

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

NUMBER 45 FALL 2006

Higher Education and Politics

- 2** Tuition Fee Reform in Germany
Barbara M. Kehm
- 3** Presidential Politics and Reforms in Mexico
Alma Maldonado-Maldonado
- 5** Manifestos and Manifestations in Athens
Christopher Ziguras and Grant McBurnie

Economic Issues

- 6** Higher Education and Poverty in Africa
David E. Bloom, David Canning, and Kevin Chan
- 8** Institutional Tuition Fee Discount
Arthur M. Hauptman
- 9** Women's Education and Employment in the UAE
Fatma Abdulla

Private Higher Education

- 11** Private Higher Education in Turkey
Kemal Gürüz
- 12** Nicaragua: New Private versus Old Private and Public
Carlos Olivares
- 14** New Private Universities in Nigeria
Isaac N. Obasi

Internationalization

- 15** Chinese Higher Education in an Open-Door Era
Philip G. Altbach
- 17** Internationalizing Higher Education in South Africa
Ariel Libhaber and Ryan M. Greene

Current Issues

- 19** Judges and Higher Education: A Troublesome Precedent
Alan L. Contreras
- 20** Universities and Leaders: A Causal Link
Amanda Goodall

Countries and Regions

- 21** Private Tutoring in India
Pawan Agarwal
- 23** Trends in American Academic Work and Careers
Martin Finkelstein
- 24** Hong Kong's Brain Race
Philip G. Altbach and Gerard Postiglione

Departments

- 27** New Publications

Tuition Fee Reform in Germany

BARBARA M. KEHM

Barbara M. Kehm is professor and director at the International Centre for Higher Education Research, University of Kassel. Address: Moenchebergstr. 17, D-34109 Kassel, Germany. E-mail: kehm@hochschulforschung.uni-kassel.de.

The introduction of tuition fees has brought about a long-term debate in Germany. While the majority of political actors and institutional decision makers wanted tuition fees in the higher education sector, the various stakeholder groups failed to agree on who should gain access to the extra revenue and thus blocked the policy decision. The responsible state government ministries wanted to save money by reducing the budget allocations to higher education institutions based on the income provided by tuition fees. The rectors and presidents rejected this idea and voted against tuition fees as long as state governments did not offer guarantees that institutions could invest this extra income, in particular for the improvement of teaching quality. Politically, the Social Democrats opposed and the Christian Democrats favored the introduction of tuition fees.

Gradually, tuition fees have been introduced on the margins of the German higher education system. First, tuition fees were charged for continuing academic education and lifelong-learning provisions. Then the German states started to demand tuition fees from students who were enrolled more than four semesters beyond the standard period. The administrative fees for student reenrollments each semester increased as well.

The last amendment to the German Higher Education Framework Law under the Social Democratic coalition government in 2002 included an explicit prohibition of tuition fees for undergraduate programs. Six of the German states—all of them governed by the Christian Democrats or a conservative coalition—brought action to the Constitutional Court, calling the federal government's prohibition of fees an unconstitutional interference into the budgetary autonomy of the states with regard to higher education.

In January 2005 the Constitutional Court ruled in favor of the German states—declaring the prohibition of tuition fees under the Higher Education Framework Law to be unconstitutional and allowing the states to levy tuition fees. The controversial debate intensified. The court's decision seemed not only to be the beginning of the end of any higher education framework law guaranteeing a certain amount of systemic uniformity but also evidence of a change from the idea of education as a public good to the idea of education as a private good.

THE PRESENT REFORM

Soon after the decision, the first German states announced their intent to introduce tuition fees. The general idea was to ask for 500 euros per semester in all subjects. Most of the states kept their previous regulations regarding administration fees for reenrollment and tuition fees for long-term students and continuing academic education provisions. In addition, the majority of states are about to introduce fees for undergraduate and graduate education. But there are considerable policy differences among the 16 German states.

All the eastern German states as well as Berlin, regardless which political party is in power, are currently not planning to introduce tuition fees. They hope to have a competitive advantage and thus be able to attract those German students into their higher education institutions who want to avoid paying tuition fees. In addition, Rhineland-Palatinate is also not planning to introduce tuition fees. The remaining nine German states plan

Gradually, tuition fees have been introduced on the margins of the German higher education system.

to introduce tuition fees of about 500 euros per semester starting in the 2006/07 winter semester or in the 2007 summer semester. However, the conditions and tuition-related regulations differ in some states. For example, Bremen will only require tuition fees from students living outside the city state. Hesse would like to introduce tuition fees but will first need to amend the state constitution, which now prohibits such fees. Bavaria will charge different tuition fees at a university and at a university of applied sciences (*Fachhochschule*). In North Rhine-Westphalia, the government allows higher education institutions to decide the level of fees, ranging from 0 and 500 euros. Furthermore, some differences exist in procedures involving international students, regulations for receiving and repaying loans, or conditions to become exempted from paying fees.

CONSEQUENCES AND CONCERNS OF ACCESS

Almost all German states (except Hamburg) are planning to introduce tuition fees by 2006/07 or 2007. While the actual consequences can only be examined in the future, there are a number of concerns and anticipated consequences. In particular, it is said that the willingness of young people coming from low-income families to engage in higher education may result in some negative impacts. In terms of access, the situation is going to become even more complex. Three aspects are worth mentioning here: (a) student mobility within Germany; (b) recognition of certificates and achievements earned in another German state; and (c) the selection of students by higher education institutions.

It is expected that the anticipated differentiation of fees will

hinder student mobility within Germany—depending on the state, the higher education institution, and possibly the subject. However, eastern German states following a tuition-free policy will profit from some student migration from states that will demand tuition fees.

The establishment of an elite sector within the German higher education system on the basis of the “initiative for excellence” as well as other complications may lead to a further differentiation of institutions and tuition fees, as well as reducing intra-German mobility. It is expected that universities succeeding in the initiative will eventually ask for considerably higher fees than other universities.

Universities counting themselves as part of the elite group will restrict access and heighten selectivity. Other institutions will follow this approach, because they fear being left with students rejected as unqualified by the elite universities. The principles of free access and students choosing their higher education institutions will be reversed.

This is a slightly revised version of an article originally published (in English and French) in *IAU Horizons* 2, May 2006. The author thanks the Association of International Universities for the permission to publish this revised version. ■

Presidential Politics and Higher Education Reforms in Mexico

ALMA MALDONADO-MALDONADO

Alma Maldonado-Maldonado is assistant professor at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona. Address: 327-B Education, Tucson, Arizona, 85721, USA. E-mail: maldona2@arizona.edu.

The Vicente Fox administration is coming to an end. In 2000, Fox was the first president elected from a political party other than PRI (the Institutional Revolutionary Party), which ruled Mexico for more than 75 years. When PAN (the National Action Party) won the last elections many expectations were created about Fox’s presidency, given the victory of a different political party.

Discussing Fox’s legacy in higher education seems pertinent at this moment. Mexican presidential elections took place on July 2nd, and the conservative candidate was declared the victor in a disputed decision. This article discusses the extent to which a political transition influences higher education reform in a Latin American country. This analysis seems necessary due to the various political changes that have occurred

on the continent recently. There is no intention, however, to simplify the complex task of reforming higher education institutions.

MAIN INITIATIVES IN THE FOX ADMINISTRATION

The four principal higher education initiatives emphasized during the six years of Fox’s government include: the Integral Program for Institutional Strengthening (PIFI—all acronyms in this article are based on the Spanish names); the National Program of Higher Education Scholarships (PRONABES); the Extraordinary Funds to Support State Public Universities (FAEUP); and the creation of polytechnic and intercultural universities. The first three programs basically offer extraordinary funds at different levels: faculty, research, infrastructure, graduate education, and low-income students, among others; the fourth initiative stresses the creation of other tertiary education alternatives.

Examining the focus of the Fox administration’s main initiatives on higher education shows limited policies that have neglected some of the major national problems in this sector. In the best scenario, some of Fox’s main policies represent just a continuation of previous programs—not necessarily a wrong approach; however, in fact most of the main problems in Mexican higher education were not addressed after the political transition, which reveals the challenge of improving higher education institutions, solving their problems, and enhancing their effectiveness.

PIFI is perhaps the best example of Fox’s approach. Its main purpose has been to integrate other government funding programs to support higher education institutions. PIFI includes the following programs: PROMEP (the Faculty Improvement Program), established by President Zedillo in 1996 to fund professional and academic faculty development; FOMES (the Fund for the Modernization of Higher Education), created under the Salinas administration in 1990 to “modernize” higher education institutions; and FIUPEA (the Fund for Public Universities with Accredited and Evaluated Programs), established to finance universities whose programs have been accredited by the corresponding national boards. PIFI includes other programs for improving infrastructure, modernizing administration, and supporting graduate education (a continuation of a program cosponsored by the National Council for Science and Technology). In sum, innovation does not characterize PIFI.

In this scenario, perhaps the most original and significant initiative, officially promoted within the Fox administration is the higher education scholarship program (PRONABES). In 2001/02, 44,400 scholarships were awarded; in 2005/06 it is estimated that 150,000 students of low socioeconomic status will benefit from the program. First-year students at public institutions (private institutions are not allowed to participate) receive about US\$67 dollars per year; second-year, about US\$79; third-year, US\$89; and fourth-year, US\$144. These scholarships seem inadequate, but no doubt they have benefit-

ed a significant number of underprivileged students. Perhaps the high profile of PRONABES has to do with its representing the Fox administration's only distinctive higher education program.

Polytechnic universities and those named "intercultural universities" have been officially viewed as other "original" Fox initiatives, although their identity has not been clarified. Approximately 15 polytechnic universities have been created, but it is unclear what constitutes the main differences between the polytechnic universities and the technological institutes, especially in terms of missions and goals. Some differences

Other relevant topics that should be the focus of an integrated reform include the absence of coordination between higher education and the science and technology sectors; and the problems regarding institutional autonomy, accountability, decentralization, and financing.

exist in the administration of these two types of institutions, but a more important task is to question the relevance of creating more institutions instead of seeking to improve the coordination and consolidation of the existing ones. Intercultural universities were created mainly to serve indigenous communities, but they cannot be judged as an original initiative since some indigenous universities were previously established in Mexico. Intercultural universities attempt to offer programs that differ from those of classic universities (i.e., language and culture, alternative truism, sustainable development, intercultural communication, or ecological agriculture). The project seems interesting but remains incomplete. Initially, Fox planned to create 10 campuses but only 5 were operating in 2005.

URGENT ISSUES

Certainly, the Fox administration introduced a number of isolated efforts—some more successful than others—to improve tertiary-level education. Unfortunately, the absence of a coordinated plan to address the main problems of Mexican higher education seems Fox's chief legacy. Some of these issues require solutions.

Access to higher education. This issue is especially critical among the poorest and most marginalized population. Two relevant aspects related to access concern the demographic change Mexico is experiencing (the rapid increase of the college-age population) and the notable growth of the private sector, which means more attention needs to focus on education provided.

Evaluation. The country needs to undertake an immediate debate on the evaluation of institutions—both the positive and

negative effects. The next government cannot consider evaluation as something inevitable. Certainly, evaluation has been useful in many aspects, but it has also created serious problems.

Institutional equity. Mexico is one of the most socioeconomically inequitable countries worldwide. Inequality affects every scope, including higher education institutions. Instead of looking to compensate inequalities, some governmental policies have penalized less-privileged institutions. The funding created during the Fox administration is a positive move, but more coordinated efforts are needed.

Coordination of subsystems and institutions. Federal and state higher education needs to improve serious policies promoting academic mobility and academic transfer (i.e., confirmation of credits or creation of an academic national retirement fund). The lack of harmonization among Mexican institutions inhibits the better use of their resources.

Cross-border higher education. The Mexican government has not promoted the necessary debate among key actors—university rectors, experts, stakeholders, and state and federal staff members—on cross-border higher education, commercialization of services, and other modalities, as well as developing subsequent actions. Today, at least four international for-profit providers have gained presence in Mexico (Laureate Education Inc., Apollo Group Inc., Alliant International Universities, and Informatics Holding); and more international providers are expected to be established in the country in the next years. No nonprofit international providers have yet been established.

Other relevant topics that should be the focus of an integrated reform include the absence of coordination between higher education and the science and technology sectors; and the problems regarding institutional autonomy, accountability, decentralization, and financing. Solving these problems involves not only political will but also being committed to provide the necessary economic resources for the higher education sector.

In the context of a new geopolitical panorama in Latin America, the recent victories by Evo Morales and Michelle Bachelet in Bolivia and Chile, respectively; and previous results in Brazil (Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva), Argentina (Néstor Kirchner), Venezuela (Hugo Chávez) and Uruguay (Tabaré Vázquez) place on the table the debate of governments positioned as leftist and their possible impact on higher education reforms. The question is whether Mexico—as well as the other eight Latin American countries carrying out presidential elections this year—is going to succeed in debating and looking to transform the higher education sector independently of or relying on the political regime change. The missed opportunity in Fox's case might be taken up again by his successor, although the chances seem smaller if the winning candidate comes from the same political party and carries out a continuation of Fox's agenda. We will see the outcome in the near future. ■

Private Higher Education in Greece: Protests Against Recognition

CHRISTOPHER ZIGURAS AND GRANT MCBURNIE

Christopher Ziguras is senior research fellow in the Globalism Institute at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology. Address: GPO Box 2476V, Melbourne 3001, Australia. E-mail: christopher.ziguras@rmit.edu.au. Grant McBurnie is executive officer in Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International) at Monash University in Melbourne, Australia. Address: Monash University 3800, Australia. E-mail: grant.mcburnie@adm.monash.edu.au.

In early June this year, some 10,000 students marched through the streets of Athens, congregating outside the Greek Parliament. They carried banners and handed out manifestos to bystanders. The situation escalated, with hard-core protesters throwing petrol bombs and rocks, smashing store windows, and setting fire to banks and cars. Police responded with tear gas and water cannon. Several more protests occurred across Greece that day and in the following weeks. Athenian students, emboldened by the success of the recent wave of protests in Paris, prefer the French term “manifestations” to describe these events.

The demonstrations are in response to mooted changes in the structure of the higher education system, the most controversial of which is the government’s proposal to alter the constitution (a process taking two parliamentary terms) to allow for the establishment of “nonstate, nonprofit” universities. Since 1975, the idealist position that higher education should be egalitarian and free has been enshrined in Greece’s Constitution, compelling successive governments to protect a state monopoly by resisting the recognition of foreign and private higher education within its borders. Enrollments in the public higher education system, comprising universities and technological education institutes, has been expanded dramatically over the past decade; but funding per student remains very low, leading to severe overcrowding and little opportunity for students to interact meaningfully with faculty.

THE “EXTRALEGAL” PRIVATE SECTOR

Despite the constitutional prohibition, around 40 private tertiary colleges now exist in Greece, together enrolling around 35,000 students with tuition fees averaging 4,500 euros. Between them they offer over 200 programs, mostly through partnerships with foreign universities, more than half of which are from the United Kingdom, a quarter from France, and some 15 percent from the United States. This is made possible by a 1935 law allowing private companies offering postsec-

ondary school education to exist under the name of Laboratories of Liberal Studies. Like other companies, they are registered as businesses with the Ministry of Commerce. However, they are not recognized as educational institutions by the state and so are not subject to any regulation by educational authorities. Due to the regulatory vacuum, they vary considerably in size, quality, facilities, and professionalism.

Qualifications gained through study at these colleges are not recognized by the Greek government or Greek public education institutions. As a result, students in transnational programs in Greece are not able to apply for graduate-level employment in the public sector, defer military service, obtain professional registration, or undertake subsequent studies at Greek universities. Over the past decade, Greece has repeatedly been taken to the European Court of Justice over complaints by the European Commission that the refusal to recognize EU member-country qualifications obtained through transnational programs is in breach of EU Directives 89/48 and 05/36, which facilitate professional mobility within the union.

Following the demonstrations, an opinion poll commissioned by the *Kathimerini* newspaper (June 30, 2006) found that 59 percent of respondents favored the recognition of private universities and only 25 percent were satisfied with the current operation of Greek public universities. Critics of Greek educational protectionism argue that it has resulted in an undersupply of student places, degradation of the quality of education due to lack of competition, and the world’s highest per capita student exodus abroad. Graduate unemployment has also risen as graduates of local institutions carry supply-driven qualifications less popular with industry, while gradu-

Since 1975, the idealist position that higher education should be egalitarian and free has been enshrined in Greece’s Constitution

ates of foreign institutions face nonrecognition or delays in recognition of their qualifications.

Unmet demand for tertiary education has long been a high-profile political issue in Greece, with the annual national examinations and competition for places attracting much press coverage. Parents of secondary school students routinely pay hefty fees to after-hours cramming schools to increase their offspring’s chances of gaining entry into prestigious public universities. The Athens News, for example, recently noted that “over 40 percent of university candidates failed to reach the minimum score . . . so they will be barred from the Greek dream” (June 30, 2006).

ANTI-IMPERIALISM AND EMPLOYABILITY

The student movement’s opposition to new private providers arose from both ideological and practical bases. Many of the

protesters see themselves as being on the frontline in the battle against “corporate” globalization. They are fighting to protect the integrity of the Greek state and to maintain its strong control of the education system and the economy as a whole, in the face of what many describe as “Anglo-Saxonic imperialism.” Greece has long had a highly regulated economy; and the widespread suspicion of markets fuels broad sympathy, if not support, for the student movement. Even the youth wing of the conservative New Democracy does not support allowing for-profit institutions to operate in the higher education sector.

The students’ opposition to private providers also stems from a more practical concern about their job prospects upon graduation. The Athenian newspaper *Kathimerini* recently editorialized that student reactions can be largely attributed to anxiety about their likely postuniversity unemployment (or underemployment) and concluded that “their rage is directed against the broader political system, which has in past decades set up a largely useless industry churning out degrees with no practical value” (June 10–11, 2006). Sadly, most student and academic groups are hostile toward any suggestion that higher education qualifications should be made more relevant to the labor market. Instead, most of those inside the state university system are set on ensuring that jobs in the public sector and regulated professions will not be open to the more readily employable graduates of private institutions with better facilities, internationalized curricula, and much shorter degrees. The Greek labor market is highly regulated, which effectively protects those in the workforce against competition from those outside it, resulting in a high rate of youth and graduate unemployment. The student movement offers the same logic in seeking to maintain the state’s preferential treatment of those who have managed to gain admission to the public universities in the face of competition from those who have not.

The students’ opposition to private providers also stems from a more practical concern about their job prospects upon graduation.

MORE TEAR GAS TO COME

Both major political parties favor constitutional reform, regarding it as one of many steps that will in the long run benefit the Greek economy while bringing it into line with practice in much of the EU. The changes are therefore likely to happen, but will take several years, much dialogue with stakeholders, and work to establish appropriate regulatory systems. The amendments would open the way for local private colleges to seek university status and for foreign universities to establish recognized branch campuses in Greece. This could have several benefits for the country, including helping to address unmet demand in certain disciplines, promoting professional mobili-

ty for more of its citizens, and allowing for the establishment (long overdue) of accreditation and quality assurance systems for private providers. Public universities and their student movements will most likely maintain their strident opposition to the private sector and, if the amendment passes, will seek to ensure that the state enforces the same debilitating conditions on the new private institutions as it imposes on the public system. The question on everybody’s lips is whether the current government considers university reform important enough to fight for. The time frame required to amend the Constitution and implement a new regulatory framework for private institutions promises to create a decade of skirmishes on the streets of Athens. ■

Higher Education and Poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa

DAVID E. BLOOM, DAVID CANNING, AND KEVIN CHAN

David E. Bloom is professor of economics and demography at the Harvard School of Public Health. Address: HSPH, 665 Huntington Ave., Boston, MA 02115, USA. E-mail: dbloom@hsph.harvard.edu. David Canning is professor of economics and international health at the Harvard School of Public Health. E-mail: dcanning@hsph.harvard.edu. Kevin Chan is a doctoral student in the Department of Population and International Health at the Harvard School of Public Health. E-mail: kchan@hsph.harvard.edu.

For several decades, donor institutions have placed great emphasis on primary and, more recently, secondary education in their development assistance to sub-Saharan Africa. But they have neglected tertiary education as an added means to improve economic growth and mitigate poverty. There is a persistent belief in the international development community that tertiary education has little role in promoting poverty alleviation. New evidence suggests that this belief may be misguided and that tertiary education may play a significant role in enhancing economic growth and poverty reduction.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

By decreasing its funding of higher education, the international development community has encouraged African governments’ relative neglect of higher education. From 1985 to 1989, 17 percent of the World Bank’s worldwide education-sector investment financing focused on higher education. But from 1995 to 1999, the proportion allotted to higher education declined to just 7 percent. Higher education in Africa has suffered from such reductions. Many African countries struggle to maintain even low enrollment levels; sub-Saharan Africa’s

gross enrollment ratio of 5 percent is by far the lowest in the world. Academic research output in the region is also poor. In 1995, the region was responsible for fewer than 6,000 published academic papers. Only the Middle East and North Africa produced fewer papers, yet this region's total had doubled since 1981, while sub-Saharan Africa's had risen by only one-third.

The World Bank's lack of emphasis on tertiary education has resulted in the absence of higher education from the Poverty Reduction Strategies in all but a few African countries. These strategies do not recognize the specific contributions of higher education to Africa's development needs. For example, a specialized trained workforce can support physical infrastructure development—constructing roads, railways, power plants, and telecommunications systems. With more well-trained people in these areas, strengthening the continent's infrastructure would become easier and less expensive because of a reduced need for expatriate workers. A problem with the strategy of expanding higher education is that educating Africans at the tertiary level often leads to “brain drain.” Many Africans have long asserted that the key means of keeping educated people in their countries constitute attractive working conditions, better salaries, and a more vibrant, self-sustaining local intellectual community.

BENEFITS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Historically, low levels of tertiary education have not created much concern within development initiatives, since, as alluded to above, there had been little empirical evidence of economic benefits for the population as a whole (let alone specifically for the poor). Most studies found higher returns to individuals from primary and secondary schooling than the returns from higher education. However, new evidence sug-

By decreasing its funding of higher education, the international development community has encouraged African governments' relative neglect of higher education.

gests that higher education can significantly increase incomes and the rate of economic growth—based on analysis of data covering 103 countries from 1960 through 2000.

In our framework, through two distinct channels expanded higher education can enhance economic growth. The first stems from the fact that higher education can increase an economy's potential by extending its potential production frontier: the level of output the economy could reach if it were operating as efficiently as possible. If Africa could increase the tertiary education stock of its population by one additional year (averaged over the whole population), the GDP per capita growth rate in Africa would rise by 0.24 percentage points in the first year. It would be elevated in subsequent years, as well,

though by lesser amounts as the frontier is approached over time.

In addition to the common contribution of human capital to productive potential a second channel works via technological upgrades. In a knowledge economy, tertiary education can enhance graduates' awareness of and ability to use new technologies and thus participate more effectively in the global economy. Countries thus empowered can diminish the divide between them and more technologically advanced societies. As the expansion of tertiary education promotes faster technological advances, a country is better able to maximize its economic output. In the case of Africa, increasing its stock of higher education—as above, by one additional year (on average)—would raise the per capita GDP growth rate by 0.39 percentage points in the first year. This higher rate of technological growth would be sustained until Africa reaches the world technological frontier.

Although these figures may not appear large at first glance,

In addition to the common contribution of human capital to productive potential a second channel works via technological upgrades.

they imply that a one-year increase in tertiary education stock may boost incomes by roughly 3 percent after five years and by 12 percent eventually, holding constant other factors that influence economic growth. Such growth, although not huge, would be significant, especially when considered in light of incomes that have been falling in some African countries. This analysis indicates that tertiary education could play a recognizable role in promoting economic growth in Africa.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR POLICY

In recent years, organizations such as the World Bank and major donor governments have begun to reconsider their exclusive focus on primary education and are now reaching out to secondary and tertiary education, as the balance between poverty reduction and growth promotion is adjusted within development assistance strategies. There are signs of progress for higher education in sub-Saharan Africa, and some African countries have implemented innovative policies to strengthen tertiary education systems. But this progress is limited in comparison with the progress in other world regions. The relatively small changes in Africa may result from insufficient understanding of the positive effects that higher education can have on economic development. The new research discussed here suggests that increased investment in higher education may be justified—at a minimum, more research into the role of higher education in development. With this new, quantified, economic justification at their backs, African advocates of higher education have some reason to be emboldened. ■

Institutional Tuition Fee Discounts: Cost Sharing Without Loans

ARTHUR M. HAUPTMAN

Arthur M. Hauptman is a public policy consultant, based in Arlington, Virginia, specializing in higher education finance issues. E-mail: hauptman_a@yahoo.com.

In developed and developing countries around the world, one of the most hotly debated higher education topics is whether to increase cost sharing by instituting or raising the tuition fees charged at public institutions. A common argument made by advocates of greater cost sharing is that higher tuition fees increase the resources to improve the quality and scope of the enterprise, including providing more access by adding more seats. Another argument for greater cost sharing is that higher fees can introduce greater equity into the system by having students pay amounts closer to their and their families' abilities to pay for higher education. A third argument is that higher fees will more nearly reflect the private benefits that college students are likely to receive in the form of higher incomes throughout their lifetime.

However, all of these arguments for greater cost sharing depend critically on more student aid being provided to help those students and families who cannot afford to pay the higher fees. More student aid is the only means by which access and equity objectives can be advanced through higher fees. Put another way, without sufficient student aid, higher tuition fees will reduce the demand for higher education, especially among students from lower-income families, who will have the most difficulty paying the higher fees.

THE DOWNSIDE OF STUDENT LOANS

But what kinds of student aid are best for offsetting the negative effects of greater cost sharing? Most frequently, student loans are presented as the way to ameliorate the demand-reducing effects of higher fees and to advance the goals of greater access and equity.

To be clear, there is no doubt that the ready availability of student loans is an effective and intellectually defensible way to help students and their families meet the higher costs entailed in any cost-sharing arrangement. Loans are also theoretically and practically the best way to help students pay for the higher lifetime incomes they are likely to receive because then students are borrowing to pay for their investment in themselves. But it should be noted that a number of factors may limit the effectiveness of student loans in helping to pay for an aggressive cost-sharing scheme.

First, many countries lack the infrastructure to ensure adequate levels of repayment of student loans. To be cost-effective and fair, a student loan program needs a reasonable chance of collecting repayment of most loans that are provided. This task requires either a viable private banking structure with a tradition of making consumer loans or a government tax structure with high levels of compliance. Most developing countries and a number of developed ones lack either of these repayment structures.

Second, student loan programs typically take a long time to develop and mature. They require a complex administrative structure that includes the development of promissory notes, servicing procedures, and collection systems that take at least several years to develop. If student loans are linked to cost sharing, the maturation process required for student loans can postpone the implementation of effective cost-sharing arrangements.

In addition, the international experience is that student loan programs (and government-funded student aid programs in general) often lead to the creation of a number of questionable academic and training programs established largely for the purpose of capturing student aid funds. These programs often have very high student loan default rates that further erode the credibility of both student aid and cost sharing.

Carlo Salerno in the most recent *IHE* issue enumerates these concerns with student loans ("Cost Sharing in Higher Education Financing: Economic Perils in Developing Countries," *IHE*, no. 43, Spring 2006). He goes on to say that these very real problems with student loans limit the viability of cost sharing in developing countries by increasing the likelihood that higher fees will discourage equity, hinder overall economic growth, and diminish quality (through the expansion of questionable academic and training programs).

More student aid is the only means by which access and equity objectives can be advanced through higher fees.

THE BENEFITS OF TUITION FEE DISCOUNTS

But the problems of reliance on student loans as a financing mechanism for higher fees can be largely avoided if institutional tuition fee discounts are used as the primary vehicle for financing cost sharing. Tuition fee discounts occur when educational institutions do not collect some or all of the fees they nominally charge their students. These discounts are limited to certain groups of students, based on financial need, academic merit—or other criteria such as athletic prowess, musical ability, and other admirable student characteristics that the institution wishes to reward by charging lower or no fees.

Such a system of tuition waivers has much to recommend it. It is much simpler to administer than a student loan pro-

gram, and it can be implemented much more quickly. A system of waivers can be established at the same time that fees are increased, whereas student loan programs will normally take at least several years to develop.

Moreover, using tuition fee discounts to address the equity concerns attached to cost sharing still allows for more resources to come into the system. It is the case that the more students who receive discounts and the bigger discounts they receive, the fewer resources will be generated. However, even if only one-quarter of students are identified as those who can afford to pay the higher fees, institutional revenues will still be

But the problems of reliance on student loans as a financing mechanism for higher fees can be largely avoided if institutional tuition fee discounts are used as the primary vehicle for financing cost sharing.

increased by that amount without any of the negative consequences of loan defaults and administrative complexities. A higher proportion of fee-paying students will generate that much more in resources for the system.

What makes for an effective tuition-fee discount program? The key is that the discounts are targeted on students who are truly unable to pay the higher fees or whose academic records qualify them for merit-based assistance in the form of a discount. The temptation will be strong, though, for institutions to minimize the number of students who receive the discount or to use discounts as a marketing device to attract high-achieving but less needy students through lower prices. Either of these institutional practices will defeat the policy incentive of using higher fees to work to resolve equity concerns.

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

This is where the government has a role to play—actually, two roles: first, to develop standards that help identify those students who should qualify for the discount; and second, to help ensure that targeted groups of students actually get the discount by reimbursing institutions only for the discounts provided to groups of students designated by the government as truly needy or meritorious enough to qualify for the aid.

The government's obligation includes developing a process that will identify the students who qualify for the waiver in a way that is fair to both students and taxpayers. This raises questions about what kind of means test might be used to identify students who qualify as needy—as a general rule, the simpler the process for identifying needy students the better. In countries where income is not readily available or reliable, other easily auditable measures could be used, such as whether the student goes to a school with high concentrations of poor students or whether the family owns a car, lives in a house with

indoor plumbing.

The government also must implement a process that ensures institutions will be willing to enroll the students whom the government or other bodies have determined as qualifying for the waiver. The concern here is that institutions will not admit students for whom a large discount is required—they will be more inclined to admit students who will pay the full fee or at least most of it. This concern can be addressed by the government providing aid funds to institutions to replace the fees that have been waived for targeted students.

Is there a role for student loans in such a system of fee discount? Yes, especially in meeting the cash flow needs of middle- and upper-income students whose families may have the assets but not the immediate means to pay the higher fees. But the loan system can be introduced later; it need not be in place for the greater cost sharing to commence.

While student loans can certainly be an important component in paving the way for higher fees and greater cost sharing, they are not a necessary condition. What is necessary is a process by which institutions waive the higher fees for students who truly cannot afford them. Such a fee waiver system can help policymakers achieve a number of key access and quality objectives and can provide a safety net to protect needy students. Tuition fee discounts become the means for ensuring equity objectives while enhanced cost-sharing strategies are being utilized to increase the resources coming into the system. ■

Education and Employment Among Women in the UAE

FATMA ABDULLA

Fatma Abdulla is dean at the Sharjah Higher Colleges of Technology. Address: Sharjah Higher Colleges of Technology, P.O. Box 7947, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates. E-mail: fatma.abdulla@hct.ac.ae.

Three of every five students in public higher education in the United Arab Emirates are women. The vast majority (80 percent) of these young women are first-generation college students. Their fathers are more likely to have higher educational levels than their mothers, because Emirati men had access to education and diverse employment opportunities well before their female counterparts. The first school for men was established in the early 1950s, while women's schools opened their doors almost a decade later. Despite their late start, women have made monumental strides at all levels of the education system because of two factors. The first is the presence of

strong support for education from the rulers of the Emirates. And the second and perhaps more potent reason is the availability of gender-segregated and cost-free primary, secondary, and tertiary education, which allows women of different socioeconomic and family circumstances to gain access to higher education.

However, the apparent success of women in the educational arena has not translated into comparable increases in employment rates. Only 14.7 percent of Emirati women were in full-time employment in 2003, an increase of 5.1 percent from 9.6 percent in 1985, with the majority of women employed in the public sector as teachers or clerical workers. Private-sector employment has been largely dominated by male foreign workers, with less than 2 percent of Emirati nationals (both male and female) employed in that sector.

The bleak picture of women and employment is not unique to the UAE but is a major issue in the Middle East and North African region, which has the lowest female labor participation

Despite their late start, women have made monumental strides at all levels of the education system because of two factors. The first is the presence of strong support for education from the rulers of the Emirates.

rates in the world. A report published by the World Bank in February 2004, *Gender and Development in the Middle East and North Africa: Women in the Public Sphere*, states that for the past decade, the region's governments have spent an average of 5.3 percent of the GDP on education—the highest allocation in the world. This huge investment in education has closed the gender gap, with women outnumbering men in higher education institutions in several countries, and has resulted in the largest increase in rate of employment over the last decade. Despite this increase, the female labor force participation in the region for the year 2000 stood at 32 percent—the lowest in the world.

ACCESS TO EMPLOYMENT

Three factors can be blamed for the low labor force participation rates of Emirati women. The first factor relates to the family, which is often labeled as the primary socioeconomic unit in the Arab world. The family plays a central role in the life of both men and women and is the sole institution through which individuals inherit their religion, social class, and cultural identities. Family interest overrides individual interest, and the family greatly affects the individual's attitude and choices. Family attitudes about female employment and a woman's ability to combine both work and family responsibilities are often identified as key to accessing work and remaining within the labor force.

The second element, closely related to the first, deals with the social conditions women need to comply with under the

“code of modesty,” which calls for the segregation of men and women in the quest to guard family honor. This code is adhered to in varying degrees by different groups within the society and confines women to seeking work in predominantly female work environments, such as schools.

The third and final element refers to the competition of women for public-sector employment and their strong preference for civil service careers. This preference is due to civil service laws that protect indigenous workers and make it difficult for employers to dismiss them without a legal battle. Public-sector employment also offers Emirati women a guarantee of employment even in cases of long absences due to sickness of immediate family members and paid maternity leave. However, throughout the 1990s, the government experienced decreased revenues as a result of falling oil prices, which led to the introduction of policies that limited the expansion of public-sector employment through automation of services and privatization—thus, sharply reducing the number of new hires and the possibility of employment in that sector. The largest employment growth area is in the private sector. Emirati women have limited access to private-sector jobs except for opportunities in the banking industry, where government-established policies require banks to maintain a 2 percent national work force quota. The restrictions placed on Emirati women by their families and community, coupled with their preferences and lack of network ties within the private sector, does not place them in a favorable position for the future.

CONCLUSION

The UAE has achieved a great deal in relation to the education and employment of women in its short 35-year history. However, not unlike other countries in the Middle East and North African region and the larger developing world, the country has issues it needs to address with regard to the dispar-

Barriers to the employment of women should be addressed to allow women to fully contribute to the nation-building process

ity between male and female representation in paid employment. Men have much greater access to high-status and high-paying executive positions while only an insignificant number of women occupy key decision-making positions. The dearth of women in positions of power has undermined their ability to exert influence over economic and social decision-making structures. Barriers to the employment of women should be addressed to allow women to fully contribute to the nation-building process. ■

The Development of Private Higher Education in Turkey

KEMAL GÜRÜZ

Kemal Gürüz is former president of the Council of Higher Education of Turkey. E-mail: kguruz@po.metu.edu.tr.

A country with a young demographic profile, Turkey continues to experience an increasing demand for higher education, which the state institutions have been unable to meet. This article describes the factors that in the past have impeded the development of private higher education in Turkey, the private sector's present structure and place in the national system, and some of the major problems currently faced.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Republic of Turkey was born out of the ashes of the Ottoman Empire. But, leaving aside the professional "higher schools" founded in the 19th century, present-day Turkish universities did not evolve from the previously existing Islamic institutions of higher learning. Rather, the university as an institution was transplanted from the West by the young republic to replace the *madrassa*. Thus, for many years, universities were regarded as state institutions and the provision of higher education as part of public service. This is still the prevalent view in Turkey's highly egalitarian society, with an important bearing on the governance of Turkish universities as well as on the development of private higher education. The election of rectors and deans by the faculty has come to be considered a *sine qua non* policy for university autonomy and academic freedom.

The historical exception was Robert College in Istanbul—the first American institution of higher education outside the United States, founded in 1863. In 1956, Middle East Technical University (METU) was founded, modeled after American state universities with rectors and deans appointed by a lay board.

FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS IN THE 1960s

With the development of a vibrant free-market economy and a growing population, the then existing institutions of higher education failed to meet the rapidly increasing demand; the gross enrollment rates remained a meager 4 percent during the 1960s. The vacuum was soon filled by some 50 for-profit institutions, in which enrollments rapidly reached 50,000. In 1971, these institutions were ruled as unconstitutional and were incorporated into the existing polytechnics. Robert College, too, was transformed into a state university in 1971. Similar legal arguments based on the traditional view of higher education were cited in various rulings of the Supreme Constitutional Court in the 1970s in abolishing the powers of the METU Board of Trustees and those of the Council of

Higher Education. The council had first been established in 1973 as a nationwide coordinating body, in response to the rapidly increasing demand.

PRESENT STRUCTURE

In 1981, new legislation was enacted that radically altered the higher education scene in Turkey. The Council of Higher Education was reconstituted as a national board of governors with powers to nominate candidates for rectorships and to appoint deans. In addition, the establishment of nonprofit institutions of higher education was permitted. However, it took several years before the first private institution, Bilkent, could use the title "university," because the Supreme Constitutional Court ruled that the constitution allowed private ones only to be named "institutions of higher education," not "universities." The legal dilemma was resolved by enacting a separate founding legislation for each and every one of the private universities and giving each of them "corporate public body" status.

GROWTH IN ENROLLMENTS

In the past two decades, 24 new private universities have been founded, and they now comprise the unified higher education system in Turkey, along with 53 state universities. Total enrollments in private universities have now risen from only 426 in 1986 to 91,000, constituting 4.3 percent of the total enrollments of 2.1 million students. Distance education is provided by one state university, Anadolu University, with about 700,000 students. Thus private enrollments are 6.5 percent of the total full-time enrollments, those in bachelor's-level programs compose 5.0 percent of the total, while the corresponding rates for associate, master's, doctoral, and medical pro-

With the development of a vibrant free-market economy and a growing population, the then existing institutions of higher education failed to meet the rapidly increasing demand.

grams are 2.2, 8.7, 3.9, and 2.9 percent, respectively. Institutional size, in terms of student enrollments, varies from about 300 in the newly founded universities to 13,000 in the largest one, Yeditepe University (founded in 1996), and 11,000 in Bilkent University, the oldest one.

The total number of full-time faculty at private universities is presently 7,000—corresponding to 8.3 percent of the system's total of 82,000 academic staff. In general, students admitted to private universities have comparatively lower scores on the central admissions examination—mainly because the majority of students prefer to study at the much cheaper state universities, which in general provide as good and, in many cases, better education and facilities. However, the situation differs somewhat among the first 100 and the

first 1,000 of top-scoring students on the admissions examination. Fierce competition exists among leading state universities and the more prestigious private universities to attract as many of the students in that range as possible. The latter universities, however, have an unfair advantage given their ability to lure students by providing generous scholarships.

Many private universities function mainly as teaching institutions, although a smaller number of them aspire to become world-class research universities. In 2004, Turkish academics published a total of over 14,000 articles in refereed journals covered by the Science Citation Index, Social Science Citation Index, and the Arts and Humanities Citation Index; 1,000 of these articles were authored by faculty members at private uni-

Many private universities function mainly as teaching institutions, although a smaller number of them aspire to become world-class research universities.

versities. On the basis of publications per individuals, three private universities outperformed the best-performing state university.

Graduates of Turkish universities, both state and private, have no problem in being admitted to graduate programs at prestigious institutions worldwide. Publications by Turkish academics presently account for 1.3 percent of the worldwide total, up from 0.067 percent in 1981, and already at least six state and three private Turkish universities are internationally recognized for the quality of their research activity. Further development in this area, however, will depend largely on the transformation of the national economy to a knowledge- and innovation-based structure.

THE IMPACT OF PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES

In terms of both the number of institutions and the share of total enrollments, private higher education in Turkey falls way below the numbers commonly encountered in the Asia-Pacific rim, Latin America, and Central and Eastern Europe. Yet, the growth of private higher education in Turkey has been smooth and scandal free. The reasons for this line of development are the statutes that require all private institutions, governed by individual boards of trustees and completely autonomous in financial and administrative matters (including setting tuition fees and salary scales and appointing rectors and deans), to comply with the academic requirements set forth by the Council of Higher Education. This system entails student admissions through the central admissions system, based on a competitive student selection and placement examination, and the requirement that at least 10 percent of students must be admitted on scholarships provided by the institutions themselves. Private universities are eligible for state funding for up

to half the per student funding at state universities. However, to qualify for such state aid, private institutions must demonstrate performance at par with state universities. The Council of Higher Education closely monitors the situation by measuring the numbers of students and publications per full-time faculty.

Private universities have contributed only slightly to overcoming the chronic supply-and-demand imbalance in Turkey. In their initial stage of development, these institutions have recruited faculty from the state universities and have relied on part-time staff. Many of these universities continue to do so, but a number have also been quite successful in repatriating Turkish academics and recruiting foreign staff.

The positive impact of private universities has been the creation of a competitive and entrepreneurial environment in an area still considered by many in Turkey to be the public domain. This shift, however, has come at cost to private universities and may impede their further development. Given the archaic and restrictive laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to public financing, state universities basically lack the legal instruments of decision-making powers that would allow them to compete with private universities in the country, as well as with the various types of international providers that are constantly eyeing the lucrative Turkish higher education market. The resentment against private universities felt by many academics and administrators at state universities is a real threat to the establishment of a fair competition and can create an obstacle to further development of private higher education in Turkey. This is perhaps one of the important lessons that should be drawn from the Turkish experience: there must be a level playing field for all types of institutions and providers if a truly free and fair competitive market is to survive. ■

New Private Sectors

IHE devotes a column in each issue to a contribution from PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, headquartered at the University of Albany. See <http://www.albany.edu/dept/eaps/prophe/>.

Impressed by a previously unnoticed comparative tendency in private higher education, PROPHE presents this special *IHE* section on new private sectors. The term new private sector refers here to private sectors that emerge subsequent to existing private sectors or after their demise. At least in the case of countries where the old private institutions survive, the new privates tend to be much more private in their finance, governance, and market missions; they may be functionally or even legally for-profit. In contrast, the old privates may in fact be viewed as part of the public sector for certain purposes.

Indeed new privates may emerge to imbue systems with a sharp privateness after old privates have evolved. Thus, the term new private means something more than just the re-emergence of a private sector after a period of proscription (the prototypical post-Communist situation) and certainly more than just the emergence of new private institutions within existing private higher education sectors. Of course the exact lines between what qualifies as new private sectors are not always clear-cut.

Daniel C. Levy, Director, PROPHE ■

Nicaragua: New Private versus Old Private and Public

CARLOS OLIVARES

Carlos Olivares is an education specialist at the Inter-American Development Bank, Washington, DC. E-mail: carloso@iadb.org.

The quality and relevance of human capital and knowledge generated by higher education is critical to Nicaragua's social and economic development. Private higher education first became available in 1960 through the creation of the Central American University. Later in the same decade, the Central American Business Administration University and the Polytechnic University of Nicaragua were founded. In the 1990s, 21 new private universities were created; ever since, enrollments in these universities have increased rapidly. Between 2001 and 2006, 23 additional new private universities were created. There are a total of 44 new private universities providing access to 65,500 students.

To flesh out the rest of the institutional infrastructure, it should be noted that in the 1980s the national public university was divided into two institutions, and later one of them supported the creation of two others. Thus, Nicaragua has four public universities, with 49,900 enrollments. Additionally, six "old private universities," in existence since prior to 1990, have 22,060 enrollments. The "old privates" are generally grouped with the four public universities (by the National University Council) as part of the public sector. While (new) private higher education has expanded, the public higher education sector has remained restricted. Thus, the new privates are quickly approaching as many as half the country's enrollments. Even without the old private universities, this is a rather high private-sector proportion by Latin American standards.

AUTONOMY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

In 1990, Nicaragua's National Assembly approved law 89, which in the opinion of many critics guarantees an unusual degree of autonomy and a lack of accountability. In accordance with this law, neither public nor private universities are regu-

lated by any ministry or other governmental unit. The law divides higher education into "universities" and "higher technical centers." The government subsidizes these institutions directly through the legally mandated 6 percent of the national budget dedicated to higher education. It also founded the National University Council, as a coordinating and consulting entity. The council's only authority with regard to the new private institutions is to authorize their operations. Subsequently, these institutions enjoy total autonomy.

In spite of efforts to make improvements, during the last few years, the subsidized universities have largely remained extremely bureaucratic, with weak planning capacity and outdated didactic methodologies and curriculum contents. The admissions process shows that the secondary school graduates are very unskilled. The majority of applicants attain minimum scores in Spanish and mathematics. Another concern is that few university professors hold doctoral degrees. Most universities function at the periphery of the international scientific community, unable to produce and adapt the knowledge needed to confront the most urgent economic and social problems of the country.

NEW VS. OLD PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES

As throughout Latin America, Nicaragua has been affected by significant expansion of higher education, which has increased the diversity of interests and aspirations of admitted students. Given the failure of Nicaragua's public universities to expand and diversify, dynamic changes in the higher education system have occurred through the large and growing number of new private universities. While these new private institutions tend to be devoted to teaching or training as their main activity,

While these new private institutions tend to be devoted to teaching or training as their main activity, there is much heterogeneity among them.

there is much heterogeneity among them. Some have existed for 10 years or more whereas others are quite young. Teaching, facilities, and infrastructure quality also differs greatly. Enrollment rates range from just 100 to over 4,000. Some institutions have branches in different parts of the country, and many are family owned. Level of tuition fees also differs greatly.

The old private universities have played an equally important role as have the public universities. Both are top choices for able students and are able to offer scholarships financed with funds from the 6 percent government subsidy. Some new private institutions, despite their small size, have made progress that will likely allow them to assume an important place within the higher education system. Many have introduced new modalities for satisfying enrollment demands. Thus, night classes are common, as are classes on weekends.

In such ways, the new privates expand access for a population otherwise marginalized. However, the quality of the teaching methods, learning content and programs, remain questionable.

Two years ago, all old privates and publics but only some of new privates carried out a voluntary institutional self-evaluation process, focusing on strengths and weaknesses followed by an external peer review and the drafting of a plan of action. As a result, the majority of the participating institutions are interested in setting up an independent national accreditation system. Several new private universities have already sought accreditation through private regional accreditation agencies. However, most of them are concerned about their ability to meet international accreditation standards and the consequences that may result from failure. While Nicaragua's higher education institutions, especially the new private institutions, are still far from reaching international standards, recent advances hold promise for bringing the country closer to the Latin American region overall.

Nicaragua's new private universities reflect some trends elsewhere in Central America, Latin America more broadly, and even globally. These developments include rapid growth, accommodation where demand exceeds public supply, small institutional size, interinstitutional variation, questionable quality, private finance, and profiles and prospects much in flux. ■

New Private Universities in Nigeria

ISAAC N. OBASI

Isaac N. Obasi is a senior lecturer and coordinator of the MPA Program, Department of Political & Administrative Studies, University of Botswana. Address: Private Bag 0022, Gaborone, Botswana; and a regular columnist on higher education for the Daily Champion newspaper, Lagos, Nigeria. E-mail: zikobasi@yahoo.com and obasiin@mopipi.bw.

Private universities in Nigeria have evolved during two historical phases. The first phase, during the period of Nigeria's second democratic experiment (1979–1983), private universities emerged without any planning for their development and were later abolished by a military regime in 1984. Both prior to and during this period, official thinking followed mainly two Presidential Commissions on Higher Education in Nigeria—the Ashby Commission (1962) and the Cookey Commission (1981)—that were very conservative about the proliferation of universities (public or private).

The second phase in the evolution of private universities

(under the present Obasanjo government, 1999–) occurred as part of a planned development. Since 1999, 24 private universities have been licensed in response to over 100 applications received by the National Universities Commission, a federal government agency charged with the regulation, accreditation, and monitoring of universities (both public and private).

THE NEW PRIVATE SURGE

The first explanation for the new private surge lies with the “public failure theory” expounded in classic literature (e.g., cases of Mexico and Peru)—the problems of public universities, leading to yielding important ground to the emergence of private universities. A second explanation also lies in the literature, but this is “demand absorption,” as public supply of higher education falls short of new demand. For example, in 1995, the admissions rate of public universities was a scant 6 percent of applications received, and between 1995 and 1998 the average was 16 percent. The private demand-absorbing role is similar to what has happened in some other African countries and elsewhere outside the region.

The third major explanation adapted from elsewhere for the

The first explanation for the new private surge lies with the “public failure theory”

surge concerns differentiated functions offered by private universities. Taken together, the three reasons fit into broader international higher education reform trends.

EMERGING FEATURES

In relation to developments in the aborted first phase (1979–1983), the new private universities are a significant improvement. For example, their establishment was meant to conform to some expectations of accreditation standards in areas of staffing, finance, establishment of infrastructure, and provision of facilities and services. Some even have modern facilities not found in their public counterparts. And secondly, in comparison with their public counterparts, the new privates have more cost-effective, lean governance structures rather than the overbureaucratized type of structures. Some are modeled on American-type governance structures as reflected, for example, in the adoption of such nomenclatures as president and vice-president in place of vice-chancellor and deputy vice-chancellor. This is also reflected in the adoption of the cost-saving collegiate system in place of the conventional structures of faculties and departments.

The key emerging features of Nigeria's new private universities involve ownership, enrollments, and tuition level. The ownership of private universities in Nigeria is dominated by religious organizations. Of the 24 licensed institutions, 15 are owned by three major religious organizations. The Orthodox/Pentecostal Church organizations have 9 (37.5 per-

cent), Catholic Church organizations own 3 (12.5 percent), while the Islamic organizations also own 3. The rising profile of indigenous Pentecostal churches that own private universities is especially noteworthy. These churches have large membership and enormous wealth; they are concentrated in the southwest region of the country, which is where the majority of the private universities are located.

Enrollments show significant potential for growth—at least based on evidence from one of oldest new private universities. Madonna University, which graduated 390 students during its first convocation ceremony in 2004, had 7,000 students as of

The ownership of private universities in Nigeria is dominated by religious organizations.

2005.

Tuition fees range from US\$769 to US\$3,285 annually. Some universities include meals and textbooks with their fees while others do not. The fees charged differ across universities and also across disciplines in the same universities. As in Kenya and Uganda, both high and low fee structures exist side by side. Also as in Kenya, Nigeria has some American-type high-cost private universities. Three notable ones are the Pan-African University in Lagos, ABTI-American University in Yola, and Igbinedion University in Okada. This price differentiation represents a normal feature of a market-driven higher education system, especially with diverse ownership structures.

ANY VALUE ADDED THUS FAR?

Currently setting the pace in some of their services and functions, private universities have become a challenge to their public counterparts. So far, they have continued to maintain stable academic calendars unlike the often-disrupted public universities. The new private universities have nipped in the bud the secret-cult organizations present among students in public universities; the clashes, violence, and killings involving these groups have become a regular feature for well over a decade now. The teaching and learning environment has generally been better in the private than in the public universities. With respect to standards, on average the privates have done much better in the National Universities Commission's accreditation process than their public counterparts. For example, in the commission's 2005 accreditation, none of the programs evaluated in five private universities failed accreditation as did many of their public counterparts. The 2006 accreditation again confirmed the higher rating of private universities. Here may well lie the greatest contributions made by the privates so far, as the emerging institutional competition would eventually help to restore the lost glory of higher education in Nigeria—after the devastation wrought partly by the long period of military dictatorship. A private quality edge would also counter the

more prevalent African situation in which the top universities continue to be located in the public sector. ■

Chinese Higher Education in an Open-Door Era

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

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

China is opening its doors to foreign higher education providers at a time when competition and markets are being expanded domestically. Today, about 1,400 foreign higher education institutions have been approved by various education authorities in China to operate in the country. This large number brings both promise and peril. The opportunity to bring new academic ideas and practices into the country may also be interpreted as a powerful invitation for problems and crises.

As Chinese higher education is being increasingly deregulated internally, the Ministry of Education is permitting foreign providers to operate. Many Chinese universities face financial shortfalls and thus explore new ways of generating revenues. Among these new market ideas are linkages with foreign providers—the thought being that an overseas connection will bring prestige, a sense of cosmopolitanism, and perhaps some new educational concepts. The central government, provincial and municipal authorities, and university administrators have all embraced internationalization for many reasons—the most important of which are commercial benefits and the need to provide access to those seeking a postsecondary degree.

FOREIGN MOTIVATIONS AND PROGRAMS

China's expanded freedom of access coincides with a growing interest in China among other countries. Again, the main foreign motivation is commercial, but there are mixed rationales from abroad. Universities worldwide see China as a major market—for recruiting students to study abroad, for "buying" some of the brightest Chinese scientists for academe and industry, and now for exporting educational programs and institutions. Chinese policymakers and institutions should remember that while foreign partners' own purposes and motives may often coincide with Chinese interests, it is possible that sometimes they might not.

Foreign institutions and governments have other motivations as well. A few foreign universities have strong historical links to China, and their motives are mainly academic. For example, the Hopkins-Nanjing master's program has been operating for more than two decades, and the ties between the

prestigious American Johns Hopkins University and Nanjing University ensure strong academic values and quality. Similarly, a longstanding linkage between a consortium of American Jesuit universities and Peking University in the area of business studies has produced joint degrees and a strongly collaborative curriculum. Other foreign universities are interested in providing a place for their own students to study in China—to learn about language, history, and culture, as well as to provide direct experience in a rapidly changing Chinese academic, social, and business environment. These programs are part of the internationalization strategy of many American and European universities.

Most foreign academic institutions are interested in China as a “market” for their educational products. They sell degrees, curricula, and other educational programs, often in partnership with Chinese institutions. They also offer opportunities for Chinese students to study abroad. Now, with fewer restrictions placed on foreign educational entrepreneurial activities in China, the scope of foreign activities will expand and will include foreign branch campuses.

WHO COMES?

While there has been no accurate census of foreign educational providers in China, it is possible to make a few generalizations. Most of the foreign academic institutions interested in the “China market” are not the top institutions in their own countries. Further, the prestigious foreign schools tend to link up with the most prominent Chinese universities in metropolitan areas, while the others mostly focus on provincial areas. At the top end, Yale and Cornell in the United States and several

As Chinese higher education is being increasingly deregulated internally, the Ministry of Education is permitting foreign providers to operate.

Australian institutions are now working in China with a variety of motivations—including providing opportunities for their own students and faculty to learn about China, expanding their “brand” to the Chinese market, and recruiting top Chinese students and staff to their home campuses.

For the United States, many of the lower-prestige colleges and universities tend to collaborate with smaller provincial institutions in China—precisely those institutions that have a minimal understanding of the complex US academic marketplace and hierarchy and little knowledge of their partners. The US institutions, for their part, want to earn money while providing a useful educational program. In Australia and to some extent the United Kingdom, universities have been told to recruit international students and establish overseas academic partnerships and branches to earn income to make up for reduced government allocations. Foreign institutions generally provide academic programs that are inexpensive to set up

and operate and can quickly attract a local market willing to pay for the product. Business management, information technology, and related fields are particularly popular for these reasons.

The Japanese experience with foreign transplants may be useful. In the 1980s, a number of mostly lower-tier American colleges and universities entered the Japanese market at the invitation of local governments or institutions in provincial parts of the country. When these US schools found that recruiting local students was more difficult than anticipated and that the Ministry of Education was not so friendly, they pulled out of the country. Without question, if most foreign partners find that the Chinese market proves difficult in terms of earning money or for operational reasons, they will withdraw as quickly as they entered.

ACCREDITATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

In the United States, almost all academic institutions are accredited by the nongovernmental US regional accrediting agencies. While these accreditors are quite effective and respected by the higher education community and government authorities, they do not provide any assessment of quality. They provide a basic floor of academic performance below

For the United States, many of the lower-prestige colleges and universities tend to collaborate with smaller provincial institutions in China

which an institution cannot go and still receive accreditation. Thus, many unimpressive institutions, including some in the new for-profit sector, do receive accreditation. In much of the world, quality assurance is at an early stage of development, and it generally provides a fairly basic assessment of performance. Thus, Chinese reliance on the mechanisms will provide only an assurance that foreign institutions do not fall below a rather modest standard. Further, some current efforts to provide international quality assurance standards may serve the interests of those providing higher education services rather than those at the receiving end.

WHAT TO DO?

China needs to carefully consider the new influx of academic institutions and programs. It is a mistake to simply open the door wide and hope that the “market” will take care of any problems that might occur. Chinese national needs, the “common good” as a major goal for higher education, and quality assurance need protection in any foreign academic relationships.

The General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) of the World Trade Organization, currently being negotiated as part of the WTO Doha round, can have significant implications for China. GATS proponents seek to force countries to open their doors to foreign academic institutions and programs from

abroad. It is in China's interests to ensure that its national needs are kept in mind and that China, at least in the foreseeable future, has only a small export market for its educational programs and institutions.

It is not at all clear that accredited but low-quality foreign colleges and universities are serving students or the Chinese academic system well. There should be a working system to evaluate foreign academic institutions seeking to enter China—including a thorough assessment of quality and an understanding of the position of the institution in its home environment. Such an arrangement, set up by Chinese researchers or with assistance from objective foreign experts, could help to evaluate potential foreign partners. Singapore, for example, has developed a list of overseas institutions considered appropriate for government-sponsored scholarships or other collaborative higher education programs.

Consideration should be given to the institutional motivations as well as the terms and conditions of any agreements with foreign partners or schools desiring to work in China. Is a foreign institution offering its best quality programs and staff? Is there appropriate accountability for performance? Do the programs offer more than the prestige of an international linkage? Is staff and institutional development part of the agreement? What is the "business plan" of the foreign provider? Questions need to be asked to ensure that the best interests of the host institution and the students are well served.

It is likely that in some cases local institutional or government authorities may fail to adequately examine overseas collaborations or may lack the expertise to make appropriate judgments. National or at least provincial agencies should have

China is not alone in facing difficult decisions concerning foreign academic relationships

authority to review overseas programs. The review process should be as transparent as possible.

Decisions concerning foreign academic relationships or granting permission to foreign institutions to operate in a country are important. They have significant implications for the local higher education community—a good partner can bring new ideas and good quality education. An ineffective link may be costly to host institutions. And perhaps most relevant, students may not be well served. China is not alone in facing difficult decisions concerning foreign academic relationships. India, Malaysia, South Africa, and other countries find themselves in similar circumstances in an increasingly globalized world of higher education. Despite an internationalized environment, higher education remains a key responsibility of nations to supervise to ensure that their national interests are served and both access and quality are preserved. ■

Internationalizing Higher Education in South Africa

ARIEL LIBHABER AND RYAN M. GREENE

Ariel Libhaber is an education policy analyst and consultant to the Education Policy Unit at the University of the Witwatersrand, and a research associate at Brandeis University. E-mail: libhaber@brandeis.edu. Ryan M. Greene is an ABD visiting scholar at the Faculty of Education at the University of Pretoria and a PhD candidate in international education policy studies at the University of Maryland, USA. E-mail: rmgreene@umd.edu.

Apartheid clearly left a very unequal higher education system of privileged and disadvantaged institutions. However, in just over 10 years we find a changing scenario of newly formed inclusive public universities, universities of technology, and a growing number of private institutions responding to a new market.

THE ADVENT OF INTERNATIONALIZATION

One of the most salient features of this new context of higher education involves coming out of isolation and joining the global community. South African higher education has clearly been developing new international paradigms, programs, and relationships. Lately, the country has also become a favored destination for foreign students, mainly from other parts of Africa, seeking postgraduate degrees and better job opportunities. The number of international students studying in South Africa stood at about 14,124 foreign nationals in 1995. However, the number rose sharply over the recent decade to stand at 46,687 in 2002, representing a total of 7 percent of the entire higher education enrollments. A new market has opened for local institutions that perceive the influx of international students as both a source of diversity and revenue for their campuses.

As part of the realities of globalization, higher education faces increasing pressure to compete both locally and internationally: for better students, faculty, funding, and research opportunities. South African higher education, as most systems of higher learning around the world, falls under the open-market ideas of the General Agreement on Trade in Services. This and other market forces have clearly impacted on expansion of the private higher education sector and the new funding constraints in the public sector.

As the education market expands, so does the demand for other products—leading to the growth of the private sector. However, private institutions comprise only a low percentage of the nation's enrollments, mostly attracting white students seeking an alternative route into the job market or degrees they can use overseas—since most degrees offered are in the areas

of business and management.

Internationalization is not only an inward process; many white students enter both the public and private system hoping to acquire internationally marketable skills (such as business, medicine, or teaching) they can use elsewhere, especially in developed English-speaking countries.

INTERNATIONALIZATION TRENDS

While dealing with this intersection of the local, national, regional, and global sectors, South Africa is still struggling to decide just what role it will play. Nevertheless, higher education institutions are pushing ahead to create more internationalized campuses by attracting international students, faculty, and staff through a variety of programs and partnerships.

For example, the University of Pretoria's Faculty of Education has signed reciprocal partnerships with institutions in countries like Namibia, Mozambique, and the Netherlands; and relationships are also being explored with institutions in countries like China and Japan. Many of these agreements deal with contracts covering the exchange of students and faculty members between institutions. In addition, the UNESCO Centre for Capacity Building in Africa is housed within the same faculty, which has also been the site of various international academic conferences.

Attracting international students, although a common phenomenon in Europe and the United States, has particularly expanded over the last few years in South Africa. Foreign students who come here are seduced by the institutions' international reputation, wide curriculum options, lower tuition and living costs (compared to Europe and North America), location, and the advantage of having English as the medium of instruction. However, international partnerships and exchange programs have been taking place for a long time, although in a haphazard way. The difference now is that institutions are realizing that if they want to become truly competitive in the international arena, they must implement formal internationalization policies; and this is easier said than done at many his-

As part of the realities of globalization, higher education faces increasing pressure to compete both locally and internationally: for better students, faculty, funding, and research opportunities.

torically disadvantaged institutions in South Africa. At more privileged institutions, internationalization is happening at a quicker rate. In 2004 the University of the Witwatersrand took on an extensive institutional survey as part of a renewed strategy for internationalization, along with specific funding and roles assigned to the deputy-vice chancellor and an improved international office. Similar international offices serving as pivotal centers for internationalization exist in institutions such as the University of Johannesburg, Stellenbosch University,

and the Mandela Metropolitan University; and these are only some of the institutions reviewing internationalization policies to integrate them in their academic planning, curriculum, research agendas, and enrollment goals. Some institutions such as the University of Cape Town also have agreements with numerous universities around the world for coursework, to attract both local students with an internationally recognized degree and foreign students with a semester abroad or even a full degree. The University of KwaZulu-Natal, for example, advertises the advantages of an internationally recognized degree at a fraction of the cost of American or European fees—highlighting the privileges that students from the Southern African Development Community receive by qualifying to pay local fees, thus creating a further incentive for African students from the region.

Attracting international students has particularly expanded over the last few years in South Africa.

CONCLUSION

For many institutions, internationalization is slowly turning into integrated policies—impressive numbers of international students and staff, as well as coordinated exchange programs and multilateral partnerships with academic institutions and private organizations.

Although the South African government has not created a clear policy framework for internationalizing higher education, it has promoted the significance of achieving rich diversity on its campuses and, more importantly, establishing better partnerships and collaborations to improve research outputs, infrastructure, and industry. With economic competitiveness in mind as well as the development of the region, South Africa seems to expect higher education would lead the way in knowledge production, skills development, and capacity building. One way toward achieving these goals is creating centers of excellence that will attract researchers and reduce the brain drain. As of this writing, such centers are in the developmental stage.

Probably the hardest challenge for South African institutions in this complex context of globalization, where different economic and social forces overlap, will have to do with the tensions between trying to be globally competitive, while at the same time retaining their local identity and commitment to social development in the region. ■

Judges and Higher Education: A Troublesome Precedent

ALAN L. CONTRERAS

Alan L. Contreras has been administrator of the Oregon Office of Degree Authorization, a unit of the Oregon Student Assistance Commission, since 1999. His views do not necessarily represent those of the commission. Address: ODA/OSAC, 1500 Valley River Drive, Eugene OR 97401. <http://www.osac.state.or.us/oda/>. E-mail: Alan.L.Contreras@state.or.us.

The world of genuine education awoke to a rude surprise on July 29, 2006, for on the previous day Mr. Justice Eady of the British High Court ruled that the *Daily Mirror* newspaper had libeled a celebrity hypnotist by saying (in articles in 1997 and again in 2003) that his PhD from LaSalle University of Louisiana was bogus. The hypnotist, one Paul McKenna, who performs on television and works with many famous clients, had no other degrees at the time. The judge said that the newspaper had not shown that its statements about LaSalle were “substantially true.”

This is nonsense. Seek in vain for LaSalle of Louisiana, unless you seek among the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the US Postal Inspection Service, the courts of Louisiana, or the federal prison in Beaumont, Tex., where LaSalle’s owner (who used various names) served time for running the fraudulent college from which McKenna acquired his degree.

Having read the entire opinion, I can say that Eady deserves an award for listening to such a peculiar case filled with half-truths, quarter-truths, and untruths and then writing an exceptionally clear, thoughtful opinion. That his conclusions are fundamentally mistaken on the question of whether LaSalle degrees equal the usual sense of the term involves the exceptional obscurity of American education law as much as it does Mr. McKenna’s actions. The case also sets a very bad precedent for the international use of degrees.

THE TERM “BOGUS”

Anyone interested in the actual history of LaSalle can read about it in Allen Ezell and John Bear’s book *Degree Mills* (Prometheus, 2005). LaSalle, its history, its brethren, and its spawn are all detailed there. A similar account is available in the new, now ironically named publication *Guide to Bogus Institutions and Documents* (June, 2006) from the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

McKenna argued successfully about not knowing of LaSalle’s baseless accreditation, and the judge agreed that it was unreasonable to expect him to have known. That argument is doubtful but not outrageous, considering that Mr. McKenna is an uneducated person who had to go outside the

United Kingdom to acquire any degree. But the judge went on to say, as quoted by Michael Herman in the *Times* of London: “whatever one may think of the academic quality of his work, or of the degree granted by LaSalle, it would not be accurate to describe it as “bogus.”

These words appear mild and even judicial in temperament, but consider what they mean in reality. A judge in one country declares that an entity in another country is a legitimate doctoral institution, although it is contrary to the universally understood status of the degree supplier in its home country. The misunderstanding comes about because the judge fails to realize that authority to issue degrees in the United States comes from states that may in fact have no meaningful standards for such programs—as was the case in Louisiana in the 1990s and in Mississippi today. As the judge found, LaSalle was issuing degrees legally under the laws of Louisiana, but what the judge did not grasp was that the degrees issued did not represent academic learning. The term “bogus” as tossed around in this case did not refer to the legality of the institution; it referred to the nature of its product relative to the standard expectations of a college degree.

AN INTERNATIONAL PRECEDENT?

The McKenna case thus sets a strange precedent for who decides the international use of degrees. Until now, we could generally assume that each country gets to decide what is and is not a meaningful college degree within its own boundaries. The fact that LaSalle was briefly allowed to operate as a religious-exempt institution (i.e., exempt from oversight, on religious grounds) in Louisiana (a status acquired by building a church on its lawn) became irrelevant on the day that its owner was convicted of degree fraud, and of course its PhDs were risible from the beginning.

All degrees are by definition academic credentials. Doctoral degrees issued by LaSalle are invalid academic credentials.

I can say that Eady deserves an award for listening to such a peculiar case filled with half-truths, quarter-truths, and untruths and then writing an exceptionally clear, thoughtful opinion.

LaSalle never issued what anyone in American education would accept as genuine degrees. The hiring of LaSalle degree holders constitutes shoddy screening practices of employers, not degree acceptability.

Justice Eady’s opinion assumes that any entity claiming to be a college is capable of issuing genuine doctoral degrees, provided that it can produce the barest mist of a holographic image of pillars around itself. I readily concede that he has the right to do that within the norms of British law, provided that he is making that decision about a British degree granter. In

the McKenna case, he made that decision about a US degree grantor, which he should not have, and he got it wrong.

In paragraph 36 of the opinion, the judge wrote that whether a LaSalle degree is “scholarship worthy of academic recognition” is not the matter being litigated. The fact that the judge italicized the word “academic” only emphasizes the underlying problem: All PhDs are academic, and must be so to be genuine, and no such thing as a nonacademic PhD exists. In paragraph 60, Eady repeats this odd view when he mentions the distinction between the academic value of the PhD and “its practical use.” It is not difficult to get some practical use out of a bogus PhD—for a while. If that were the standard upon which issuance of PhDs were to be based, we would all be calling each other “Doctor.”

Thus, Eady got it wrong, but the greater concern involves his determination about a foreign college contrary to how the home nation would treat such a college. I hope that other British judges do not make the same error and that this case remains not an anomaly but an utterly freakish event, as it is widely viewed in the education community. Does Great Britain really have nonacademic doctorates?

DEGREES ARE NOT COMMODITIES

Finally, it is important to compare this case with the recent cases involving fake schools in Liberia. In the St. Regis case, a US court was presented evidence that the college’s approval in Liberia had been obtained through fraudulent means and bribery and that the approval was therefore invalid, as were the degrees. The court then ruled against St. Regis. Any nation should hold the right to decide whether degrees issued by a so-called college in a foreign country are substandard or fake and therefore unusable in the receiving nation, based on evidence supporting that view. Degrees cannot be imported like coal: degrees are not commodities and do not uniformly contain the same ingredients. All nations need the right to protect their citizens from fakes.

No nation has the right to compel acceptance of degrees issued by a fake school in another country, simply because someone thought it was a real school. In fact, Mr. Justice Eady has done the academic community a favor by saying that the *Mirror* newspaper had not shown that LaSalle was sufficiently bogus. This should wake up the British ministry in charge of postsecondary education, which will, I hope, establish a meaningful screening system for grossly substandard degrees issued by fly-by-night suppliers in other countries.

This article originally appeared in *Inside Higher Education*, August 3, 2006 (<http://insidehighered.com/>). ■

Universities and Leaders: A Causal Link

AMANDA GOODALL

Amanda Goodall is a doctoral researcher at Warwick Business School, University of Warwick, UK CV4 7AL. E-mail: amanda@amandagoodall.com. The full version of this article can be obtained from the author.

For a number of years, a question about university leadership has circulated across many countries: should research universities be led by good scholars? Given the importance of academic research to the mission of universities this seems a logical inquiry. An alternative question, one that has been aired particularly in the United Kingdom, asks: is it more essential that university presidents are good managers? Search committees from Beijing to Budapest grapple with these issues.

New research is showing that a university led by a good scholar will improve its performance level. Likewise, universities led by weaker scholars will proceed to decline relative to the average level. Thus a causal link appears to exist between a leader’s research ability and future university performance. The evidence for causality comes from the time frame and goes beyond a simple cross-section correlation.

In my earlier article, “The Leaders of the World’s Top 100 Universities” (*IHE*, no. 42, Winter 2006), I reported the strong correlation between the individual lifetime citations of a university president and the position of that university in a global ranking. In other words, the top universities are being led by better scholars. A follow-up study of mine focused on deans of business schools and found a strong correlation between the position of a business school in the *Financial Times* Global MBA ranking and the lifetime citations of its dean.

A LONGITUDINAL STUDY

Recent work on the performance of 55 UK research universities over a nine-year period focuses on the issue of causality. By drawing upon longitudinal data, the study attempts to go beyond cross-section patterns. It uses regression analysis, with university performance as the dependent variable, and the lifetime citations of presidents as the key independent variable. The study also inputs controls for the university income, the president’s age, and the academic discipline of presidents.

An established measure of performance is used, one that has existed in the United Kingdom since 1986—the so-called research assessment exercise (RAE). Unlike league tables, RAE is based on a more objective system of peer review; it provides quality ratings for research across all disciplines. The data in the study come from 55 universities—namely, institutions that

competed in terms of RAE in 1992, 1996, and 2001.

The sample includes 165 British university presidents, those who have led the 55 institutions over approximately a 20-year period. Again, the focus is on presidents' lifetime citations, normalized for discipline and used as a proxy measure of each individual leader's past research productivity.

EVIDENCE OF CAUSAL LINK

The longitudinal study uncovers evidence consistent with the existence of a causal relationship between the research ability of a leader and the future performance of the university. Thus, across the nine years, universities led by better scholars went

The longitudinal study uncovers evidence consistent with the existence of a causal relationship between the research ability of a leader and the future performance of the university.

on to perform better in terms of RAE measurements. The data indicate that the top-performing institutions were disproportionately led by presidents with higher lifetime citations. Put simply, of the total 55 universities in the sample, the 10 percent that improved the most were led by presidents with average lifetime citations that were four and a half times higher than those of presidents who led the 10 percent of universities that improved the least.

SCHOLARSHIP OR MANAGEMENT?

Scholarship does not serve merely as a proxy for either management experience or leadership skills. Of the 165 presidents in this study most were either deputy-heads or had led major centers and laboratories before their step to the top position. Maybe a different question to ask is does management matter more than scholarship?

Twenty-three leaders of UK and US research universities were interviewed. The majority defined leadership as setting the overall direction and planning the execution of strategy. Interestingly, the leaders interviewed overwhelmingly saw themselves as responsible for developing university strategy, albeit admitting that a process of consultation followed.

Increasingly, UK university presidents are trying to centralize decision making, a customary US structure. Many regarded making decisions by committee both inefficient and untenable. Commonly, they also expressed frustration at not being able to appoint members of their own top management team. Deputies, deans, and even heads of departments were traditionally appointed by committees of academics, with numbers sometimes as high as 100. Most of the interviewed leaders had successfully changed the process of appointing top teams in their organization, allowing leaders greater powers of selection.

While most saw it as essential for presidents to have had

some experience, they clearly felt that, when needed, many areas of managerial expertise could be brought in.

WHY MIGHT SCHOLARSHIP MATTER?

The root of this question is about context—namely, does leading a university differ greatly from leading any other organization? Of the 165 presidents in this study only eight were not career academics. To explain the faculty leadership norm among UK research universities, university presidents cited three general themes. The first was about the importance of gaining credibility and respect from peers. It was suggested that a good scholar will appear more credible, which enhanced a leader's influence. Second, leaders needed to act as the arbiters of quality—to set the institutions' academic standards. Therefore, in the words of one leader, "the standard-bearer has to first bear the standard." Finally, leadership required fully understanding the university's business and culture, a capacity they felt was not easily achieved by nonacademics nor, to a lesser degree, by those who gave up research a decade earlier. It was also suggested that being a scholar signals that a leader may well sympathize with the needs of other scholars.

CONCLUSION

Earlier research has uncovered a pattern showing that top universities and business schools are led by top scholars. A recent longitudinal study has started to reveal a causal relationship between the former research success of a university president and the future performance of the respective university. This evidence suggests that research universities need more than managers to lead them, specifically, that universities are organizations requiring leaders to have expertise from within the academy. The appropriate level of scholarship for a leader may, ultimately, depend on the ambitions of a university. ■

Private Tutoring in India

PAWAN AGARWAL

Pawan Agarwal is a visiting scholar at the Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations, Core 6A, India Habitat Centre, Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003, India. E-mail: pawan.agarwal06@gmail.com.

India has a tiny quality sector in higher education. The seven Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs) and six Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs) are at the top of this quality hierarchy. With a strong meritocratic tradition, these institutions are ranked among the most highly selective higher education institutions in the world. Entry into many other medical, engineering, and management institutions is just as difficult. As a result of strong linkages between admission to these insti-

tutions and later life opportunities, these institutions have high-stakes entrance exams. Strategic interventions by students and parents to improve performance on these tests have stimulated a rapid growth of private tutoring in India.

CHANGING PATTERNS

There is a long tradition of private tutoring in India. Earlier, a teacher used to make some money by teaching a gathering of 10 to 15 students in a makeshift classroom in his house after school. He solicited students through word of mouth. (This home-based private tutoring is referred to as “private tuitions.”) This form of tutoring essentially provided remedial classes for academically weak students.

The focus on admissions exams of reputed institutions and a plethora of tests for entry into government and the public sector has now transformed the tutoring business. Prime commercial addresses with spacious classrooms capable of accom-

There is a long tradition of private tutoring in India.

modating hundreds of students and specialized, full-time teachers are now offered. Classrooms are now air-conditioned and equipped with modern teaching aids and comfortable furniture. Customized education packages, glossy brochures, and a complete marketing strategy for promotion are provided. Though this continues to be a largely urban phenomenon, private tutoring has made inroads in rural areas as well.

No longer a covert job, private tutoring has become a booming industry. This organized private tutoring is referred to as coaching classes in India. Big private players—such as FIIT JEE, IMS, Career Launcher, and Career Point—have nationwide franchise operations. Some of these firms are even offering coaching to students in the United States.

Many coaching centers are bad and indifferent, charge heavy fees, and prey on the anxieties of parents. Teachers from regular schools moonlight at these centers and use quasi-blackmail methods to exact demand for tutoring from their regular students. However, other centers are well organized, have specialized tutors, and use instructional guidebooks and materials, provide customized programs, conduct periodic assessment of students’ progress, and provide students with diagnostic feedback. Some centers develop their own teaching and practice materials and provide guidance and information services.

Private tutoring has become a significant portion of household spending. Some of the big players have estimated the market potential of organized coaching in India, for a number of competitive exams alone, at Rs. 70 billion (US\$1.6 billion), nearly half of what the government spends on higher education annually. Spending levels for home-based private tutoring are much higher than for classes at coaching centers.

IS PRIVATE TUTORING BAD?

In a 1999 nationwide survey, two-thirds of the people expressed the opinion that coaching institutes flourish because of the poor quality of education; nearly 90 percent stated that even the best students feel the need for systematic coaching. Ninety percent of parents were even prepared to pay the high fees for private tutoring since they felt that this would be an essential investment in their children’s future. While no systematic study has been conducted on the influence of private tutoring on student performance, the fact that nearly 60 percent of students who qualified for admission to IITs in 2004 had received some form of private tutoring seems to suggest that there is a linkage.

Private tutoring in India has become one of the most important, yet unacknowledged, factors in children’s performance on the high-stakes entry tests. The inability of families from the lower-income population to spend much on tutoring results in inequalities in academic competitiveness, particularly in rural areas. This situation skews the class-mix in higher education, particularly in institutions with competitive entrance exams.

Moreover, private tutoring appears to cause some problems—including a weakening of students’ self-directed learning capabilities, students’ low engagement in classroom teaching, and undue pressures (both financial and psychological) on parents as well as students. Private tutoring also increases inequalities in access to highly selective higher education institutions. The tutoring culture is making education a unifocal exam-oriented activity. Instead of imparting a holistic education, it force-feeds students with knowledge to get high marks but does not enhance the questioning, reasoning, or analytical ability so vital to meeting the challenges of life.

This phenomenon can be observed in other countries. The effectiveness of Japan’s school system in teaching difficult subjects like math and science is often attributed to the widespread use of after-school tutoring known as *juku* and *yobiko* in Japan. In Korea, high levels of family expenditure on private tutoring (*hakwon*) is believed to have the salutary effect of ensuring high academic achievement on the part of Korean students, particularly their high science and math scores.

Considering these factors, it is difficult to say whether private tutoring is definitely bad. Tutoring appears to fill a vacuum left by a grossly inadequate formal school system. Though only a few thousand students may get entry into the limited number of quality institutions, competition tends to push up the science and math skills of a large section of the student population that aspires for entry into these highly selective institutions. This may be providing a competitive edge to the workforce from India. For this reason, it would be inappropriate to dismiss private tutoring totally.

CONCLUSION

The growing dissatisfaction of parents with the formal school system and their realization that bad exam results will doom the life chances of their offspring will further stimulate the

growth of private tutoring. With the emergence of mass private tutoring, distinction between formal and informal learning would get blurred. Private tutoring costs will occupy a significant proportion of household expenditure on education. Efforts to control or monitor private tutoring are likely to meet with only limited success.

Several measures could be taken to cope with the growing incidence of private tutoring. These could include making teachers in the formal school system more accountable and the schools qualitatively more competitive; reviewing the selection criteria for entry to higher education institutions; and, finally, supporting students from poor households and in rural areas so that they are better prepared for entry to reputed and highly competitive higher education institutions.

Since it is not feasible to control supplementary private tutoring and perhaps not even desirable to curb it, considering that it might be raising the country's average levels of achievement, the best option is to adopt a coping strategy that takes care of its negative consequences. ■

Trends in American Academic Work and Careers

MARTIN FINKELSTEIN

Martin Finkelstein is professor of higher education at Seton Hall University. Address: Seton Hall University, 418 Jubilee Hall, South Orange, NJ 07079, USA. E-mail: finkelma@shu.edu.

In 1994, Jack Schuster and I launched an ambitious project on the future of the American faculty. Retrospectively, we sought to comb the available evidence provided by three decades of national faculty surveys in the United States (mostly in the public domain) to trace empirically the trends in academic work and careers. Prospectively, we sought to place these trends into the context of seismic shifts in the global economy and the mission of higher education and provide an explanation of the dizzying concatenation of trends we were seeing. The fruits of that project were recently published as *The American Faculty* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006).

All in all, the last 30 years have probably seen changes in the American system on a historically unprecedented scale. Since the 1960s, American faculty have grown from a corps of some 300,000 to nearly 1.2 million. The sheer magnitude of this growth has been accompanied by a shift in the overall shape and character of the profession.

INSTITUTIONAL AND DISCIPLINARY VENUES

The center of gravity of the American academic professions

has shifted from the university sector (from about half of the whole in 1970 to about 40 percent today) to the two-year community college sector (from about 10 percent in 1970 to 20 percent today) and the public four-year college sector. Moreover, the center of gravity has also shifted from the traditional arts and science fields to the professions. Indeed, the majority of newly hired faculty in the past decade are in the professions.

DEMOGRAPHY

The proportion of women in the academic professions has

The center of gravity of the American academic professions has shifted from the university sector (from about half of the whole in 1970 to about 40 percent today) to the two-year community college sector (from about 10 percent in 1970 to 20 percent today) and the public four-year college sector.

increased overall from about 17 to 35 percent since 1970. However, if one examines new entrants to the academic professions over the past decade, one finds that about 45 percent are women; and in some fields in the humanities and social sciences as well as some professions such as education, the majority of newly entering faculty are female. At the same time there have been notable, albeit less dramatic, increases in the representation of foreign-born faculty (especially Asians and especially in the natural sciences and engineering) and faculty from racial and ethnic minority groups (Asian, Black, and Hispanic).

NEW TYPES OF APPOINTMENTS

While about 45 percent of current college teachers in the United States are employed part time, over the past decade and largely under the radar screen of most observers colleges and universities in the United States have been engaged as well in the restructuring of *full-time* faculty appointments. Nominally, that restructuring has involved the introduction of a parallel system of fixed-term contracts alongside the traditional tenure system for full-time faculty.

This parallel system of full-time, fixed-term contracts has grown rapidly. Since 1993, the majority of new full-time faculty hired in US higher education institutions have been appointed *off* the tenure track. This new type of full-time appointment differs not only (or even primarily) from traditional tenure appointments in contract duration but also in function. These appointments involve more specialized roles that differ from the Humboldtian model of a single individual playing a functionally integrated (teaching, research, and service) role—thus supporting a largely tacit, unexamined depar-

ture from the traditional faculty role in the United States. They typically focus their energies on only one of the three traditionally integrated faculty functions (teaching *or* research *or* service) and spend less time overall on their more circumscribed institutional responsibilities

For the largest group of full-time, fixed-contract (teaching-only) faculty there is little involvement in research and institutional governance and for research-only faculty little involvement with teaching and students. In a sense, full-time, fixed-contract appointments of the teaching-only variety represent a kind of aggregation of multiple part-time appointments into one and a significant departure from what has historically been one of the distinctive sources of American higher education's strength. Overall, fixed-term-contract faculty spend as much as 10 to 20 percent less time on their work as tenured/tenure-track faculty (and that difference is accentuated at research universities), more time than "generalist" colleagues on teaching, and less time on research (if teaching is their principal activity); publish much less; and are less engaged in student contact. They are also less involved in institutional service and administration.

It is important to note that although these appointment differences are discernible across institutional types and academic fields, they do take on different guises by institutional type and disciplinary venue. Teaching-only appointments are increasingly common at research universities, especially in the humanities (English, foreign languages, mathematics) and in several of the professions (business, nursing, other health sciences). Administrator and program-director appointments are especially common in public two-year institutions.

THE CHANGING ACADEMIC CAREER

Over the past half century, a singular, predictable, lockstep academic career track developed in the four-year collegiate sector in the United States as follows: (a) PhD receipt; (b) initial appointment to full-time, tenure-ladder-rank position (assistant professor); (c) review for tenure after a six-to-seven-year probationary period; (d) tenure review based on success in a trinity of teaching, research/publication, and service (institutional and external); and (e) promotion to associate and full professorships.

Newly available evidence from the US Department of Education's National Study of Postsecondary Faculty suggests that this modal, homogeneous pattern is fast becoming a thing of the past. For part-time faculty, the vast majority of previous work experience is also part time, and for full-time faculty, primarily full time. Indeed, among those who held full-time appointments in 1998, 8 out of 10 had always worked exclusively on a full-time basis.

When we compared the work experience of fixed-term-contract appointees with tenured/tenure-track appointees, a similar, if less pronounced, pattern emerged. Current tenured/tenure-track faculty usually start out that way—about

three-fifths had reported only previous tenured/tenure-track experience. At the same time, two-thirds of current fixed-term-contract faculty typically pursued their careers entirely in fixed-term-contract positions. While there is some permeability between fixed-term-contract and regular tenureable full-time appointments (about one-fourth move from fixed term to tenure track), the two have come to constitute quite independent career tracks for the majority of American faculty.

QUO VADIS?

How shifts in the American academic profession will impact the long-term health of the higher education enterprise is open to debate (although those closest to the profession seem the least sanguine). Clearly these changes represent one form of a larger global restructuring of academic work that the world will be wrestling with for some time to come. ■

Can Hong Kong Keep Its Lead in the Brain Race?

PHILIP G. ALTBACH AND GERARD POSTIGLIONE

Philip G. Altbach is Monan professor of higher education and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. Gerard Postiglione is professor in the Faculty of Education at the University of Hong Kong. Address: Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Rd., Hong Kong, China.

Hong Kong's future depends on its human resources—the skills of its people in such fields as financial management, law, science and technology, tourism, the management of trade and business, and related fields. In a recent poll of 11,000 business leaders, almost 20 percent highlighted an inadequately educated work force, as the most problematic factor for doing business in Hong Kong. In the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report of 2005/06, Hong Kong dropped 7 places to 28 out of 117. To build and maintain human capital, Hong Kong needs world-class innovative and competitive universities. Singapore, similar to Hong Kong in its dependence on brains and innovation, has been rapidly internationalizing its higher education system, actively recruiting scholars and students globally and from mainland China as well. Singapore (like South Korea and Taiwan) got a big jump on Hong Kong by heavy investment in science and technology R&D in the 1980s and 1990s. Hong Kong has paid for that mistake and still lags behind with a GDP expenditure on R&D of 0.7 percent compared to 1.9 percent on average in the

EU in 2004, 2.26 for OECD countries, 2.59 percent in the United States, 3.15 in Japan and 2.25 in Singapore. Even renowned astrophysicist Steven Hawking, on a visit last week with Hong Kong chief executive, called for the funding of more research and teaching posts at Hong Kong's universities.

Hong Kong's quick-profit business community chose to rely more on the approaching reunion with China for keeping the economy charging ahead, rather than following the path of the other three Asian Tigers. It seems to be repeating that scenario with respect to investment in higher education. A special challenge now is keeping abreast of the rapidly developing and improving universities in other parts of China. If Hong Kong does not pay special attention to its universities, it will inevitably lose its position as a primary place for innovation and commerce internationally and in the region. However, another widely held perspective is that Hong Kong benefits greatly from robust university growth on the mainland and that the proximity to and unique relationship with mainland universities will become instrumental to enhancing Hong Kong's global competitiveness. This may be wishful thinking. The mainland is in fact building universities that rival Hong Kong's best institutions now.

MAINLAND DEVELOPMENTS

The challenge from the Chinese mainland in higher education is immense. At the present time, China is making a headlong effort to create a dozen or more "world-class" universities. Academic leaders and the government are not thinking about Hong Kong but rather Oxford, Berkeley, Harvard, and other world-class universities whose leaders have been spending a good deal of time visiting China lately. Peking and Tsinghua Universities have long been identified as leading institutions, and much money has been spent to build new facilities and instill a culture of academic quality and competition. Three additional examples can illustrate the scope of China's efforts. Zhejiang University and Shanghai Jiao Tong University are both considered in China's "top 10." Each has upwards of 30,000 students and graduate programs in many fields. Both institutions are part of the 985 Initiative of the central government, which is providing significant resources to a select group of universities. Both also benefit greatly from additional local funding—from Zhejiang province and the Shanghai municipal government, respectively—each of which is among China's richest local authorities. Shanghai Jiao Tong's new suburban campus rivals, in size and facilities, the best of America's state universities. Indeed, it is as if Jiao Tong built the equivalent of an American "land grant" campus in five years rather than the century it took to build up the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign or a similar institution. China Ocean University in Qingdao—a more specialized institution in Shandong province, but also under the umbrella of the Ministry of Education—is also building its second new campus on the outskirts of the city. It will focus more specifically on marine technology, its traditional strength. However, all

three of these institutions are seeking to build strength across the disciplines and to shed the overspecialization of many Chinese universities.

Building top research universities requires more than impressive buildings and advanced laboratories. An advanced academic culture focused on research, collaborative work, meritocratic advancement, and top-quality teaching and advisement is also required. It may be in these "soft" areas that mainland universities need further development.

HONG KONG'S ADVANTAGES—SOME LESSONS FOR THE MAINLAND

Hong Kong has many important advantages in its academic culture that go beyond its impressive facilities. The University of Hong Kong (UHK) is undergoing a major expansion and renovation to its campus in anticipation of its 100th anniversary. But it is in the "software"—the academic culture and traditions—where Hong Kong's top universities have a competitive advantage over their mainland competitors. These include English as the main medium of instruction—while the UHK is the only exclusively English-medium institution, the other two major research institutions, the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology and the Chinese University of Hong Kong, are predominantly using English. Nevertheless, as several Chinese mainland universities are also increasing the English-medium component of their institutions, it will be more important for Hong Kong to excel in this area while keeping a high standard of Chinese. Academic freedom is sufficiently well entrenched to have withstood several major challenges since 1997. The international faculty with both Chinese and other foreign heritages have not been sidelined in the day-to-day operation of the universities and complement the cosmopolitanism of the institutions. Transparency in administration and a significant degree of faculty governance have meant that the academic staff have been involved in all major development planning and key decisions. Working conditions are favorable by international standards, as are academic salaries—despite quickly sliding downward toward the international norms with several cuts in recent years, a delinking from the civil service salary scale, and introduction of a performance-based salary system. However, Hong Kong's competitiveness in terms of salaries may gradually decline as salaries and conditions on the mainland improve and academic salaries in other places like the United States continue to rise.

While permanent tenured academic appointments are highly competitive and difficult to obtain in Hong Kong, there is a recognized academic career path and reasonable security of employment. Mainland institutions are still struggling to establish regularized personnel policies, with appropriate expectations and evaluations.

Perhaps most important is the fact that both Hong Kong's universities and its society function according to accepted international standards and have a general commitment to excellence, meritocracy, and an openness to ideas and innova-

tions.

WHAT HONG KONG NEEDS

The main requirement for Hong Kong to maintain its competitive academic system is for society at all levels—including the universities themselves as well as the government and the public—to support the universities and recognize them as a central element of Hong Kong's competitive future. This means both adequate funding as well as attention to maintaining and strengthening Hong Kong's distinctive academic culture. An environment in which the most creative professors can pursue their work is essential. Steven Hawking also pointed out on his visit to China that scientists' deference to authority can be a hindrance to scientific breakthroughs. Many mainland Chinese academics are still at the crossroads, stuck between the old traditional bureaucratic control and the new forces of global corporate university culture. But, it won't be that way forever as social change continues in China. Given Hong Kong's heavily commercial and business culture and the lack of a strong intellectual tradition, its leadership could easily slip back into the past when Hong Kong maintained a university as a symbol rather than as a center for intellectual innovation. Within the strong pull of Chinese history, Hong Kong has not been recognized as a cultural Mecca or center of intellectual dynamism, and the powerful business sector has often remained skeptical of the usefulness of Hong Kong's universi-

ties with their high price tags.

Hong Kong needs to commit fully to the idea that the knowledge economy is one of its keys to the future. That means that Hong Kong's key universities need to be supported in their efforts to compete globally. Specific policy initiatives should include internationalization (recruiting international staff and students), the continued use of English as the central language of higher education, an emphasis on academic and professional fields especially relevant to Hong Kong's competitive future, dedication to intellectual freedom and independence that have been a hallmark of higher education in Hong Kong, the ability to attract Hong Kong overseas scientists to return home, continued reform of the school system, an undergraduate curriculum that builds problem-solving skills and commitment to community building, and a research culture that is supported with bold initiatives to sustain a new intellectual environment of discovery and application. Without these emphases, Hong Kong will be unable to keep abreast of the emerging academic sector in mainland China and will fall behind in global higher education competition. Of central importance is sustained financial support for higher education. ■

New Publications

New CIHE Publications

The Center has published two new books. Copies are available without cost by request from readers in developing countries.

D. Bruce Johnstone. *Financing Higher Education: Cost-Sharing in International Perspective* (2006). This book includes analysis of the theme of financing and cost sharing and case studies of specific countries. A commercial edition is available from

Sense Publishers, POB 21858, 3001 AW Rotterdam, Netherlands.

Philip G. Altbach. *International Higher Education: Reflections on Policy and Practice* (2006). This book contains a collection of articles reprinted from *International Higher Education*, on a range of themes such as internationalization and globalization, research universities, private higher education, the academic profession, as well as others.

New Listserv Will Provide Current CIHE Information and Access to *IHE*

We are launching a new listserv that will provide the higher education community with information concerning the CIHE, *International Higher Education*, and related publications. We will provide you with current information concerning new *IHE* issues and new publications. Please visit the following URL to sign up for the listserv: <http://www.bc.edu/bc.org/avp/soe/cihe/listserv.html>.

Arthur, James, with Karen E. Bohlin, eds. *Citizenship and Higher Education: The Role of Universities in Communities and Society*. London: RoutledgeFalmer, 2005. 195 pp. (hb). ISBN 0-415-33487-X. Address: RoutledgeFalmer Publishers, 2 Park Sq., Milton Park, Abingdon, OX14 4RN, UK.

This somewhat mistitled book—the theme is on building character and civic responsibility among university students—focuses on how universities can help to build a civic consciousness and responsibility among students through specific academic programs, the roles of faculty and others, the development of service learning, and in other ways. The data are largely based on the British experience.

Bataille, Gretchen M., and Betsy Brown. *Faculty Career Paths: Multiple Routes to Academic Success and Satisfaction*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2006. 224 pp. \$45 (hb). ISBN 0-275-98748-5. Address: Praeger Publishers, POB 5007, Westport, CT 06881, USA.

A series of very short essays focusing on the challenges of a changing academic profession, this book is aimed at providing university administrators with insights on the new academic labor market. Among the themes discussed are expectations of early-career faculty, the role of non-tenure-track faculty, late-career satisfaction, the role of graduate students and postdoctoral scholars, and others. This book focuses on the United States.

Bracken, Susan, J., Jeanie K. Allen, and Diane R. Dean, eds. *The Balancing Act: Gendered Perspectives on Faculty Roles and Work Lives*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2006. 177 pp. \$24.95. (pb). ISBN 1-57922-149-1. Address: Stylus Publishing, 22883 Quicksilver Dr., Sterling VA 20166, USA.

The focus of this book is on how faculty members cope with work and family life, particularly from the perspective of women faculty. Among the topics discussed are the balance between work and personal roles, academic policies relating to family issues, career expectations of academic couples, and related themes.

Eckel, Peter D. *The Shifting Frontiers of Academic Decision Making*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2006. 168 pp. \$45 (hb). ISBN 0-275-98792-2. Address: Praeger Publishers, POB 5007, Westport, CT 06881, USA.

The focus of this book is on the complexities of academic decision making in the context of new challenges to higher education. These challenges include the role of for-profit activities, interinstitutional programs, the role of ad hoc committees, the role of centers and institutes, activist trustees, information technology, and other issues. The case studies are all US-based.

Frank, David John, and Jay Gabler. *Reconstructing the University: Worldwide Shifts in Academia in the 20th Century*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006. 248 pp. \$19.95 (pb). ISBN 978-0-8047-5376-0. Address: Stanford University Press, Stanford CA 94305, USA.

By examining numbers of faculty members and curricular trends as measured by courses offered, this study looks at academic change during the 20th century in universities worldwide. The authors point out how universities incorporated professional studies and changes in knowledge by adding departments and course offerings. Worldwide, they point to many common elements in how universities have adapted to changing circumstances.

Gallin, Alice, ed. *Ex Corde Ecclesiae: Documents Concerning Reception and Implementation*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006. 496 pp. \$80 (hb). ISBN 0-268-02966-0. Address: University of Notre Dame Press, 310 Flanner Hall, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA.

Ex Corde Ecclesiae, Pope John Paul II's 1990 apostolic letter to Roman Catholic universities around the world, stimulated considerable debate concerning the nature of Catholic higher education, how Catholic universities can maintain their religious identity and mission in the 21st century, and analysis of how to implement changes. This book focuses mainly on the work of the Implementation Committee of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in the United States and features documents used

by the conference as well as by universities and the Church leadership. The discussion is relevant to Catholic higher education outside the United States.

Kehm, Barbara M., and Hans De Wit, eds. *Internationalization in Higher Education: European Responses to the Global Perspective*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: European Association for International Education, 2005. 180 pp. (pb). ISBN 10-90-74721-24-9. Address: EAIE, PO Box 11189, 1001 GE Amsterdam, Netherlands.

This book presents essays concerning how European countries are responding to internationalization trends—including student mobility, degree structures, GATS-WTO issues, competition, and related themes.

Morey, Melanie M., and John J. Piderit, SJ. *Catholic Higher Education: A Culture in Crisis*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. 450 pp. (hb). ISBN 0-19-530551-5. Address: Oxford University Press, 198 Madison Ave., New York, NY 10016, USA.

A thorough analysis of leadership and goals in American Catholic colleges and universities, this book is based on a study of 124 senior administrators in 33 institutions. The focus was on how Catholic institutions are to remain focused on their mission with the absence of priests and nuns on the faculty and in the administration. Among the themes discussed are the mission and culture of the institution, religious activities, student issues, among others.

Priest, Douglas M., and Edward St. John, eds. *Privatization and Public Universities*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006. 280 pp. \$39.95 (hb). ISBN 0-253-34735-0. Address: Indiana University Press, 601 B. Morton St., Bloomington, IN 47404, USA.

As enrollments have expanded to meet mass demand for access at the same time government support for higher education has stagnated or declined, there is an inevitable crisis. Focusing on the United States, this book examines the phenomenon known as the privatization of public higher education and its various ramifications. Among the themes considered are the priva-

tization of business and auxiliary services, patents and royalties, e-learning, alternative revenue sources, patterns of tuition increases, and others.

Wedlin, Linda. *Ranking Business Schools: Forming Fields, Identities, and Boundaries in International Management Education*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 2006. 213 pp. \$95 (hb). ISBN 1-84542-515-4. Address: Edward Elgar Publishers, 136 West St., Northampton, MA 01060, USA.

An academic study of the European experience with rankings of business schools, this book looks at the rankings undertaken by various publications such as the *Financial Times*, *Economist*, *Business Week*, *Wall Street Journal*, and others. Topics discussed include

how the business schools react to the rankings and focus on them, how classifications are defined, and related issues.

New American Council on Education—Internationalization Publications

The American Council on Education has published seven working papers on aspects of internationalization in American higher education. Sponsored by the Ford Foundation, this research-based project is aimed at improving campus internationalization in the United States. The publications will be of interest to those concerned with internationalization worldwide. Among the themes considered in the working papers

are: building a strategic framework for comprehensive internationalization, measuring internationalization at community colleges, research universities, liberal arts colleges, and comprehensive universities; internationalization in U.S. higher education—the student perspective; and faculty and the internationalizing of disciplines. Each working paper is priced at \$20. More information can be obtained at: The American Council on Education, 191, Washington, DC 20055-0191, USA. www.acenet.edu.

OUR WEBSITE

The Center's award-winning website is a useful source of information and analysis on higher education worldwide. All back issues of *International Higher Education* are available, and an index provides easy access to articles by topic and country. Center publications are also available, and links to relevant higher education websites and information are provided. We are a featured e-link of the World Bank and other agencies.

THE PROGRAM IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE LYNCH SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, BOSTON COLLEGE

The Center is closely related to the program in higher education at Boston College. The program offers master's and doctoral degree study in the field of higher education. The program has been preparing professionals in higher education for three decades. It features a rigorous social science-based approach to the study of higher education, combining a concern with the broader theoretical issues relating to higher education and an understanding of the practice of academic administration. The Administrative Fellows initiative provides financial assistance as well as work experience in a variety of administrative settings. Specialization is offered in higher education administration, student affairs and development, international higher education, and other areas. Additional information about the program is available from Dr. Karen Arnold, coordinator of the program in higher education, Lynch School of Education, Champion Hall, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts, 02467, USA. Fax: (617)

552-8422. E-mail: arnoldkc@bc.edu. More information about the program—including course descriptions and degree requirements—can be found on-line at the program's website: http://infoeagle.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/hea/JEA/html. *International Higher Education* is available full-text on our website. The Boston College Center for International Higher Education provides a unique service to colleges and universities world wide by focusing on the global realities of higher education. Our goal is to bring an international consciousness to the analysis of higher education. We are convinced that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center publishes *International Higher Education*, a book series on higher education, and other publications. We sponsor occasional conferences on key issues in higher education and maintain a resource base for researchers and policymakers. The Center welcomes visiting scholars for periods of study and reflection. We have a special concern for academic institutions in the Jesuit tradition worldwide, and more broadly with Catholic universities. The Center is also concerned with creating dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions in industrialized nations and in developing countries. We are convinced that our future depends on effective collaboration and the creation of an international community focused on the improvement of higher education in the public interest.

EDITOR

Philip G. Altbach

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Salina Kopellas

EDITORIAL OFFICE

Center for International Higher Education
Champion 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>

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. There is no charge for a subscription.

ISSN: 1084-0613

Our work is supported by the Ford Foundation and by the Lynch School of Education at Boston College. We are indebted to these funders for core sponsorship.