enactment of the law on

academic autonomy. The private higher education sector grew quickly, although it never reached the expansion levels of private higher education in other postcommunist countries. In Belarus, Moldova, Poland, and Romania, for instance, student enrollments in the private sector constitute approximately 30 percent of the total student population. Between 1991 and 1995, the Bulgarian Parliament recognized five new private universities. Currently, four of them are in operation: Varna Free University (with some 9,000 students), the New Bulgarian University (with 7,500 students), Burgas Free University (with 6,600 students), and the American University in Bulgaria (with 640 students). The fifth private institution, the Slavic University in Sofia, functioned for four years before being closed down by Parliament in 1999 due to administrative irregularities.

Private institutions differ not only in many aspects from their state counterparts but also from one another. Whereas, for instance, the Free Universities of Varna and Burgas rely primarily on local support and tuition fees, the New Bulgarian University and the American University in Bulgaria are also heavily dependent on financial support from foreign donors. The latter institution is rather small, offering American-style education and differing in many aspects from other institutions discussed in this article. Throughout the 1990s, however, the private universities faced common challenges. One major difficulty was the legal vacuum in which they operated for several years. It was not until 1995 that the higher education law officially recognized private universities as institutions with different structures and modes of operation—a trend further strengthened by the 1999 changes and amendments to the law, with the recognition of the department as a basic institutional unit. The 1995 higher education law also created requirements for the establishment of other private institutions.

Another major challenge for Bulgarian private universities involved accreditation procedures. State accreditation is granted by the National Accreditation Agency and verifies that all programs and institutional structures comply with the law on higher education and the uniform state requirements. Should an institution fail to file an application for accreditation or receive a negative accreditation, the state will stop future student admissions (and terminate funding, in the case of state universities). Uniform state requirements define in detail the educational process while at the same time accommodating the familiar "old" disciplines and traditional university structures. Paradoxically, then, in their attempts to receive national accreditation, individual private institutions—with their different institutional structures, forms of governance, and programs—also had to comply with these state standards.

Finally, strong public distrust has accompanied the development of private universities in Bulgaria. Possibly with the exception of the American University in Bulgaria, all other private institutions have been viewed with reservation due to the high tuition fees they charge as well as the nontraditional programs and courses that they offer.

Achievements

Although private universities still face many challenges, their achievements in the past decade cannot be underestimated. Often they have anticipated changes that were later adopted by state institutions. It was in the private sector, for instance, where in the early 1990s the bachelor's-master's-doctoral degree structure was first applied. This degree structure was not officially introduced into Bulgarian higher education until 1995, as a part of the entire system's attempt to harmonize with European higher education structures. Private universities were also the first to use the credit system to evaluate student progress. The credit system still presents a major goal for state institutions, although its introduction has been hindered by rigid university structures and programs. Distance education was yet another accomplishment first offered at private universities. Finally, with the exception of Varna Free University, private universities were the first to institute standard admissions exams.

Private universities have also played a progressive role in introducing different modes of operation, institutional structures, and organization into the educational process, which are able to support a variety of nontraditional programs. Program flexibility and student mobility characterize all of them. Moreover, the American University and the New Bulgarian University are the only institutions in the country that offer liberal arts education—a model that up until several years ago took second place to the official educational system that provided “spiritual and physical perfection” instead of “knowledge and skills” (in the words of the former vice minister of higher education). The New Bulgarian University has been instrumental in encouraging debate concerning liberal arts as a different model of education. Finally, private universities employ market strategies in the planning and regulation of their activities and course offerings—yet another challenge facing state institutions.

Many of the accomplishments mentioned above have been made possible due to the private universities' financial autonomy from the state: unlike state universities, they are not supported by the annual state budget. Instead, they have a variety of sponsors, both national and international. In addition, most private institutions receive funds through various programs. Tuition fees are a major form of funding, set by the

institutions themselves, and are much higher than the mandatory annual tuition fees in the state sector.

Present and Future Challenges

A major weakness that private universities are attempting to address relates to their faculty profile (excepting the American University): the majority of their faculty occupy permanent positions at state universities and “travel” to a private institution to deliver lectures or seminars (these are the so-called “suitcase” or “traveling” lecturers); their contracts at the private institution are for a given period of time or number of classes. In this area, the negative consequences for the overall educational process include the lower faculty commitment to the life of the institution. A slight improvement in this situation has occurred as a result of accreditation demands: whereas in the 1999–2000 academic year 18 percent of the faculty held permanent jobs at private institutions, for the 2000–2001 academic year their numbers rose to 23 percent.

Finances are a second hurdle that these institutions must overcome. Whereas tuition fees are rising, the numbers of students capable of covering them are not. The fact that there is also no state student loan program in place makes it even more difficult for students to finance their education. The strong reliance on tuition-paying students makes the private universities overly dependent on market demand, often hampering program development in many different fields. Despite some appeals, the likelihood that the government will offer financial assistance to these institutions is rather small.

All of the existing private institutions have received their institutional accreditation.

State accreditation, mandatory for all Bulgarian institutions, is yet another issue before private universities. At present, all of the existing private institutions have received their institutional accreditation. However, they must still obtain individual program accreditation, which will remain a difficult process as long as the uniform state requirements persist in their old, inflexible form. There has been much criticism both of the state requirements and the state registry of specialties. As a result, the government is at present contemplating introducing changes to accommodate program varieties across the country.

In its short history, the Bulgarian private university sector has successfully defied the persisting government tendency to treat them more as an *addition* to the existing

higher education system than as an *alternative* to it. Once considered a place for students who failed to gain entry to state institutions of higher education, Bulgarian private institutions have managed to sustain student interest and earn greater legitimacy. ■

Faculty at Private For-Profit Universities: The University of Phoenix as a New Model?

Kevin Kinser

Kevin Kinser is assistant professor and collaborating scholar of the Project on Research on Private Higher Education, Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, University at Albany, State University of New York. Address: 344 Education Building, University at Albany, SUNY, Albany, NY 12222, USA. E-mail: < kkinser@albany.edu >.

With 100,000 students across more than 100 campuses and learning centers, the University of Phoenix (UOP) is perhaps the most well-known example of for-profit higher education in the United States. With an academic model that is unusual by traditional standards, Phoenix caters to an exclusively adult student population in the health care, business, and education professions, using a highly structured, centrally designed curriculum. A typical undergraduate class meets four hours per week for five weeks. Required weekly “learning team” meetings outside of class give small groups of students the additional opportunity to discuss and prepare for the week’s assignments with their classmates.

Given its academic structure, it is no surprise that Phoenix employs a faculty that is similarly unusual. “Unbundling” is a term applied to the UOP model: various components of the traditional faculty role (e.g., curriculum design) are divided among different entities, while others (e.g., research) are eliminated altogether. Faculty are hired primarily to facilitate student learning in a particular course, and their term of employment begins and ends with the five-week UOP semester. Such a transient and diminished faculty role would be a source of concern at most institutions of higher education. The UOP, on the other hand, makes no apologies.

From a market perspective, Phoenix has been successful. As an education institution, it is much more difficult to evaluate. In particular, the limited role of the Phoenix faculty may raise questions about the academic values that underlie the for-profit model the institution employs. The expansion of private higher education in various regions around the world, however, suggests that a range of potential faculty models could be

adopted by these new institutions. As a model for the delivery of educational services, the UOP stands as a prominent example. Whether or not emerging institutions are organized as profit-making entities, Phoenix-like faculty roles may be employed.

Many observers of higher education will view Phoenix with suspicion because of the institution’s commitment to the bottom line. The Phoenix business model, though, is dependent on providing an educational environment that students and their employers will value. The faculty play a key role in creating this environment. At least three aspects of the UOP faculty model deserve attention.

Hiring Strategy

First, the UOP hiring strategy focuses on bringing in new faculty committed to teaching and in full agreement with the Phoenix model and philosophy. Those selected to join the teaching staff have been vetted in a rather elaborate process that begins with an information session and orientation, continues through a formal teaching demonstration and interviews with current faculty, and concludes with a training session that exposes all new faculty to the Phoenix curriculum and classroom expectations. Individuals who are ambivalent about teaching tend not to make the cut. Likewise, potential faculty members not amenable to the specific classroom structures required by UOP are screened out by this process. Phoenix employs a model of adult learning that assumes that students learn best in groups and in practical, interactive, discussion-based sessions. Faculty who believe it is important to lecture about theory unconnected to practice, for example, would not only find it difficult to be successful in the Phoenix classroom, they most likely would never pass muster to get there in the first place.

Professional Experience

Second, faculty teach part time for Phoenix and are expected to bring to the classroom the knowledge and experience from their full-time positions outside the university. In addition to accreditation-specified academic credentials, all UOP faculty members must have current professional experience in the area in which they are teaching, and they must have a full-time job other than teaching at the UOP. UOP training emphasizes that what a student learns in class Tuesday night, he or she should be able to use in the office on Wednesday morning. Faculty are encouraged to use their professional experience as a teaching tool to make explicit connections to the world of work. In this light, even aside from the cost savings important to UOP’s for-profit status, it makes sense to employ a part-time faculty. It has the practical effect of ensuring the relevance of the curriculum to industry needs. It also has the symbolic effect of making it clear to students and faculty alike that the in-

Countries and Regions

stitution is about the concentrated study of skills and knowledge with immediate useful application.

Pedagogy and Profit

Finally, classroom activities themselves can be described in terms of both pedagogy and profit. The actual instruction—and the training that supports it—focuses on helping students learn. At the same time, the profit motive dominates the design of the curriculum and the decision to offer a particular program of study. Phoenix is unapologetically an institution for which making money is the bottom line. But within the constraints of a centrally designed curriculum, the faculty are encouraged to adapt evaluation procedures, assignments, and discussions to fit their notion of what is important for students to know. Rather than rote performance of a standardized syllabus, the individual faculty member is directly and personally involved in shaping the course. The decisions and actions made by the faculty in conducting their instructional responsibilities reflect a concern for the student that, for Phoenix, is compatible with the institution's concern for the shareholders.

Implications

The UOP selects its faculty and uses them in the classroom in ways that support the goals of the institution. A fairly rigorous selection process is designed to ensure that faculty are competent, capable, and willing to teach using Phoenix-specified techniques. Part-time faculty members are expected to contribute their full-time pro-

fessional experience to classroom instruction. Limited participation by the faculty in the design of the curriculum is combined with faculty involvement in structuring the classroom delivery of the material. Emerging institutions looking to duplicate the Phoenix approach should understand how these various aspects interrelate to form a coherent academic model. They should also be aware of how the extremely short semester and limited faculty-student contact could continue to raise questions about the ability of the Phoenix model to foster in-depth learning.

The for-profit sector holds great interest not only for its economic implications for the development of private higher education, but also for how it may affect academic culture and faculty identity. Cases such as the UOP can be used to explore the range of practice among for-profit institutions of higher education to identify the ways in which faculty roles differ. How common is it for private institutions to adopt structured, centralized curricula? To what extent are faculty screened for their commitment to teaching or for their practical expertise? Has there been a strategic decision to employ a part-time faculty? Answers to questions such as these will help us map the range of options available to private higher education in a time of global expansion.

This article is presented as part of our ongoing cooperation with the Project on Research on Private Higher Education, directed by Daniel Levy at the State University of New York at Albany. This project is funded by the Ford Foundation. ■

A New Framework for Higher Education in Spain

José-Ginés Mora

José-Ginés Mora is professor of economics at the University of Valencia. Address: University of Valencia, Faculty of Economics, 46022, Valencia, Spain. E-mail: <gines@uv.es>; web: <http://www.uv.es/~ginesj>.

At the end of 2001, the government promulgated a new act on higher education (LOU, Ley de Ordenación Universitaria). This act is the last in a series of profound changes in the structure of Spanish higher education that started in the early 1980s. At that time, the Spanish higher education system was a perfect example of the Napoleonic model of the university. Universities were part of the state, professors were civil servants, and they were ruled through typical bureaucratic methods.

Recovering Autonomy

The "big change" occurred in 1983, when the university reform act was instituted after the end of the Franco dictatorship. This act introduced major changes in the legal framework of Spanish universities. Universities, which had been completely controlled by the central government, became autonomous, moving from dependence on the central government to dependence on the regional governments. The decision-making power was transferred from the state bureaucracy to collegial bodies with significant representation of nonacademic staff and students. Boards with many members make the decisions concerning the university and departments and elect the rector, deans, and department heads.

The 1983 reform shook up the traditional university system and produced many positive effects. In addition, the financial resources for universities increased enormously in the last two decades. The main result has been the tremendous expansion of the higher education

system in terms of the number of universities, in physical and human resources, and in student numbers. Consequently, access to higher education is quite open, research activities have greatly increased, and the quality of the higher education system has generally improved in all aspects.

Some Perverse Effects

Nevertheless, the new legal framework produced some perverse effects mostly due to the excessive internal power of academics and the lack of accountability. As depicted in Burton Clark's model, universities moved from the strong influence of the state to a situation in which the academic oligarchy is the main force ruling the system. Professors, who kept their civil servant status, together with nonacademic staff and student unions (which, by the way, are not very representative) control institutions with a clear tendency to protect the "ivory tower."

A greater responsiveness to market forces in higher education and a more entrepreneurial university structure were considered necessary to confront the new challenges facing universities: decreasing demand (for demographic reasons), increasing competition, new external demands, globalization, and so on. The need to reform the legal framework of universities was recognized by both major political parties, which included proposals in their platforms for the last general elections.

The LOU

In 2001, the government presented a draft of the act that was considered by most experts to be too timid. The draft proposed a governing board for universities, one-third of which would be composed of people from outside the university and the rest of university staff and students. Nevertheless, rectors reacted angrily to the draft, considering it to be a frontal attack on university autonomy. For several months there was a confrontation between the conservative government and rectors, most of whom were on the left. The debate was not very productive and was basically conducted via the media. It was not a debate about the future of universities but rather a political confrontation that can only be explained in internal political terms. Eventually, the government reduced the external representation to only three people on the governing board (which may reach as many as 50 members), and the LOU was finally approved by Congress. In spite of this modest representation of the nonuniversity community, there are several claims in the Constitutional Court charging that the LOU is unconstitutional. It should be pointed out that in Spain university autonomy (which is guaranteed by the Constitution) and self-government by the academic staff are consid-

ered by most university people as equivalent.

The consequence of this confrontation is a new act with inadequate tools for coping with the challenges that Spanish universities have to face in the new global context. The central problem—the internal power structure of universities—remains untouched. Nevertheless, the LOU introduced some elements of flexibility that could be taken by universities or autonomous regions as a means of moving forward. For instance: non-civil-service positions at all levels of the academic staff ladder can be created; wage increments to compensate staff productivity will be introduced by regional governments and, universities will have more freedom to establish their own internal statutes. On the other hand, a clear positive aspect of the LOU has been the creation of the Agency for University Quality and Accreditation, which will be in charge of promoting quality and informing citizens about university performance. Quality assurance has been a regular activity during the 1990s in the Spanish higher education system, but the LOU has institutionalized these activities and introduced accreditation of academic programs.

In summary, while the LOU might bring create some opportunities for more dynamic universities, most analysts are skeptical about the real capacity of the LOU to transform the Spanish higher education system. The fear is that a good opportunity has been lost for making serious improvements and that events of last year in Spanish higher education can be summarized as too much ado about nothing.

A Research University in the Periphery: A Japanese Mistake

Philip G. Altbach

Philip G. Altbach is J. Donald Monan, S.J. professor of higher education and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College.

The Japanese government has announced plans for a new research university to be built from scratch in Okinawa, in the Ryukyus, the island chain located two and half hours flying time southwest of Tokyo and known mainly for its tropical weather and American military bases. One could hardly think of a more isolated location for such a university. It will focus on biotechnology and will require an investment of \$600 million by the Japanese government to get it started. Japanese authorities say that it will cost \$160 million per year to operate—a figure that seems unrealistically low to operate a science-based research university. The aim is to recruit half the researchers from outside Japan; the language of instruction is to be English. Except perhaps

for some scientists from China, it is highly unlikely that many top researchers will be lured to Okinawa, not only because of the location and surroundings, but because of the generally internationally uncompetitive salaries offered by Japanese national universities at the senior levels.

From every perspective except perhaps for providing some public investment for Okinawa, this is a terrible idea. There are some significant lessons to be learned for higher education generally, and perhaps there is still time for the Japanese government to reconsider.

The decision comes at the same time that Novartis, the multinational pharmaceutical company, announced that it is moving its research laboratories from Switzerland, not exactly a scientific backwater, to Cambridge, Massachusetts in order to take advantage of the scientific infrastructure and entrepreneurial atmosphere there. This illustrates why Okinawa is not the right place for a research university. Even in the era of the Internet, intellectual enterprise requires community infrastructures, and other academic and intellectual stimulation.

There are a few examples of great universities or scientific centers located in isolated places, although it would be especially problematic to attempt this feat in the current environment. Even some of the great American state universities, established in the 19th century in relatively isolated places such as Iowa City or Urbana-Champaign, Illinois suffer somewhat from geographical isolation and find it difficult to retain top scientists and scholars. And this is why great centers of science have for a long time been located in or near metropolitan centers that have a tradition of academic excellence—such as Tokyo and Kyoto as well as Boston or San Francisco, Paris, and London. It is one thing to establish postsecondary teaching-oriented educational institutions in places like Okinawa to provide opportunities for training and education to the local population. It is quite another to build a research university in such a location.

There are a few examples of significant scientific centers located in remote places, and Okinawa must be categorized as a remote place. Novosibirsk in Russia and Los Alamos in the United States come to mind. But both were built to serve military needs more than basic or applied research and were purposely located in places where security would be easier to maintain.

The Japanese experience with establishing Tsukuba University in Ibaraki Prefecture near Tokyo is an example of the challenges. Tsukuba, founded in the 1973 as a way of diversifying higher education from the center of Tokyo, required several decades and much money to establish itself as a major academic center.

The insurmountable problem of the plans for

Okinawa is that the location is so clearly peripheral—to other academic institutions as well as to the industries it is intended to serve. It will be very difficult to attract top talent to Okinawa regardless of salary or other incentives—and the Japanese national universities are not noted either for administrative flexibility or high salaries. Top scientists, it should be remembered, are a rare breed. They are attracted by a scholarly community as much as by high salaries and favorable working conditions. The incalculable elements of an intellectual atmosphere—bookstores, cinemas, coffeehouses, and the like—are all significant in the thinking of academics. Okinawa has the multiple disadvantages of location, climate, and the complete lack of other academic or scientific amenities.

There are several relevant lessons to be learned from the current Japanese proposal—not only for Japan, which still has time to drop the idea, but also for other initiatives elsewhere for the establishment of new scientific institutions.

Major research institutions should not be founded in remote or peripheral locations. It is, of course, appropriate to have higher education facilities in such places in order to provide access and skills to local populations. But research universities will seldom be successful. The informal infrastructures of intellectual life are important. While communication is now possible through the Internet, there is no substitute for community or for direct links to both other researchers and the users (companies, government agencies, and others) of the knowledge products to be produced.

Lost Opportunities in the Massification of Higher Education in China

Rui Yang

Rui Yang is a lecturer in international and comparative education at the Graduate School of Education, University of Western Australia, Nedlands, WA 6009, Australia. E-mail: <ryang@ecel.uwa.edu.au>.

One of the latest changes in China's higher education is the dramatic growth in student numbers. This expansion is happening in a policy context that views higher education as a tool for achieving an integrated global system along market lines. Meanwhile, Chinese society is also in transition. While making impressive progress in many areas, China is full of the tensions caused by turbulent social changes. This article aims to illustrate how some parts of the population are losing out on opportunities for receiving higher education while others are

greatly benefiting from the recent fast growth.

Rapid Growth within the Ninth Five-Year Plan (1996–2000)

Chinese higher education has expanded rapidly over the past decade—with gross enrollment rates increasing from 3.4 percent in 1990, to 7.2 percent in 1995, and to 11 percent in 2000. Quantitative growth continued in 2001. More than 1,500 new undergraduate and associate degree programs were launched. In order to further drive economic growth, the Chinese government lifted the longstanding restrictions on marital status (the requirement to be single) and age (a maximum age of 25 years) of student examinees.

China will be well ahead of the goal set in the Action Plan to Vitalize Education in the 21st Century.

With the current growth rate, China will be well ahead of the goal set in the Action Plan to Vitalize Education in the 21st Century, issued by the Ministry of Education in 1999 to achieve a gross enrollment rate of 15 percent by 2010. The national government has recently readjusted its state planning and is determined to increase the gross higher education enrollment rate to 15 percent by 2005, with a total of 16 million students in higher education.

The expansion of higher education has greatly reduced the longstanding gap between social demand and higher education supply. Many people—especially in affluent areas, including major cities and coastal areas—have greatly benefited from the rapid growth in higher education. The Beijing municipal education commission, for example, in 2001 declared its intention to raise the higher education admissions rate to 70 percent of secondary school graduates. Higher education enrollment in Shanghai has reached 38.8 percent of the 18-to-22-year age cohort. With an annual growth of 10 percent, Jiangsu is expected to become China's first province to start the transition from elite to mass higher education.

The decision to increase university student enrollments was made by the national government with the goal of stimulating the economy. The central government hopes to push Chinese parents to use some of their huge savings on their children's higher education. It is anticipated that the expansion will lead to large-scale construction work at higher education institutions, which will further drive up domestic consumption.

Another major motivation for the expansion is to maintain social stability by delaying employment for

some of the population. Gradually, a trend is emerging for large numbers of secondary school graduates to go on to various institutions to receive their tertiary education. The tension caused by thousands of secondary school graduates competing for a very limited number of places in universities has been lessened.

The overall picture, however, is not all rosy. While many Chinese have increased access to higher education, some others have suffered a decrease in access. Among these are university students from poor families and the population in China's less-developed regions.

Students from Poor Families

The issue of disadvantaged university students, who comprise 10 percent of the total student population at national universities, emerged in 1997 when Chinese universities began to charge students tuition and accommodation fees. By the late 1990s, when student fees were still relatively low, a student needed at least 10,000 to 10,500 yuan annually for a 10-month academic year, already an astronomical amount for many families. A survey in Shandong showed that only 8.01 percent of families could cope with the whole amount on their own, 22.43 percent could only manage half, 43.68 percent could afford less than one-third, and 10.2 percent felt absolutely helpless.

Chinese parents are well known for diligently saving up for their children's education, enduring hardships that would be unimaginable for many people living in affluent industrialized nations. However, as some families live in absolute poverty, they have no savings and little chance to borrow money. In such cases, assistance from universities, while important, is insufficient.

Such straitened circumstances can hardly fail to exert a strong negative impact on the spiritual and social life of these students. While some students face their economic difficulties courageously, many experience great mental pressures. The Chinese government, at various levels, and the universities have worked together to implement some policies to address the problems facing the poorest students. Yet, within the globalized competitive culture of corporate managerialism, efficiency, and accountability in higher education worldwide, efficiency has been given the highest priority in China. University students from poor families will continue to be a knotty issue well into the coming years.

Opportunities in Less-Developed Regions

Globalization never meant global equality. Disparities are widening in China between the thriving export-oriented coastal zones and the provinces, especially those in the interior. There is great variation across provinces with regard to available human, financial, and material resources. Under such conditions, it is not surprising that

higher education development is poor quantitatively and qualitatively in China's less-developed areas.

Despite recent spectacular economic development, 6.7 percent of the Chinese population still lives in poverty. The introduction of university fees does not favor students living in remote areas with little money. As higher education is becoming more expensive, the gap in higher education opportunities between the developed and underdeveloped areas is rapidly widening.

Most affected are the impoverished areas, which are often those with large minority populations. For instance, by the end of 2000, the number of students studying at higher education institutions in Tibet was 5,400; whereas in 2001, 38.8 percent of the 18-to-22-year age cohort in Shanghai went to universities; and 70 percent of secondary school graduates in Beijing went directly to universities.

To make the situation in poorer areas worse, China is still practicing a discriminative university admissions policy, which gives preference to students from the major cities. Top universities have a quota system and admissions requirements that favor local students. Such a policy was originally designed to ensure that the best students in underdeveloped areas would have a chance to attend key institutions and enjoy the same quality of education. As academic qualifications become more important in China's job market, the disparity in access to higher education in different regions will have an even greater negative impact. A distribution of quotas between the central and local governments will be even more of a problem as the Chinese government begins to decentralize.

Conclusion

Parallel to international changes in the philosophy of governance and the way higher education is managed, there has been a strong trend toward diversification and decentralization in China's higher education. Meanwhile, the latest developments confirm findings reported by many comparative studies that decentralization can be a mechanism for tightening the control of the central government over higher education. Thus there is a co-existence between decentralizing and centralizing trends in higher education governance. While higher education in China is under increasing pressure to follow international trends, the lingering influence of the country's longstanding centrally planned system and the complex domestic situation combine to create difficulties in easing China's ongoing social transformation. The role of the state, while still strong, is undergoing change. Considering China's social, cultural, and historical realities, the state remains necessary as a regulator, facilitator, and negotiator. Currently, the state performs all these roles, although arguably such diverse roles often do not play out in a consistently beneficial way. ■

Trends in International Student Flows to the United States

Hey-Keung Koh

Hey-Kyung Koh is on the staff of the Institute of International Education. Address: 809 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017. E-mail: <HKOH@iie.org>.

The year 1999–2000 was a milestone year. For the first time since the Institute of International Education began collecting data on international student flows to the United States, the number of international students in the United States passed the half-million mark, rising to 514,723. This past year, in 2000–2001, 547,867 international students were studying in the United States. The institute has been collecting this data since its founding in 1919 and began publishing this data independently in 1948 and, with United States Department of State funding, since the early 1970s in the annual *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*.

In 2000–2001, over half, or 55 percent, of these students came from places of origin in Asia, followed by Europe (15 percent), Latin America (12 percent), the Middle East (7 percent), Africa (6 percent), North America (6 percent), and Oceania (6 percent). China is the leading place of origin for the third year in a row, with 59,939 students, or 10.9 percent of the foreign student total. India is ranked second, with 54,464 students, or 10 percent of the total; this number represents a 29.1 percent increase from the previous year, the largest percent increase of all the places of origin.

Although international students are studying throughout the United States, they are mainly concentrated in just a few metropolitan areas. Over one-fifth of all international students are found in seven states and the nation's capital. The New York metropolitan area hosts the most international students (49,283), followed by the Los Angeles area (27,426). In comparisons by county, Los Angeles County hosts the most international students, with New York County (Manhattan) a close second. Regionally, the Northeast hosts the most international students (25 percent), followed by the Midwest (22 percent), the South (21 percent), the Pacific (18 percent), the Southwest (11 percent), and the Mountain Region (11 percent).

The overwhelming majority of international students are at Research I universities, Master's I institutions, and community colleges. These three institutional types host more international students than the other 16 Carnegie Classification types combined, with 368,169, or 67.2 percent of the total. Business and

management continues to be the most popular field of study among international students in the United States, with 106,043, or 19.4 percent, of all international students enrolled. Engineering and mathematics-computer sciences are the next largest fields of study, with 83,186, or 15.2 percent, and 67,825, or 12.4 percent, respectively.

For the first time since the Institute of International Education began collecting data on international student flows to the United States, the number of international students in the United States passed the half-million mark

Enrollment Trends Over Time

The numbers of international students in the United States have for the most part grown steadily since 1954–1955, the year that the present form of the *Open Doors Report* came into being. Two of the exceptions to the periods of growth, and at times of steep growth, in the foreign student totals were plateaus in the mid-1980s and mid-1990s. Changes in enrollment flows have been relatively stable over the past 10 years, with significant growth since 1998. This past year's international student total, 547,867, represents a 6.4 percent increase over the previous academic year. This is the largest percentage growth in over two decades, since 1980.

At present, even though there are over a half million international students, in the United States they represent less than 4 percent of all U.S. higher education enrollments. In 1954–1955, there were 34,232 foreign students studying in the United States; they represented 1.4 percent of the 2,499,800 total U.S. higher education enrollment. Fifty years later, the foreign student population has increased tenfold to 547,867, but represents only 3.9 percent of the 14,046,659 total enrollment. However, at the more advanced degree levels, and in certain disciplines, foreign students comprise a high percentage of total U.S. graduate student enrollments, with 13.1 percent of all graduate enrollments. More than half of all international students study at the undergraduate level. Historically, they have always outnumbered graduate students, though in recent years the gap has been closing.

Even though the overall foreign student enrollment percentages are small, their presence both on campuses and throughout the United States is significant and felt in a variety of ways. They are an important factor in the internationalization of U.S. higher education, especially for colleges and universities that do not offer study abroad

opportunities for the students or have students who are not able to study abroad. In addition, international students' financial contributions to both U.S. institutions of higher education and the U.S. economy are significant. In an analysis prepared for NAFSA, the Association of International Educators, Lynn Schoch and Jason Baumgartner of Indiana University estimated that they contributed over \$11 billion to the U.S. economy through tuition and living expenses last year.

Regional Trends

Enrollment trends during the time period 1954–1955 to 2000–2001 differ greatly by region of the world. Asia has always been the leading source of foreign student enrollments in the United States, with the exception of one year, 1979–1980. The percentage of enrollment from Asia has ranged from a low of 29.7 percent in 1954–1955 to over 55.1 percent in 2000–2001; the highest percentage was nearly 60 percent (59.4 percent) in 1992–1993. There have been very sharp percentage increases since the late 1970s and early 1980s, especially beginning in 1983–1984.

In the Americas, the general trend over the years has been a decreasing percentage of enrollments from Latin America, from 24.7 percent in 1954–1955 to 11.6 percent in 2000–2001, with fluctuations throughout the years. In the 1970s, the Middle East surpassed Latin America in its number-two ranking; then in the 1990s, Europe surpassed them both. Though actual numbers have been increasing over the years, the percentage of enrollments from North America have, in general, seen steady declines, from 13.8 percent in 1954–1955 to 4.7 percent in 2000–2001. There were double-digit percentages from 1954–1955 to 1968–1969, but they have been 4 to 5 percent since 1979–1980.

Percentages of enrollments from Europe have generally been in the double digits, in the range of 10 to 15 percent, except in the decade from 1974–1975 to 1984–1985. These percentage of enrollment decreases were taking place simultaneously with increasing African enrollments in that same decade. The percentage of total enrollment each year from Africa was in the double digits for a decade, from 1974–1975 to 1984–1985, with the peak in the early 1980s, when enrollments doubled. International students from Oceania have always constituted less than 2 percent of international student enrollments; they have for the most part constituted less than 1 percent of the foreign student total in the United States since the 1991–1992. As in the case of North America, there have been total number increases, but percentage decreases, since the early 1980s (1979–1980).

In comparing top regional enrollments from 1954–1955 to 2000–2001, several patterns emerge. In the early years, from 1954–1955 to 1974–1975, Asia was the leading

region of origin, followed by Latin America, which saw its peak in 1954–1955 (24.7 percent). However, the ranking changed in 1975–1976. Asia was still the top region of origin, but the Middle East displaced Latin America as the second-ranked region in the 1970s. Asia has been the leading region of origin for international students in the United States, but in 1978–1979, the percentage of students from the Middle East (26.6 percent) grew quite close to that of students from Asia (29.1 percent). In 1979–1980, the Middle East percentage (29.2 percent) surpassed that of Asia (28.6 percent), the only year that Asia was not the leading region. In 1982–1983, Latin America began catching up to the Middle East percentages. In 1987–1988, Latin American enrollment percentages (12.5 percent) passed the Middle East (6 percent). Since then, it has dropped down in the rankings as the number-four region, surpassed by Europe in the 1990s, and has seen a steady decline to almost 6 percent since 1991–1992. In 1990–1991, Asia was still ranked the leading region of origin, followed by Europe, for the first time, and then Latin America. They have remained the top three regions since then.

The United States continues to be the destination of choice among international students.

The Future of International Student Flows

The United States continues to be the destination of choice among international students wishing either to pursue or continue higher education abroad. However, the U.S. market share of international students has been decreasing from 36.7 percent of the world's total enrollment in 1970 to 30.2 percent in 1995. The proportion of international students studying in the United States has decreased by approximately 10 percent since the 1980s.

Reasons for this decrease in market share are varied and include internal and external factors. There has been increased competition for full-fee-paying international students from other English-speaking countries, notably the United Kingdom and Australia, which have national international education policies and international student recruitment strategies in place. While these nations' total international enrollments do not reach the level of enrollments in the United States, the international enrollments in these countries are proportionally much greater, as are the percentage increases. Compared to the United States, these

countries have a smaller number of institutions and enrollments in total. In addition, a number of countries have emerged as regional players in the international student marketplace that hope to attract a growing number of students from within their world region. These countries include, among others, Australia, Japan, Malaysia, and South Africa.

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 have impacted international student flows, but in unexpected ways.

More recently, the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 have impacted international student flows, but in unexpected ways. Though the final impact on the number of students studying in the United States remains to be seen until the data are collected and analyzed for the next *Open Doors Report*, an initial on-line survey conducted by the institute through its on-line membership network website during a two-week time period a month after September 11 indicates that there was little immediate impact. Contrary to people's fears that international students would return to their home countries in droves after the terrorist attacks, very few institutions reported much "negative" activity related to September 11. Of the 577 international educators surveyed, 99 percent reported that there was little (less than 10 percent) or no change regarding the numbers of international students returning home. Moreover, 97 percent reported that international education was equally or more important in the aftermath of September 11.

These findings revealed that the desire to seek an international educational experience has not been eradicated among international students wishing to study in the United States and American students wishing to study abroad, and that it is still considered an important dimension of education. The events of September 11 underscored the fact that the world is interconnected and interdependent. The positive outcome of the events was that they created an awareness of the need to promote better understanding among peoples and cultures and to become more internationally educated. In this global world, the best way to promote peace, understanding, and "open minds to the world" is to continue international education—not despite, or in spite of, the events of September 11, but because of those events. It is the institute's hope that the post-September 11 levels of international student enrollment will continue to build on the growing trend since 1954–1955.

Cuba and the Link between Education and Social Transformation

Jesús M. García del Portal

Jesús M. García del Portal is senior professor of the UNESCO Chair on Management and Teaching of the Center of Studies for Improvement Higher Education at the University of Havana, Cuba. CEPES-Universidad de La Habana, Calle 23 N° 453 entre H e I. Vedado. C.P. 10400, La Habana. CUBA. E-mail: <portal@cepes.uh.cu>.

This article offers some reflections on Cuban higher education and attempts to present the key features of the educational system, especially with regard to the link between education and social transformation.

Post-1959

As early as 1962, the reform of higher education had become the most significant development for Cuban universities until the mid-1970s. The reform identified the main steps to be taken, anticipating short- and medium-term developments and warning of initial and future contradictions and difficulties. The reform would serve as a guide for successive transformations.

The changes to the system went beyond the simple massification of school and university services but were a radical transformation, involving the very concept of education and its link with social transformation. Among the many contradictions and difficulties created simultaneously by such a major undertaking were those involving the students, almost all of whom were first-generation university attenders; designing a new curriculum; training a new cadre of professors; diversifying academic institutions and their location; opening up opportunities to the entire student population, to both young and adult students; linking training with the needs of the labor market; and guaranteeing the employment of graduates by the state.

The last four decades have witnessed a change in the disciplinary distribution of university enrollments. While in the late 1960s the technical, pedagogical, and medical fields led in enrollments, pedagogy later moved to first place. More recently, the humanities have started to see increased enrollments. In the future, the humanities will likely experience a boom—just as the pedagogical and medical fields did at earlier periods—as part

of a national movement to improve the cultural attainment of people throughout the country.

Current Developments

Higher education in Cuba is going through a period of qualitative development, as well as a decentralization process. The trend is for academic institutions to become centers in which research work will be the foremost substantive function. A network of research centers is being extended all over the country to equalize provinces with the large urban areas where the oldest centers are found. Those centers are under the auspices of various government offices, so that education is not just the responsibility of the ministries of education. The fact that the privilege of scientific activity does not lie within the education arena alone has helped to promote aggressive development in such areas as medicine, genetics engineering, and biotechnology. Still, this does not imply that research is given higher priority than teaching and education. Research will be integrated into postgraduate studies.

Higher education in Cuba will continue to be involved with university extension activities, in which students and faculty work in communities to ensure that academic professionals are still part of economic development at the ground level. The bulk of the country's scientific potential is in the universities.

Problems and Perspectives

If academic excellence is to be attained, fundamental requirements would be reexamining the undergraduate curriculum and developing postgraduate programs and scientific research activity—inspired by a willingness to do everything better and a conviction that this is possible as part of a process of ongoing academic self-evaluation and adaptation. Beyond the support the universities have given to the social transformation of the Cuban project, a higher stage of academic achievement must be attained in three fundamental areas: student access; the missions of teaching, research, and service; and governance.

Nevertheless, the foundations of the Cuban educational model: public, free, and secular education and the professional, ideological, and cultural level of our graduates are indications of the success of the Cuban educational enterprise. The results of some studies on the professional performance of graduates and progress in the productive and service sectors, along with certain scientific developments, support the position that Cuba has a highly qualified and valuable labor and cultural potential.



Reaction and Response

More on the Pseudouniversity and Its Consequences

Thomas J. La Belle

Thomas J. La Belle is provost and vice president for academic affairs at San Francisco State University, 1600 Holloway Ave, San Francisco, California, 94132. E-mail: <labelle@sfsu.edu>.

This is a follow-up to the exchange in *International Higher Education* between Altbach (fall 2001) and Levy (winter 2002) on the pseudouniversity. Altbach argues that it is time to find a new way to refer to and accredit the mixed bag of institutions calling themselves universities. He especially wants those “pseudos,” operating for profit who vocationally “train” students to be renamed, thereby preserving the title of university for those that “teach, do research, and serve the public good.” Levy notes that many universities in the world do not meet the standards Altbach sets for them and that it is extremely complex to establish definitions and characteristics to differentiate them.

While I agree with much that was said by both authors, I think they overlook another dimension of the differences—namely that the traditional university is being challenged and changed by the pseudos and in some ways the two are not looking so different.

Neither author mentions explicitly the students or the teaching/learning (not just teaching) process. In the 1980s, arguments against the most visible of the pseudos, the University of Phoenix, were not focused on the faculty, research, or services of the institution. Instead, criticism was leveled at what Altbach might call the emphasis on training and the lack of attention to the educational process—that is, what constitutes a legitimate campus learning context and on-campus learning experiences for students.

But the concern with time-on-campus has overshadowed the need to focus on what happens to students during that time—their access to and the size of classes, their time with tenure-track faculty, their satisfaction with class schedules, and their receipt of academic advising. These are the areas where the pseudos are most competitive and where the traditional universities are being challenged.

A second challenge concerns accreditation. Educational *outcomes*, rather than educational *processes* explain the accreditation of Phoenix in the mid-1980s. Once accredited, credentials from Phoenix gained credibility, and learning outcomes and accountability became the dominant indicators for all postsecondary accreditation—including the accreditation of traditional universities.

An additional challenge is associated with the curriculum. The pseudos typically focus on, and standardize, a few subject areas. They then train faculty to teach the material and deliver the core curriculum when and where the students—rather than faculty—want it. This is in contrast to traditional university curricula where the courses offered—often as a result of faculty interests—grow and never seem to diminish.

The curriculum in the pseudos is also tailored to meet licensure, credentialing, and the broader needs of the marketplace—certainly a public good—something that traditional academics in the arts and sciences continue to believe is a “sell-out” to corporatism. While many traditional universities don’t like the vocational emphasis of the pseudos, student preference is for coordinating knowledge and skills with the opportunity structure.

An additional challenge involves the faculty who teach at the two types of institutions. Most traditional universities seek to have at least a majority of faculty on the tenure track and thus limit their dependence on graduate students and part-time lecturers. In reality, many traditional universities are becoming more dependent on the latter for teaching lower-division and major introductory courses and are concerned with growing unionization and the accompanying employment issues. The pseudos rely primarily on part-timers—usually the same part-timers as the traditional universities. Thus, while it may be the ratio of tenure-track faculty to part-time faculty that distinguishes institutional types, it is not the specific faculty per se who can be used to make such differentiations.

“Profit making” is also not a distinguishing feature between universities and the pseudos. If a traditional university can make money on its “business” of teaching, research, and service, it does so. Because of dwindling financial support, however, it often finds it difficult just to balance its books. Associated with funding there are often conflicts between policies designed, for example, to keep students enrolled and paying fees as opposed to expediting their graduation. Fiscal constraints often require skimping on support for things like advising and remediation, and offering faculty-sponsored electives or small seminars.

In sum, whether we like it or not, the issue may not be what to call an institution that does not present a traditional appearance. Instead, the broader question may be how and whether to sustain what has made the traditional ones the standard bearers, in the face of the challenges posed by the others. ■

Higher Education Research in Latin America: Trends and Resources

Alma Maldonado-Maldonado

Alma Maldonado-Maldonado is a research assistant in the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College. Address: CIHE, 207 Campion Hall, Boston College, Chestnut Hill MA 02467, USA. E-mail: <guadalup@bc.edu>.

Approximately half of the students in higher education today live in the developing world. Therefore, it is no coincidence that the number of books and research centers on higher education is rapidly rising in developing countries. This is the case in Latin America, where a significant number of specialists are working on the problems of higher education institutions in the region. The fact that most of their research output is published in Spanish complicates the access to the English-speaking academic community. However, these important studies should not be ignored by specialists in the English-speaking community and other communities. Therefore, this article provides information concerning several books recently published in Latin America—specifically, in Argentina, Mexico, and Columbia.

Many differences exist among Latin American countries in the development of their higher education systems, research infrastructure, and number of specialists working on higher education. These variations relate to the number of institutions and the total enrollments in higher education as well as factors such as academic traditions or national policies. Nevertheless, it may be useful to classify the countries according to the level of institutionalized research on higher education. Some countries have quite a few research centers, specialists, associations of practitioners, journals, governmental bodies, and established networks of experts. Mexico, Brazil, Chile, and Argentina fall into this group. Countries in the process of consolidating their research systems include Colombia, Venezuela, and Cuba. A group of countries that has made serious efforts to develop more institutionalized research in this field, but are at an early stage of development, includes Bolivia, Ecuador, Costa Rica, and Peru. A final group is comprised of countries that have not yet developed institutionalized research on higher education—such as the Central American countries as well as others about whose research systems specialists know very little, such as Uruguay and Paraguay.

Another relevant factor concerns the diverse topics analyzed in the region, a reflection of the differences that exist across Latin America. Many of the topics concern

only specific institutions, but others are relevant for the majority of the higher education systems worldwide.

Current Literature

Orlando, Albornoz. *Cuba y China, ¿Son dos opciones académicas para Venezuela? Un ejercicio de educación superior comparada internacional* (Cuba and China: Are they two academic options for Venezuela? An exercise in comparative international higher education). Caracas, Venezuela: Universidad Central de Venezuela-Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Sociales, 2000. 345 pp. ISBN: 980-00-1659-0. Address: Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Sociales, UCV, Unidad de publicaciones, Caracas, Venezuela.

Venezuela is one of the countries in Latin America currently experiencing a complicated political and economic situation. This is the context in which Albornoz presented his analysis. According to Venezuelan officials, Cuba and China are the two educational models that Venezuela should follow. Therefore, Albornoz, one of the most well-known researchers on higher education in Venezuela, decided to undertake a comparative analysis of the viability of this idea. Albornoz analyzes the Cuban and Chinese education systems, their characteristics, history, and problems to see what Venezuela can learn from these two countries' experiences. The author discusses the real possibilities for its future in the Venezuelan higher education system.

Pablo González Casanova. *La universidad necesaria en el siglo XXI* (A university paradigm for the twenty-first century). Mexico: Era, 2001. 167 pp. ISBN: 968-411-512-1. Address: Editorial Era, Calle del Trabajo 31, 14269, Mexico, D.F., Mexico.

González Casanova discusses the relevant issues concerning the type of university a society like Mexico's needs as it confronts its most pressing national problems. The author addresses the current challenges for universities in the context of globalization: finance, the relationship with state and national governments, privatization, and access. He proposes a university model for Mexico that addresses all these issues from a humanistic, democratic, and critical perspective; this is one of the most important strengths of this text.

Francisco López Segrera and Alma Maldonado-Maldonado, eds. *Educación superior latinoamericana y organismos internacionales. Un análisis crítico* (Latin American higher education and international organizations. A critical analysis). Cali: Universidad de San Buenaventura Cali, 2002. 267 pp. \$15 (pb). ISBN: 958-95925-4-6. Address: Universidad de San Buenaventura Cali, La Umbría. Carretera a Pance, A.A. 25162 y 7154, Colombia. E-mail: <jlgrosso@usb.edu.co>.

López Segrera and Maldonado have edited a collection of eight different essays analyzing the impact of the report *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise* (Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 2000), focusing on Latin American countries. The book includes chapters by authors such as José Joaquín Brunner, Carlos Tünnermann, Axel Didriksson, Roberto Rodríguez, and other specialists, as well as by the editors. The authors analyze, from a Latin American perspective, the future impact of this report in the implementation of different policies involving higher education institutions. The essays point out many important topics: the influence of globalization on higher education, the process of institutional reform, a historical review of World Bank recommendations, the problems with research, the trends with regard to curriculum, and the pertinence and future of Latin American higher education institutions—all in the context of the main recommendations and conclusions of the document written by the Task Force on Higher Education and Society.

Renate Marsiske, ed. *La universidad de México: Un recorrido histórico de la época colonial al presente* (The Mexican University: A historical journey from colonial times to the present). Mexico: Centro de Estudios sobre la Universidad (CESU)-UNAM- Plaza y Valdés Editores, 2001. 326 pp. \$15 (pb). ISBN: 968-36-9737-2. Address: CESU, Edif. de la Unidad bibliográfica, lado norte del Centro Cultural Universitario, Coyoacán, Mexico, D.F. 04510, Mexico. E-mail: <emaro@servidor.unam.mx>.

This book includes 14 chapters about the history of the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM). The authors, 12 researchers at the CESU-UNAM, analyze the different stages in UNAM's history—first, as the Royal University, then the Royal and Pontifical University of Mexico, the National University of Mexico, the Autonomous University of Mexico, and finally in its current configuration. This book constitutes a good source on UNAM and provides an important interdisciplinary study not only about this institution but about Mexican universities in general.

Javier Mendoza Rojas. *Los conflictos de la UNAM en el siglo XX* (UNAM's conflicts in the 20th century). Mexico: Centro de Estudios sobre la Universidad (CESU)-UNAM-Plaza y Valdés Editores, 2001. 254 pp. \$15 (pb). ISBN: 968-36-9485-3. Address: CESU, Edif. de la Unidad bibliográfica, lado norte del Centro Cultural Universitario, Coyoacán, México, D.F. 04510, México. E-mail: <emaro@servidor.unam.mx>.

The National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) is one of the largest universities in Latin America and the world. It is also one of the oldest and

most complex institutions of higher education in the region. UNAM has lived through many important political conflicts during its history and particularly since 1900. The most recent event was the student strike that started in 1999 and ended almost one year later, as a consequence of the attempt of the authorities to increase tuition. Mendoza Rojas traces the major conflicts that have arisen at UNAM since its reopening in 1910. The author divides the history of the institution into eight periods: its creation as an elite institution, the Mexican Revolution, the phase between 1920 and 1940, the "golden age" of the university, the political and cultural crisis in the 1960s, the populism of the 1970s, the lost decade in the 1980s (when the state no longer considered the university a useful social institution for its national project), and the modernization process began in the 1990s. For those who are interested in learning about the most important public university in Mexico this book represents an important source.

Approximately half of the students in higher education today live in the developing world.

Javier Mendoza Rojas. *Transición de la educación superior contemporánea en México: de la planeación al Estado Evaluador* (The transition of contemporary higher education in Mexico: From planning to evaluating State). Mexico: Centro de Estudios sobre la Universidad (CESU)-UNAM-Miguel Ángel Porrúa, 2002. 374 pp. \$12 (pb). ISBN: 970-701-201-2. Address: CESU, Edif. de la Unidad bibliográfica, lado norte del Centro Cultural Universitario, Coyoacán, Mexico, D.F. 04510, Mexico. E-mail: <emaro@servidor.unam.mx>.

The decade of the 1990s is considered the period in which significant reforms occurred in Latin American higher education systems. Mendoza Rojas points out that at the beginning of this decade, a new approach to coordinating the higher education system was initiated. The traditional role of the state changed, and evaluation became the most important policy mechanism, together with market logic, to regulate the development of higher education institutions. In addition to an analysis of the policies implemented during the 1980s, the author presents a discussion of the main actors, programs, and initiatives that influenced and regulated higher education institutions. The analysis is centered on the changes started in the 1990s when the economic crisis forced institutions

to modify their policies. A range of evaluation and accountability procedures were introduced encompassing institutions, programs, academics, students, and research projects, among other elements. Mendoza Rojas's book constitutes a basic document for understanding the transformation in the public policies that took place in Mexico over the last two decades.

Marcela Mollis. *La Universidad argentina en tránsito: Ensayo para jóvenes y no tan jóvenes* (The Argentine University in transition: An essay for the young and not so young). Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2001. 145 pp. \$7. (pb) ISBN: 950-557-421-5. Address: Fondo de Cultura Económica S.A., El Salvador 5665, 1414, Buenos Aires, Argentina. E-mail: <fondo@fce.com.ar>.

Every book that focuses on Argentina has acquired special relevance in view of the economic and political crisis that the country is now experiencing. This is the case with Mollis's book. The author describes and analyzes the Argentine higher education system and the principal trends, problems, and transformations that the system has been facing. The text is presented in a very informal way because it is addressed to a general audience. In fact, one of the author's main purposes is to provide a guide for

young people of college age, to help them in making decisions about their educational options and especially their professional future. Mollis discusses the current process of marketization in Argentina from a very critical point of view. Although this book was written prior to the recent economic crisis in Argentina, it provides a realistic analysis that remains relevant.

Alberto C. Taquini. *La transformación de la educación superior argentina: De las nuevas universidades a los colegios universitarios* (The transformation of Argentine higher education: From the new universities to traditional colleges). Buenos Aires: Academia Nacional de Educación, 2000. 339 pp. ISBN: 987-9145-10-0. Address: Pacheco de Melo, 2084, 1126 Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Taquini's book presents a study about Argentine higher education. The author presents important data about the system and some statistics about enrollment, institutions, and programs. The author also discusses the problems and major trends of the system. The book provides an analysis of the context for Argentine higher education, labor market demands, and other issues, such as decentralization of the system. ■

News of the Center and the Boston College Program in Higher Education

The Center has received support for a research project on The Past and Future of Asian Universities. Experts from 12 Asian countries will examine past and future trends affecting universities in their countries. The countries involved include China, Japan, South Korea, Vietnam, the Philippines, Cambodia, India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and Cambodia. The research group will meet at Nagoya University in Japan, in December 2002, to discuss their findings, and a book will be published based on this work. The project is undertaken in cooperation with Prof. Toru Umakoshi of Nagoya University, and is supported by the Toyota Foundation, The Japan Foundation, and the Japanese Ministry of Education.

Work on our major reference handbook on African higher education has been completed and the book will be published by Indiana University Press at the end of 2002. Copies will be made available without cost to key research institutions in Africa. Damtew Teferra has been the main researcher on this project. Philip G. Altbach spent a month as a visiting professor at the Fondation Nationale d'Etudes Sciences Politique and the Centre de Sociologie des Organisations. While in Paris, he lectured at the OECD, Sciences Po, CSO, and others. Damtew Teferra, Center staff member, is participating in an Africa-focused study of information technology. He recently participated in a conference on African higher education at the University of Illinois. The Center welcomes Roberta Bassett, Jef Davis, Francesca Purcell, Alma Maldonado-Maldonado, and Robin Matross as graduate assistants for the 2002 fall semester.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Chapman, David W. and Ann E. Austin, eds., *Higher Education in the Developing World: Changing Contexts and Institutional Responses*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Publishers, 2002. 278 pp. (hb). ISBN 0-313-32016-0. Address: Greenwood Publishers, 88 Post Road West, Westport, CT 06881, USA.

A wide-ranging discussion of higher education issues in developing and transitional economies, this book focuses broadly on issues of government-university relations and governance. Among the topics considered are privatization in Russia, higher education goals in Laos, autonomy in Brazil, the role of the state in Mongolia, the role of the academic profession in reform in China, and related topics.

De Wit, Hans. *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe: A Historical, Comparative, and Conceptual Analysis*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Publishers, 2002. 270 pp. \$70.00 (hb). ISBN 0-313-32075-6. Address: Greenwood Publishers, POB 5007, Westport, CT 06881, USA.

A comprehensive analysis of the entire range of internationalization of higher education in the United States and Europe, this book provides an unprecedented range of topics. It discusses the historical origins of internationalization, the various definitions of internationalization, and contemporary themes such as globalization, the rise of regional networks, and the role of English as a key international language.

Drewry, Henry N. and Humphrey Doermann. *Stand and Prosper: Private Black Colleges and Their Students*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2002. 332 pp. \$29.95 (hb). ISBN

0-691-04900-9. Address: Princeton University Press, 41 William St., Princeton, NJ 08540, USA.

Probably the most comprehensive and thoughtful analysis of America's black colleges and universities ever written, this book includes historical discussion, sociological analysis, and contemporary consideration. The unique role of historically black institutions of higher learning is the focus of this book, which discusses how this segment of higher education remains relevant.

Friedland, Martin L. *The University of Toronto: A History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002. 764 pp. \$60, £45 (hb). ISBN 0-8020-44298. Address: University of Toronto Press, 5201 Dufferin St. North York, ON M4Y 2W8, Canada.

A detailed historical chronology of Canada's most important university, this volume provides a complete historical discussion of the development of the University of Toronto.

Grendler, Paul F. *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002. 591 pp. \$49.50 (hb). ISBN 0-8018-6631-6. Address: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2715 N. Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21218, USA.

A detailed account and analysis of the first Western universities, this book includes historical sketches of the early universities—Bologna, Padua, Florence, and others—a discussion of teaching in the various disciplines provided, and consideration of the organization of the academic institutions, student life, and finances.

Guhr, Daniel J. *Access to Higher Education in Germany and California*. Frankfurt/M, Germany: Peter Lang, 2002. 308 pp. (hb) \$45.50. ISBN 0-8204-4708-0.

This book compares access to higher education in Germany and California

between 1970 and 1989 and tracks sociocultural and ethnic groups. Policy initiatives, such as affirmative action in California, are analyzed.

Gumport, Patricia J. *Academic Pathfinders: Knowledge Creation and Feminist Scholarship*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Publishers, 2002. 197 pp. \$64.95 (hb). ISBN 0-313-32096-9. Address: Greenwood Publishers, POB 5007, Westport, CT 06881, USA.

An analysis of the emergence of feminist scholarship in the United States, this book discusses how feminist thought was embedded into American universities and analyzes the key scholars and intellectual trends in the field as feminism and women's studies became important parts of academic research and discourse.

Huber, Mary Taylor and Sherwyn P. Morreale, eds. *Disciplinary Styles in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 2002. 239 pp. (pb). ISBN 1-56377-052-0. USA.

One reform effort in U.S. higher education is to increase the emphasis on teaching as a central element in the scholarly work of the professoriate. This book focuses on the relationship between teaching and scholarship in such disciplines as English studies, history, communications, sociology, and psychology, among others.

Langan, Elise. *The European Union: ERASMUS in Paris*. Huntington, N.Y.: Nova Science Publishers, 2001. 169 pp (hb). ISBN 1-59033-112-5. Address: Nova Science Publishers, 227 Main St., Huntington, NY 11743, USA.

A case study of the internationalization efforts in Paris, this volume discusses French internationalization policy for higher education and examines several universities in the Paris region.

McDonald, William M. et al. *Creating Campus Community*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers, 2002. 200 pp (pb). ISBN 0-7879-5700-3. Address: Jossey Bass Publishers, 989 Market St., San Francisco, CA 94103, USA.

The focus of this book is on creating a sense of community among students, faculty, and administrators in colleges and universities. Case studies of campus-based programs to foster community through social service and other programs are presented.

McMillan, Linda A. and William G. Berberet, eds. *New Academic Compact: Revisioning the Relationship Between Faculty and Their Institutions*. Bolton, Mass: Anker Publishing Co., 2002. 256 pp. \$39.95 (hb). ISBN 1-882982-44-4. Address: Anker Publishing, POB 249, Bolton, MA 01740, USA.

A project of the Associated New American Colleges, a group of private universities and colleges, the New Academic Compact project examines the role of the academic profession in changing circumstances. Among the topics considered in this book are faculty workloads, shared governance and the academic profession, professional development across the academic career, the role of service, and others.

McSherry, Corynne. *Who Owns Academic Work? Battling for Control of Intellectual Property*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001. 275 pp. \$29.95 (hb). ISBN 0-674-00629-1. Address: Harvard University Press, 79 Garden St., Cambridge, MA 02138, USA.

Issues relating to intellectual property are increasingly central to the future of modern research universities as well as to the scholars and scientists who work in them. This volume, which focuses on how scholars deal with intellectual property, copyright, plagiarism, and related issues in American universities, has major implications for the future of higher education everywhere.

McVeigh, Brian J. *Japanese Higher Education as Myth*. Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, 2002. 320 pp. (pb) \$25.95. ISBN 0-7656-0925-8. Address: M. E. Sharpe, 80 Business Park Dr., Armonk, NY 10504, USA.

Another critique of the Japanese higher education system, this book focuses on the problems of the examination system, overly strict centralized controls, poor teaching, and other issues. The author, an anthropologist, focuses on the experiences and opinions of students.

O'Brien, George Dennis. *The Idea of a Catholic University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002. 336 pp \$28 (hb). ISBN 0-226-61661-4. Address: University of Chicago Press, 1427 E. 60th St., Chicago, IL 60637, USA.

This wide-ranging book discusses the philosophical and historical origins of Catholic higher education as well as the contemporary challenges facing American Catholic colleges and universities. The author argues for the primacy of academic freedom in the context of religious values, and explains the university's role as a center for critical thought. For that reason, he is critical of the recent efforts by the Catholic Church to ensure loyalty through its document, *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*.

Onestini, Cesare. *Federalism and Länder Autonomy: The Higher Education Policy Network in the Federal Republic of Germany*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2002. 235 pp. (hb). ISBN 0-415-93359-5. Address: RoutledgeFalmer, 29 W. 35th St., New York, NY 10001, USA.

A detailed analysis of the organization of the federal structure of German higher education and how various political forces at the state and national levels impact on higher education policy, this book provides a thorough overview of Germany's complex higher education policy framework. Such specific topics as the

financing of universities, the process of German unification, and others are included.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. *Lithuania*. Paris: OECD, 2002. 276 pp. (pb). ISBN: 92-64-18717-0. Address: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2 rue Andre-Pascal, 75775 Paris, France.

This is one volume of OECD's useful series "Review of National Policies for Education." These policy-focused studies deal with all sectors of education, but higher education, adult education, distance education and other aspects of postsecondary education are the ones prominently discussed. Statistical information, description, and analysis are all included in the study, which is prepared by a group of international experts with input from local counterparts. Additional studies in this series relate to the other Baltic nations—Estonia and Latvia. The OECD has also sponsored similar reviews of OECD member states.

Schier, Tracy and Cynthia Russett, eds. *Catholic Women's Colleges in America*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002. 439 pp. \$45 (hb) ISBN 0-8018-6805-X. Address: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2715 N. Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21218, USA.

More than 150 American colleges were founded by nuns to educate Catholic women, of which approximately 110 remain in existence. This book analyzes the historical development of this underresearched segment of

Sign up to receive announcements regarding new issues of International Higher Education by sending an e-mail to: IHEonlinesubscribe@yahoogroups.com or visit our website at <http://www.bc.edu/cihe/>

American higher education and analyses the current status of Catholic women's colleges. Chapters include case studies of institutions, discussions of the religious impulses that led to the founding of the schools, and the role of the colleges in the broader context of American higher education.

Tierney, William G. and Linda Serra Hagedorn, ed. *Increasing Access to College: Extending Possibilities to All Students*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 2002. 250 pp. (pb). ISBN 0-7914-5364-2. Address: SUNY Press, 90 State St., Albany NY 12207, USA. The focus of this book is on the increasingly important topic of

school-to-college transition, and the aim is to increase access to students from population groups with low postsecondary attendance rates. Programs for preparing students for college study are analyzed from the perspective of improving their effectiveness and contributing to greater access. ■

An Initiative in International Higher Education

Introduction

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education provides a unique service to colleges and universities worldwide. While it has as its primary aim providing information and publications to colleges and universities related to the Jesuit tradition, it also has a broader mission to be a focal point for discussion and thoughtful analysis of higher education. The Center provides information and analysis for those involved in managing the higher education enterprise internationally through publications, conferences, and the maintenance of a database of individuals and institutions. The Center is especially concerned with creating dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions in the industrialized nations and those in the developing countries of the Third World.

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education works in a series of concentric circles. At the core of the enterprise is the Jesuit community of postsecondary institutions—with special emphasis on the issues that affect institutions in developing countries. The next ring of the circle is made up of academic institutions in the Catholic tradition. Finally, other academic institutions as well as governmental agencies concerned with higher education may participate in the activities of the Center. All of the Center's publications are available to a wide audience.

Programs and Resources

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education has as its purpose the stimulation of an international consciousness among Jesuit and other institutions concerning issues of higher education and the provision of documentation and analysis relating to higher education development. The following activities form the core of the Center's activities during its initial period of development:

- newsletter,
- publication series,
- study opportunities,
- conferences,
- bibliographical and document service, and
- networking and information technology.

The Program in Higher Education

The Program in Higher Education offers masters and doctoral degree study in the field of higher education. The Program has been preparing professionals in higher education for three decades, and features a rigorous social science-based approach to the study of higher education. The Administrative Fellows initiative provides financial assistance as well as work experience in a variety of administrative settings. Specializations in higher education administration, student affairs, international higher education, and others are offered. The Higher Education Program works closely with the Center for International Higher Education. Additional information about the program in Higher Education is available from Dr. Karen Arnold, Coordinator, Program in Higher Education, Campion Hall, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467. Fax: (617) 552-8422 e-mail: Arnoldkc@bc.edu. More information about the program—including course descriptions and degree requirements—can be found online at the program's WWW site:

http://infoeagle.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/hea/HEA.html

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

ISSN: 1084-0613

Editorial Office

Center for International
Higher Education
Campion Hall
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467 USA
Tel: (617) 552-4236
Fax: (617) 552-8422
E-Mail: highered@bc.edu
<http://www.bc.edu/cihe/>

Editor: Philip G. Altbach
Assistant Editor: Jef C. Davis

Material in this newsletter may be reproduced. Please cite the original source of publication. Opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center for International Higher Education.

International Higher Education is published quarterly by the Center for International Higher Education. We welcome correspondence, ideas for articles, and reports. If you would like to be placed on our mailing list, please write to the editor on your business letterhead.