

INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

THE BOSTON COLLEGE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

NUMBER 54 WINTER 2009

International Issues

- 2 The Story of Academic Rankings
Nian Cai Liu
- 3 Intricacies of Academic Remuneration
Philip G. Altbach
- 5 University Admissions: Global Variations
Robin Matross Helms
- 7 International Quality Control
Alan Contreras

Internationalization

- 8 Internationalization: Unintended Consequences?
Jane Knight
- 10 Is Australia Overdependent on International Students?
Simon Marginson

Private Higher Education

- 12 For-profit versus Nonprofit Private Higher Education
Daniel C. Levy

The World Bank's New Africa Report

- 14 Tertiary Education and Economic Growth in Africa
William Saint
- 15 The World Bank's Perspective
Damtew Teferra

South Asia

- 17 India's Effort to Join 21st-Century Higher Education
Philip G. Altbach and N. Jayaram
- 19 Higher Education Transformation in Pakistan
Fred M. Hayward

Countries and Regions

- 20 Higher Education and Wayward Labor Markets in Mexico
Wietse de Vries, Alberto Cabrera, and Shaquana Anderson
- 22 US Financial Crisis and How Students Pay
Arthur P. Hauptman
- 23 Arab Open and Virtual Universities
David Porcaro

Departments

- 25 New Publications
- 27 News of the Center

The Story of Academic Ranking of World Universities

NIAN CAI LIU

Nian Cai Liu is professor and Dean of the Graduate School of Education, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China. E-mail: ncliu@sjtu.edu.cn.

Building world-class universities has been the dream of generations of Chinese. At the 100th anniversary of Peking University in May 1998, the then president of China declared that the country should have several world-class universities—resulting in the 985 Project, which is especially for building world-class universities in China.

In 1998, Shanghai Jiao Tong University was selected by the Chinese government to be among the first group of nine universities in the 985 Project. At that time, many top Chinese universities drew up their strategic goals as world-class universities, and most of them set up a timetable. Shanghai Jiao Tong University was no exception. As a professor and vice-dean of the School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering of the university, I became involved in the strategic planning process of building Shanghai Jiao Tong University into a world-class university.

During the process, I asked myself many questions. What is the definition of a world-class university? How many world-class universities should there be globally? What are the positions of top Chinese universities in the world higher education system? How can top Chinese universities reduce their gap with world-class universities? In order to answer these questions, I started to benchmark top Chinese universities with world-class universities and eventually to rank the world universities.

THE GLOBAL POSITION OF CHINESE UNIVERSITIES

From 1999 to 2001, with Dr. Ying Cheng and two other colleagues, I worked on the project of benchmarking top Chinese universities with four groups of US universities, from the very top to ordinary research universities. The main conclusions include that top Chinese universities were estimated to be in the position of 200 to 300 in the world. The results of these comparisons and analyses were used in the strategic planning process of Shanghai Jiao Tong University. Eventually, a consultation report was written and provided to the Ministry of Education of China.

The publication of the report resulted in numerous positive comments, many of which involved the possibility of making a real ranking of world universities. During the time, many foreign friends, who visited us for other purposes, learned about our study and encouraged us to do world rankings. They reminded us that not only in China but also universities, governments, and other stakeholders in the rest of the world are

interested in the ranking of world universities. Therefore, I decided to undertake this project, and with three colleagues spent another two years until the Academic Ranking of World Universities was completed in early 2003.

In June 2003, the ranking was published on our Web site (<http://www.arwu.org>). Although about 1,200 institutions from all over the world have actually been ranked, only the lists of the top 500 institutions have been published on the Web. Considering the significance of differences in the total scale, the ranking results include groups of 50 institutions in the range of 100 to 200 and groups of 100 institutions in the range of 200 to 500.

RANKING BY BROAD SUBJECT FIELDS

Ever since its publication, the ranking has attracted attention from all over the world. Numerous requests have been received, asking us to provide a ranking of world universities by broad subject fields or by schools and colleges. We have tried to respond to these requests and the results were published on our Web site in February 2007. The five broad subject fields include the natural sciences and mathematics, engineering/technology and computer sciences, life and agriculture sciences, clinical medicine and pharmacy, and the social sciences.

Although about 1,200 institutions from all over the world have actually been ranked, only the lists of the top 500 institutions have been published on the Web.

Arts and humanities were not ranked because of the technical difficulties in finding internationally comparable indicators with reliable data. Psychology and other cross-disciplinary fields were not included in the ranking because of their interdisciplinary characteristics. Two new indicators were introduced: first, the percentage of articles published in the top 20 percent journals of each broad subject field and, second, the research expenditures (for engineering ranking). The list of top 100 universities in each broad subject field was published.

ONGOING EFFORTS TO DIVERSIFY THE RANKING

The Academic Ranking of World Universities sought to rank research universities in the world by their academic or research performance based on internationally comparable third-party data that everyone could check. The project was carried out for our academic interests, with potential impact on the strategic planning of Chinese universities.

Methodological problems involve the balance of research with teaching and service in ranking indicators and weights— inclusion of non-English publications, the selection of awards, and the experience of award winners. Technical problems exist in the definition and name given to institutions, data searching

and cleanup of databases, and attribution of publications to institutions and broad subject fields. We have been working hard to study all the above-mentioned problems and to improve our ranking.

In addition to the broad subject field ranking, we are surveying the possibilities of providing more diversified ranking lists, particularly rankings based on different types of universities with different functions, disciplinary characteristics, history, size, and budget, as well as other topics. Furthermore, we have been doing theoretical research on ranking in general, seeking to contribute to the understanding of ranking. We have also been actively participating in international societies related to ranking such as the International Ranking Expert Group—International Observatory on Academic Ranking and Excellence (<http://www.ireg-observatory.org>).

CONCLUSION

Any ranking is controversial, and no ranking is absolutely objective. Nevertheless, university rankings have become popular in almost all major countries in the world. Whether universities and other stakeholders agree, ranking systems clearly are here to stay. The key issue then becomes how to improve ranking systems and how to use their results properly. Ranking methodologies should always be examined carefully before looking at any ranking lists, and ranking results should be used with caution.

Author's note: For additional information about the Shanghai higher education rankings, see <http://www.arwu.org>.



The Intricacies of Academic Remuneration

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

*Philip G. Altbach is Monan University Professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. E-mail: altbach@bc.edu. The research referred to in this article is from Laura E. Rumbley, Iván F. Pacheco, and Philip G. Altbach, *International Comparison of Academic Salaries: An Exploratory Study* (2008).*

How can we comprehend academic salaries? Does the sum paid monthly to a professor constitute his or her full remuneration? Our research on international comparisons of academic salaries found major variations among countries. Differences exist as well within countries—by rank, discipline, and other factors. In some countries, salaries are determined by an individual's age, length of employment, rank, and often by civil service rules—without much cognizance of productivi-

ty or academic accomplishment. Indeed, in much of the world, academics are paid on the basis of their length of service and rank alone. In other countries, particularly in some of the newer private universities, salary structures are far from transparent.

The full-time professoriate—probably a global minority of the academic profession overall, since in many countries part-timers dominate the academic system—is divided by role, function, type of institution, and discipline. As interpreted by sociologist Burton Clark, the academic profession is divided by “small worlds, different worlds.” Academics are also divided by salaries. In many countries, faculty in private universities earn more than their counterparts in public institutions. Our research shows significant variations by rank. Not surprisingly, in our study of 15 countries, senior professors earned on average significantly more than junior staff.

PATTERNS

Among most full-time academic staff in North America, Western Europe, much of Asia, and Australia, the salary paid by the university is the bulk of the total income earned. Relatively little extra income is earned through consulting, part-time teaching, or other sources. The salary, particularly if there are two income earners in the family, provides for an adequate if not lavish middle-class lifestyle commensurate with national standards. As our research shows, while academic salaries vary considerably, in the regions mentioned here, full-time academics can survive on their university incomes.

This is not the case in Latin America, most of Africa, or some of the countries of central and eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. In these countries, full-time academic salaries generally do not provide sufficient income, and academics must earn additional money from other sources. Some hold more than one academic position, as the growing private higher education sector in many countries is staffed largely by “moonlighting” professors from the inadequately paid public universities. Others do consulting, own businesses, and a significant number do private tutoring or other activities that border on corrupt academic practices.

SOME ACADEMICS ARE LESS EQUAL THAN OTHERS

In many countries, academic remuneration from the university is not equivalent to the base salary from the university. There are many reasons for this. Salaries are often nationally stipulated by government authorities or through union contracts or other arrangements. Universities may be unable to differentiate among disciplines, pay anything close to “market rates” to professors who are in high demand in the labor market, or reward highly productive scholars. Faculty members living in high-cost urban areas may earn the same as professors in lower-cost regions.

Most faculty members serve as teachers and possess few if any research expectations or accomplishments. In many parts of the world, particularly in developing countries, a large num-

ber of university teachers hold a bachelor's or master's degree and not a doctorate. For this large proportion of the academic profession, the base salary is the full income provided by the employing university, and in some countries additional income is needed. In others, the base salary is sufficient if not particularly attractive.

FOR OTHER PROFESSORS, MORE IS REQUIRED

For a relatively small minority of the academic profession, the standard salaries offered by most universities are insufficient to keep them in academe or, in some cases, even within their

The full-time professoriate—probably a global minority of the academic profession overall, since in many countries part-timers dominate the academic system—is divided by role, function, type of institution, and discipline.

home country. These academics are research-active faculty members found in all fields but larger numbers in the sciences than the humanities, mostly located at top universities, and in “hot” fields such as management, information technology, or biotechnology, where salaries outside the universities are very high. These academic “stars” form a modest proportion of the academic profession in any country, ranging possibly from 2 to 10 percent of the total professoriate. Indeed, without this group little research would be undertaken and universities would have no chance to succeed in the international rankings.

“Salary progression”—the difference in salary between junior and senior professors—in general appears modest compared to the situation in the professions outside academe. According to our research, for most of the 15 countries in the study, salaries seldom doubled between entry level and senior ranks. The major industrialized countries (including Germany, France, Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom) stood at the bottom, in terms of variations between junior and senior ranks, and the developing countries (such as China, South Africa, Argentina, and others) at the top. India ranks poorly on both progression and on basic salary. The lack of possibilities for improved salaries is a problem for the profession in general, but it is particularly damaging for the most productive academics. The latter are the most likely to leave academe or to go to countries with higher salaries.

How are these academic highflyers paid in the bureaucratic and rather flat academic salary environment of academe? For a start, in a few countries and frequently in private higher education, salary structures are relatively flexible, and it is possible to pay top professors significantly higher direct salaries than the rank and file. American private universities are the most dramatic examples, where highly productive professors, those in such fields such as law or management, and scholars hold-

ing endowed chairs may obtain salaries possibly double or more than other senior academics earn. In these institutions and in some others in the United States and elsewhere, universities are able to compensate professors based in part on market-rate salaries for fields and individuals in high demand.

Research-active professors often teach less—providing them more time to focus on research and thus compensating them with time instead of salary. It is common for professors to be directly paid by their universities for research production. In some places, professors are paid by their university or a government agency for each article they publish in a prestigious journal. Where professors are able to obtain research grants from external sources they are often paid a part of the grant income. Research-active faculty in some countries can be compensated by government agencies set up to boost incomes, often as members of organizations of researchers. The Mexican Sistema Nacional de Investigadores is an example.

While these and other arrangements create inequalities in compensation among professors and universities within an academic system, they are necessary to reward research-active faculty.

SALARY IS NOT ALWAYS REMUNERATION

For many reasons, the incomes earned by academics do not always coincide with the salary provided by the university. Universities sometimes try to boost compensation to meet high urban living costs and keep professors from leaving the institution for higher paying jobs elsewhere in the economy. Some institutions, as in the case of Makerere University in Uganda, have established extra academic programs for students to let professors earn extra income by teaching additional high-fee-paying students. Many academics earn extra money on their own by consulting, holding appointments in more than one university, or other schemes.

How are these academic highflyers paid in the bureaucratic and rather flat academic salary environment of academe?

It is often difficult to measure nonsalary income. Universities have few ways of tracking income sources. Individual academics, particularly those with creative ways of boosting their incomes, have little incentive to report extra income. Nonsalary income provides, in the cases of research-active professors, a necessary way of rewarding highly productive faculty. Other extra-salary compensation supplements unrealistically low salaries. However, certain forms of such compensation may lead to corruption, unfair advantages, or other problems. Salaries frequently are insufficient to attract or retain the best scholars and scientists, and attractive remuneration is absolutely necessary to reward productive academics in a complex and globalized university. ■

University Admissions: Practices and Procedures Worldwide

ROBIN MATROSS HELMS

Robin Matross Helms is an international education consultant in Washington, DC. E-mail: robin.m.helms@gmail.com.

Tertiary education—more than the capstone of the traditional education pyramid—is a key pillar of human development worldwide. In today's lifelong—learning sector, tertiary education provides not only advanced skills to meet the demands of knowledge-based labor markets but also the training for teachers, doctors, nurses, civil servants, engineers, humanists, entrepreneurs, scientists, social scientists, and other personnel. These trained individuals are essential in developing the capacity and analytical skills that drive local economies, support civil society, teach children, lead effective governments, and make important decisions that affect entire societies.

University admissions procedures play a critical role in determining who has access to such training, and therefore, to the many opportunities and benefits. Procedures and priorities of the process vary widely from country to country. Some admissions practices are comparatively objective and look at a single entrance examination score. Other procedures are quite subjective and consider a portfolio of examination scores, academic performance, references, and extracurricular work of a prospective student. Multiple admissions systems may also be used within a particular country; such systems sometimes vary between public and private institutions.

This study, sponsored by the World Bank, examined one piece of the tertiary admissions puzzle: undergraduate university admissions policies and procedures worldwide. The scope was limited to undergraduate admissions in the public university sector, the specific activities undertaken to admit students, and the primary or dominant system used in each country. This article presents the admissions typology that resulted from the study. Readers who would like more information, including an analysis of key considerations and challenges associated with each model, are referred to the full paper.

TYPE 1: SECONDARY LEAVING EXAMINATIONS

Type 1 admissions systems rely on candidates' scores on one or more secondary-school leaving examinations. These exams are generally nationally or regionally administered by the government, achievement oriented, and may cover a range of subjects. Alternatively, students may select subject exams, either based on their secondary-school program or intended university program of study. A candidate's score may be the only factor considered in the admissions process, or it may be combined

with other factors—such as a secondary-school grade-point average. The process may be centrally coordinated, with cutoff (minimum) scores determined by a government or another entity, or institutions may manage the process and set their own selection criteria. Representative models of Type 1 admissions systems include Ireland and Tanzania.

Ireland. Students in Ireland take national Leaving Certificate examinations at the end of secondary school, which are administered by the State Examinations Commission of the national government. Institutions determine the number of places available in each of their programs, but the admissions process is centrally coordinated by the Central Admissions Office, an independent organization owned by the institutions. Candidates submit their preferences to the commission and are automatically matched by computer to a program and institution, based on their preferences and examination scores.

This study, sponsored by the World Bank, examined one piece of the tertiary admissions puzzle: undergraduate university admissions policies and procedures worldwide.

Tanzania. Control and coordination of the admissions process in Tanzania for both public and private institutions are shared by the Tanzania Commission on Universities and individual institutions. Candidates apply directly to the institutions of their choice (they may apply to a total of three). In addition to submitting their applications to individual institutions, candidates are required to submit an application to the commission, indicating the institutions to which they are applying. Assignment is based on a variety of factors—including gender, other demographic considerations (e.g., disability status), demands of the labor market, and other national economic and social needs.

TYPE 2: ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS

Like secondary-school leaving examinations, university entrance examinations are often administered nationally or regionally by the government in the countries where they are used; in these cases, admissions procedures are also often centrally coordinated. However, in a number of systems entrance examinations are administered by individual institutions, which determine the required cutoff score and other admissions criteria. Like secondary-school leaving exams, entrance examinations generally measure the knowledge candidates acquired in subjects studied in high school and may be considered alone or in combination with other factors in the admissions process. Representative models of Type 2 systems include China and Serbia.

China. Candidates take a national entrance exam in one of two categories: humanities or sciences and engineering. The university system is centrally planned and admission is cen-

trally coordinated by the national government, which determines the number of spaces available in each institution and program. Candidates specify the institutions and departments they wish to enter in order of preference and are assigned by the government to an institution and program, based on their exam performance and preferences.

Serbia. The number of spaces available in each university are set by the national government, which also determines how many of these spaces will be government funded and how many will be allocated to tuition-paying students. However, individual institutions administer their own entrance examinations and oversee their own admissions processes. Institutions weigh applicants' average grade achieved over four years of secondary education with scores on their entrance exams.

Like secondary-school leaving examinations, university entrance examinations are often administered nationally or regionally by the government in the countries where they are used

TYPE 3: STANDARDIZED APTITUDE TESTS

Standardized aptitude tests are designed to measure general cognitive abilities, rather than achievement, of candidate students. When used in the admissions process, they are usually combined with other factors that measure previously acquired knowledge and academic achievement (with the notable exception of Sweden). Representative models of Type 3 admissions systems include Sweden and the United States.

Sweden. University candidates take the Swedish Scholastic Aptitude Test, which is administered by the National Agency for Higher Education, a government entity. Admission may be based on a candidate's score on the aptitude test or on his or her high school grades; at least one-third of the places in any university program must be allocated based on scores and at least one-third, on high school grades.

The United States. Contents of the required dossier and the relative weight applied to each application element are determined by each institution in the United States. Most institutions consider the candidate's performance on a standardized aptitude test such as the SAT Reasoning Test or the American College Testing Program. Secondary-school performance is a key factor, and many institutions, particularly in the elite sector, require a considerable number of application materials, including essays, recommendation letters, interviews, and in some cases auditions and/or portfolios.

TYPE 4: MULTIPLE EXAMINATIONS

In this admissions system, performance on a national secondary-school leaving or entrance exam is considered, along with performance on one or more additional exams, which may be administered by the government, the education institution in question, or independent organizations. Representative Type 4

models include Israel and India.

Israel. A government-determined minimum level of performance on national secondary-school leaving exams (the Bagrut examinations) is required to access the university system in Israel. In addition, candidates are required to take the Psychometric Entrance Test, a standardized aptitude exam administered by the National Institute for Testing and Evaluation, a nonprofit, nongovernment organization.

India. Candidates are admitted to university in India based on their scores on one or more secondary-school leaving or entrance exams. These exams are conducted by many different entities, including the national government, provincial governments, individual institutions, and groups of institutions. Institutions set their own requirements regarding which examinations candidates must take, how much weight each exam carries, and what scores are required for admission.

TYPE 5: NO EXAMINATIONS

As noted previously, a majority of university systems worldwide use examinations of one kind or another in the admissions process. Nonetheless, certain systems do not require examinations; these systems generally rely heavily on secondary-school academic performance in selecting students. Non-exam-based admissions procedures are also beginning to appear in the private sector in various countries, most notably the United States. Type 5 models include Norway and some US institutions.

Standardized aptitude tests are designed to measure general cognitive abilities, rather than achievement, of candidate students.

Norway. The university admissions process in Norway is centrally coordinated by the Norwegian Universities and Colleges Admission Service, which is a government agency. Candidates specify up to 10 programs to which they would like to apply, in order of preference. They are awarded points based primarily on their high school grades, with additional points awarded for specific courses, demographic variables, and military service experience.

Certain US institutions. Since the mid-1980s, a growing number of US institutions have adopted an "SAT optional" policy in their admissions practices due to concerns about fairness, equity, validity, and other issues related to the SAT exam.

Gaining a greater understanding of the admission models currently in use and further exploring the issues and challenges involved will help governments and institutions determine the procedures that will best meet their needs, ensure fairness, promote equity, and ultimately, realize the potential of tertiary education to improve economic and social conditions worldwide. More research is needed to understand the complexities of admission. This report is intended as a first step,

which will contribute to a robust and on-going dialogue on university admission among government and institutional leaders, development organizations, scholars, and other stakeholders in the global tertiary education enterprise.

Author's note: A longer paper on this topic is available from the author.

The Complexity of International Quality Control

ALAN CONTRERAS

Alan Contreras has served as administrator of the Oregon Office of Degree Authorization since 1999. He is a frequent contributor to American higher education media. E-mail: Contreras_a@mercury.osac.state.or.us.

In March 2008, the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education was established under what is called the Bologna process. The 46 countries involved in the process seek to improve the quality and assessment of higher education throughout Europe, thus facilitating students' mobility among institutions and countries and enhancing international use of courses and degrees from the participating countries. The new register creates a screening process that European colleges can apply to go through.

The register is a good idea, but its administrators will have to grapple with the same underlying reality that US states struggle with: some governments have good standards for higher education oversight, and some do not. A few American states have such low standards that a degree from anywhere except the best private colleges within their borders is met with suspicion by people aware of accreditation. California has no standards at all and is widely considered a haven for degree mills.

THE COMPLEXITY EUROPE FACES

The same basic problem now confronts Europe. However, these university sectors vary even more widely from each other than those in the United States, with issues of national autonomy added to the mix.

In Belgium the constitution does not allow the government to interfere in education. That blissful approach impacts reality rather badly: Belgium serves as the registry of choice for suppliers of substandard degrees, although some of those institutions actually operate out of Africa or even the United States. An entity called the Euclid University Consortium, which

claims a Belgian university as a member, is really an enterprise in the Central African Republic, with some of its services coming from the United States. This organization issues documents showing that it is a "real" university, yet to which reliable governmental agency could we turn for an evaluation of its claims? None that we know of.

Britain and Ireland house genuine universities second to none in the world and shelter a wide variety of foreign entities—including medical schools—with only the barest layer of paper authority from small governments on tropical islands all over the world. The two countries also play host to, in the parasitic sense of the term, something that calls itself Warnborough College, a diploma mill that has managed to move back and forth between Britain and Ireland for decades without either government's being able to put an end to it. Warnborough is owned by an Australian expatriate named Brenden D. Tempest-Mogg. He is widely known as Fog-Tempest, owing to his ability to keep his operation out of sight of education authorities.

The register is a good idea, but its administrators will have to grapple with the same underlying reality that US states struggle with: some governments have good standards for higher education oversight, and some do not.

Given their sound educational institutions, countries like Denmark and Switzerland appear unlikely to be homes for bottom-feeder colleges. Yet the so-called Knightsbridge University has operated in Denmark for many years. However, because the diploma mill does not try to sell degrees to people intending to use them as credentials inside Denmark, the Danish education authorities told me several years ago they did not consider it worth extracting. Thus, such meaningless degrees can be found as far away as New Zealand.

In Switzerland there is a list of Swiss-recognized institutions. However, the Swiss dislike admitting that each canton can license anyone to issue degrees, which occurs even though canton-sanctioned entities such as Robert Kennedy College do not issue credentials acceptable as Swiss degrees inside Switzerland. The college's recent arrangement with the University of Wales results in the issuance of British degrees to international students who take courses from that little-known supplier in Switzerland. No agency in Great Britain seems to know how this arrangement came about.

Who would bother to establish a sub-standard-degree provider in the depths of Finland? The Americans who own Preston University would. That unaccredited supplier was flushed out of Wyoming and has gone to ground in Alabama, from where it has established what I will generously call a rela-

tionship with a Finnish degree supplier called Firelake University, which does not appear on lists of genuine Finnish colleges. Preston operates all over the world from its base in Alabama, which until recently had the worst degree-program oversight in the United States, a reputation that has now passed downward to California as Alabama purges its degree mills.

The new European screening agency may exist to ensure that entities like those I have mentioned never appear on lists of legitimate European degree-granting institutions—even though they appear to be operating legally, or at least unmolested. That kind of screening would be an effective strategy. In the United States, accreditation serves as a reasonable proxy for legitimacy in the absence of good laws and enforcement in every state. That is not true elsewhere in the world, as government approval can mean a lot in Japan, say, and not much in Senegal.

Given their sound educational institutions, countries like Denmark and Switzerland appear unlikely to be homes for bottom-feeder colleges.

THE PROBLEM OF PARTNERSHIPS

A trickier problem exists when legitimate colleges form partnerships with entities in other countries without identifying the nature of the foreign institutions. For example, Oral Roberts University, accredited in the United States, has a partner in Sweden called Livets Ord University. There is no law in Sweden against calling any entity a “university,” but the Swedish government considers Livets Ord to be a church, not a college, and it has no authority to issue college credits. So where, exactly, do Livets Ord degrees come from? Are they Oral Roberts degrees (that is, the Oral Roberts curriculum taught in Sweden and accompanied with transcripts from Oral Roberts), earned at a branch campus in Sweden? Are they Livets Ord degrees issued without legal authority in Sweden and therefore invalid everywhere? Does Oral Roberts have the legal authority to issue degrees in or from Sweden under Swedish law? And what is Oral Roberts's accreditor, the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, accrediting?

The reverse situation involved the entity called Trinity Theological Seminary, in Indiana. Although lacking recognized US accreditation, it has managed to establish a partnership with a British institution, the University of Liverpool.

We now have Stanford University, the University of California at Berkeley, and the University of Texas at Austin planning to operate a joint program with a new institution in Saudi Arabia and the University of Arizona hoping to operate what amounts to a brand-new, full-scale university in China. To top off this set of shaky pyramids, a school called Northcentral University in Arizona now has a kind of feeder operation in

Hanoi.

THE NEED FOR ACADEMIC OVERSIGHT

How many of these “relationships” are simply credit-laundering operations? It is all but impossible for a university to maintain meaningful academic oversight at such a distance; some senior staff members need to be permanently assigned to the foreign campus. I have grave doubts about the ability of even the best institutions to do that consistently; and without meaningful third-party oversight by an accreditor or government, where does quality control come from?

By all means, the Europeans should have a screening agency for their colleges and universities, but they must establish real standards that other countries can rely on. Nobody should assume that just because an entity has not been forced, by some government to close, it is a genuine university. There are all sorts of reasons why governments lack, or do not enforce, standards. Any new screening agency must be prepared to override that widespread nonperformance. In some cases, the accreditor will need to act contrary to the desires of its member governments, or it, too, will have standards not worthy of the name.

Author's note: This article is revised from an essay published in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* on May 30, 2008.

Internationalization: Unintended Consequences?

JANE KNIGHT

Jane Knight is adjunct professor in the Comparative and International Development Education Centre, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada. E-mail: janeknight@sympatico.ca.

As we progress into the 21st century, the international dimension of higher education is becoming increasingly important and complex. Headlines from recent higher education newspapers paint a colorful picture: “China could be vulnerable to ‘education dumping’ by overseas universities seeking to exploit the rapid expansion of higher education in the country.” “European Higher Education Fairs ‘conquer’ Vietnam.” “Ten universities in the United Kingdom, Ireland, New Zealand, and Australia begin sharing education content on iTunes U.”

THE RANKINGS RACE

Over the last five years, international and regional rankings of universities have become both more popular and problematic.

A heated debate continues about their validity, reliability, and value. Yet, at the same time, university presidents declare that an outcome of internationalization will be achieving a higher position in the global ranking game. This focus on gaining worldwide profile and prestige signals a lamentable shift from capacity building to status building as a driving rationale. The intense competition for world rankings would have been impossible to imagine two decades ago when international collaboration among universities through academic exchanges and development cooperation projects were the norm.

DOUBLE AND JOINT DEGREES

In a recent trend, joint programs have been established between institutions in different countries, leading to double (even multiple) degrees or a joint degree. Such programs are intended to provide a rich international and comparative academic experience for students and to improve their opportunities for employment. Yet, with all new ideas, come questionable adaptations and unintended consequences. In some cases, double degrees can be nothing more than double-counting of one set of course credits. Situations exist where two or three credentials (one from each participating institution) are conferred for little more than the workload required for one degree. While it may be attractive for students to obtain two degrees from institutions in different countries, the situation is being described as both innovative and on the brink of academic fraud if course requirements for two full degrees are not completed or differentiated learning outcomes are not achieved.

This focus on gaining worldwide profile and prestige signals a lamentable shift from capacity building to status building as a driving rationale.

THE BRAIN TRAIN

Many countries invest in major marketing campaigns to attract the best and brightest talent to study and work in their institutions to supply the “brain power” for innovation and research agendas. The complexities and challenges of academic and professional mobility should not be underestimated—nor should the benefits. But, it is impossible to ignore the latest race for attracting international students and academics for brain power and income generation. The original goal of helping students from developing countries study in another country to complete a degree and return home is fading fast as nations compete for retaining human resources.

Research is showing that international students and researchers are increasingly interested in taking a degree in country A, followed by a second degree or perhaps internship in country B, leading to employment in country C and proba-

bly D, finally returning to their home country after 8 to 12 years of international study and work experience. Hence, the emergence of the term “brain train” represents a phenomenon that is presenting benefits and risks for both sending and receiving countries. Higher education has gained more recognition as an important actor and is working in closer collaboration with immigration, industry, and the science and technology sectors to build an integrated strategy for attracting and retaining knowledge workers. The convergence of an aging society, lower birth rates, the knowledge economy, and professional labor mobility is introducing new issues for higher education and producing some unanticipated and for many troubling results in terms of international academic mobility and recruitment.

The convergence of an aging society, lower birth rates, the knowledge economy, and professional labor mobility is introducing new issues for higher education and producing some unanticipated and for many troubling results in terms of international academic mobility and recruitment.

DIPLOMA, ACCREDITATION, AND VISA MILLS

Who would have guessed two decades ago that international education would be struggling to deal with fake degrees and accreditations; academic credentials that are earned but not recognized; and nonregulated fly-by-night institutions? New cross-border education initiatives are intended to increase access to higher education and meet the growing appetite for foreign credentials, but serious issues relate to the quality of the academic offer. The increase in the number of foreign degree mills (selling “parchment”-only degrees) and accreditation mills (selling bogus accreditations for programs or institutions), and rogue for-profit providers (not recognized by national authorities) is a reality that needs to be understood by students, parents, employers, and the academic community. Of course, what needs to be acknowledged are the innovative developments by bona fide higher education institutions that are delivering high quality, programs and legitimate degrees through new types of arrangements, and partnerships (franchise, twinning, virtual, and branch campuses). But, the perpetual issue of balancing cost, quality, and access significantly challenges the benefits, risks, and quality of cross-border education.

FOR-PROFIT INTERNATIONALIZATION EQUALS COMMERCIALIZATION

The number-one risk identified in the 2005 survey on internationalization by the International Association of Universities

was the commodification and selling of education programs. The General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) has been a wake-up call for higher education around the world. Higher education has traditionally been seen as a “public good” and a “social responsibility.” Many people see GATS as presenting new opportunities and benefits, while others see it as introducing serious risks and positioning higher education as a private commodity. In addition, there are those who question why the trade sector needs to impose regulations at all, given that the education sector has been using its own international agreements and conventions.

The impact of new forms and types of international academic mobility on the recognition and promotion of indigenous and diverse cultures is a subject that evokes strong positions and sentiments.

INCREASED ACCESS: EQUITY OR ELITISM

While internationalization—more specifically cross-border education—is seen as a potential to increase access to higher education, deep concerns have been raised about the equity of access. Access for whom is the key question: those who can afford to travel, or those who speak English, or those who can afford foreign tuition fees whether they stay at home or go abroad for their foreign credential? The growth in the for-profit sector of international education provision gives fodder to critics who believe that cross-border education rather than education at home is contributing to the perception that internationalization is only available for financially independent students. Furthermore, the small percentage of students actually participating in short-term study abroad, internships, and international research projects provides more evidence of the exclusive nature of internationalization.

CULTURAL DIVERSITY OR HOMOGENIZATION?

The impact of new forms and types of international academic mobility on the recognition and promotion of indigenous and diverse cultures is a subject that evokes strong positions and sentiments. Many observers believe that modern information and communications technologies and the movement of people, ideas, and culture across national boundaries present new opportunities to promote a culture and provide more chances for the fusion and hybridization of culture.

Other people see both the movement and the speed as alarming. They contend that these same forces are eroding national cultural identities and that, instead of the creation of new hybrid cultures, native cultures are being homogenized—usually interpreted as Westernized. Because education has traditionally been seen as a vehicle of acculturation, these arguments focus on the issues of the dominance of English as the

language of instruction, irrelevance of curriculum content, and the standardization of education and its accreditation processes.

WHAT IS NEXT?

These new developments and unintended consequences illustrate that nothing unfolds entirely as planned. It is necessary to stay alert to unexpected twists and turns along the road to internationalization. With innovation come new opportunities, successes, as well as threats. It is imperative that the international, intercultural, and global dimensions of higher education continue to be proactive and innovative, while keeping a close watch on unanticipated spin-offs and implications. As internationalization matures through its ages and stages of growth, a critical eye and strong will are needed to monitor intended and unintended results—for today and 25 years hence.

Is Australia Overdependent on International Students?

SIMON MARGINSON

Simon Marginson is a professor of higher education in the Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne, Australia. E-mail: s.marginson@unimelb.edu.au.

Australia has become a byword for the generation of export revenues by selling education to foreign students. In 2007, 254,414 international students were enrolled in Australian public universities, 26 percent of all students. Another 18,685 were in private higher education institutions. Each year Australia receives about the same number of university students from mainland China and Hong Kong combined, as does the United States.

The only other country running education as an export business on this scale, the United Kingdom enrolls half the share of international students as in Australia. Education is the third-largest export sector in Australia—below coal and iron ore but ahead of tourism, beef, wheat, and manufacturing. It earned \$12 billion in 2007, mostly from the 207,800 students attending institutions onshore in Australia. There were also 65,299 more in offshore distance education and in branch campuses of Australian institutions, mostly in East and Southeast Asia.

THE EDUCATION EXPORT BOOM

The growth of international education has been amazing. Between 1996 and 2007 the number of foreign students multiplied fivefold, from 53,188 to 273,099. However, this trend

does not show that Australia is more popular with foreign students than other countries. Market research consistently finds the United States as the number one destination of choice, followed by the United Kingdom. At the doctoral level the United States continues to draw the lion's share of the highest-achieving students. Rather, Australia's export boom results from several favorable factors, plus the federal government's framing of the political economy of the national system.

Australia benefits from the global demand for English-language-based education systems. The cost of studying in Australia is cheaper than in the United Kingdom or United States, despite depreciation of the greenback. Australia is close to Asia, the largest-source region for foreign students, and has enjoyed good relations with China for three decades. As in the United Kingdom and Canada, immigration policy encourages foreign students to stay after graduation. Australia has developed very effective marketing and student servicing.

Above all, Australia's export boom is the outcome of supply-side government policies that drive all Australian universities—even the research-intensive institutions at the top of the local market—to raise global student market and thus maximize national exports.

The international education industry provides 15 percent of the combined revenues of Australian universities, up to 50 percent in individual universities. International students subsidize not just university facilities and services but part of the

Australia benefits from the global demand for English-language-based education systems. The cost of studying in Australia is cheaper than in the United Kingdom or United States.

core teaching and research. This support has enabled the national government to run down its funding of higher education. Last year, Education at a Glance—of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)—showed that Australia was the only nation to reduce total public spending on tertiary education from 1995 to 2005, with public funding per student falling by 28 percent in real terms.

In Australia, tuition levels for domestic students are capped, while international fees are not—and the total tuition for each domestic student place, student payments plus government subsidy, has fallen below unit cost. Universities lose money on every local student they enroll, while internationals generate a surplus. At the same time research is not fully funded. Only two-thirds of the cost of government-funded research projects, including infrastructure and teaching buyouts, are covered by research grants. Further, government grants are not fully indexed for cost inflation. The funding gap between public revenues and the costs of domestic students and research grows each year.

Thus the economic factors of the remarkable Australian growth strongly encourage institutions to enroll more international students each year. At the same time, fully commercial English-language and business-training colleges are mushrooming, driven especially by immigration-based demand. The large and growing export industry strengthens Australia's connections with Asia and reduces fiscal costs. This win-win for government is not so good for the universities.

The problem for the universities is that their state is not as “healthy” as the export figures suggest. Perversely, the export industry has been built not on a solid base of quality, but on the deliberate underfunding of the Australian system. Underfunding drives export growth but also empties out quality.

THE GROWTH OF DILEMMAS

The negative signs have been revealed of long-term underfunding in both teaching and research. The rate of participation of domestic students has not changed much since the mid-1990s, while international student numbers have grown so dramatically. Moreover, most OECD countries and East Asian countries are expanding domestic tertiary participation in line with the evolution of the knowledge economy. Between the early 1990s and 2006 the average number of students per academic faculty in Australia rose from 14 to 20, a sharp deterioration in conditions of teaching and learning.

Australia's research performance, relative to population and national wealth, is below levels in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada. Australia has 15 universities in the Shanghai Jiao Tong ranking's top 500, a good performance for a nation of 20 million. But there are no Australian universities in the Jiao Tong top 50, where the United States has 36 research universities, the United Kingdom 5, and Canada 2.

One suspects that Australia cannot keep growing its export industry and emptying out teaching and research capacity at the same time. Eventually, quality might be seen to deteriorate, reducing the number (and certainly the quality) of international students and further driving down systemic resources. Otherwise, government may begin refunding the domestic system, in which case international student numbers might begin to fall.

A recent article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* noted Australia's “dangerous dependence” on education exports. The danger extends beyond the risks of the global market's sharp drop and Australian tertiary education's underfinancing (a possibility, given the slowing down of economic growth in China). The deeper threat includes the corrosion of educational priorities and intercultural principles that a commercial approach can engender, when operating on this scale over a generation, as in Australia.

Australia has not in fact relinquished its educational mission or the commitment to scholarship and research that is integral to universities, as sometimes argued by critics of the commercial approach. In many respects, the culture of

Australian universities remains similar to that of North American and European universities, and good work continues.

However, university marketing budgets remain very large, with symptoms of public underfunding everywhere. Australia has attracted few high-quality foreign doctoral students, and the aim is to secure revenues rather than to allocate scholarships. The opportunity to develop rich intercultural pedagogies and curricula has not been taken—given that the policy focuses on minimizing the unit cost per international student, to maximize earnings. Moreover, at the bottom of the hierarchy there are diploma mills and immigration scams.

In spite of unhealthy signs, Australian policy is unlikely to change unless and until the volume and quality of international student demand drop. Then the crunch will come: the choice of either maintaining export revenues (for example, via immigration incentives) at the further cost of the quality of students, education, and Australia's global reputation; or public refunding that sustains quality but increases fiscal costs and halts export growth. ■

For-Profit versus Nonprofit Private Higher Education

DANIEL C. LEVY

Daniel C. Levy is Distinguished Professor and Director of the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, State University of New York at Albany, Albany, NY, USA. E-mail: dlevy@albany.edu.

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

While most of the world's private higher education is nonprofit, a major uptick is under way concerning for-profit higher education. In the United States, for-profits are the fast-growing segment of higher education and will probably soon capture a 10th of total enrollment—about one-third of the country's private higher education overall. Although the US for-profit share is larger than in most of the world, that segment is growing in many countries. The potential for growth of for-profit higher education appears strong in such areas as adult education, distance education, career education, and foreign-domestic partnerships. A few decades back, even nonprofit private higher education was prohibited in much of the world, whereas today very few countries maintain such a ban. The extent to which legalization of for-profits will follow suit is

as yet unknown, but growth is unmistakable.

The prominence of for-profit higher education relates not just to its expansion but also to its relative distinctiveness. Undeniably, major blurring occurs across all three higher education sectors—for-profit, nonprofit private, and public. But just as scholarship has identified major private (nonprofit) versus public differences, we can increasingly see for-profit versus nonprofit differences. Furthermore, most for-profit versus nonprofit differences likewise reflect the fact that the for-profit sector is particularly distinctive from the public sector.

NOT A DISTINCT SECTOR

It is not always easy to identify for-profit institutions. The biggest problem in numerical terms is that many institutions legally labeled nonprofit are in fact for-profit in practice.

The potential for growth of for-profit higher education appears strong in such areas as adult education, distance education, career education, and foreign-domestic partnerships.

Additionally, some countries neither proscribe nor explicitly allow the for-profit form, simply not mentioning it in the education context. Further ambiguity, however, relates to a widespread misconception about the nature of nonprofit institutions; outside the United States, “private” is often equated with business or pursuit of financial gains. Yet nonprofits violate no rules simply by pursuing gain, as long as the gain is not distributed as profits to owners. Gains reinvested in the institution, perhaps to cross-subsidize fields or build new ones, are legitimate within the nonprofit rubric. Illegitimate but common are other forms of distributing gains, as with expensive perks for family members who may be listed as part of the work staff. It was such widespread practice that helped drive the Brazilian government in the 1990s to permit legal for-profits: better to have tax-paying for-profits than bogus nonprofits.

Blurry boundaries and overlapping realities are hardly unique to higher education. They are longstanding matters of great concern in the general literature on nonprofit organizations and intersectoral differences. Confusion is today compounded as nonprofits commercialize themselves more than ever. Indeed, as manifested in higher education, even some public institutions increasingly take commercial routes. Furthermore, even when clearly identified as for-profit, institutions are often only ambiguously “higher education.” This is particularly salient with training (as opposed to “education”) institutions. The former may come under business law, the latter under education law, with only the former allowed to be, legally, for-profit while the actual boundaries are slippery. Finally, domestic partnerships are growing between public universities and for-profit colleges, sometimes causing ambiguity

as to the nature of the units. In cross-border activities, foreign universities that back home are clearly public or nonprofit partner with private entities abroad, where they themselves act like for-profits.

Intersectoral blurring often increases over time. On the coercive side, state rules and regulations may outlaw certain distinctive traits, such as charging “too much” tuition in India. On a noncoercive side, sectors may choose to emulate one another in certain respects, as in training for the labor market, or they get imprinted by similar overarching market or social realities (such as changes in religious beliefs).

Even if to some extent we define *for-profit* in higher education, we must recognize that for-profit hardly indicates one form. A few institutions are very large, foremost the University of Phoenix, approaching 400,000 enrollments. Like Phoenix,

It is not always easy to identify for-profit institutions. The biggest problem in numerical terms is that many institutions legally labeled nonprofit are in fact for-profit in practice.

some of these are multisite and some are distance-education institutions. Phoenix is part of the Apollo group, which operates internationally. The largest international for-profit chain, however, is Laureate, which is most extensive in Latin America, followed by Europe. Whitney International is a more modest example. However, the great majority of US for-profits are solely domestic institutions, and the for-profit institutions in most countries are largely domestic providers—often small proprietary institutions and frequently family owned. Yet many nonprofits are also small and family owned, and no reliable data exist to compare nonprofits and for-profits on these aspects. We do know that public institutions are substantially larger on average and by definition not family owned. Yet, an absolutely key variable within the for-profit sector lies between institutions of abysmal quality, with dubious intentions, and institutions seriously pursuing gratification of students' interest in practical study aimed at the labor market. The foreign for-profits are at great pains to distinguish themselves from the often numerous fly-by-night domestic for-profits (or nonprofits), and of course, as in the Anglophone Caribbean, they may face a special set of rules dealing with foreign provision.

MAJOR FOR-PROFIT VERSUS NONPROFIT DIFFERENCES

The established differences between private and public higher education are especially clear when the private is for-profit. It tends therefore to be the for-profits that provide the starkest contrasts to public higher education.

These generalizations are illustrated in finance. Whereas public higher education (notwithstanding a strong push to tap

into private funds) remains extremely dependent on government money, typical private institutions draw overwhelmingly on tuition and fees. The exceptions, most importantly US private research universities, are usually nonprofit, as are church-related universities. The United States may be unique in allowing government grants and loans to go to students in (accredited) for-profits.

In governance, private higher education institutions are generally more hierarchical and centralized than public ones, especially regarding for-profits. For example, whereas professors tend to have less power in private than in public institutions, they are notoriously weak in for-profits; in fact, for-profits sometimes boast of this weakness, claiming it allows their institutions to concentrate more on student desires. Mainly, privates pursue accountability more to their usually narrow group of direct stakeholders while public institutions claim a more dispersed accountability to the broad public. To the extent privates claim to defy this generalization, they are usually nonprofits. Moreover, a common private-public contrast involves the greater government policymaking for the public sector, but government's role on the private side generally constitutes public funding or tax exemptions provide a rationale (i.e., on the nonprofit side). Accreditation may be stepped up, however, where suspicion about for-profits' quality or motives could conceivably stimulate more vigilance of for-profits than nonprofits, though again for-profits are sometimes treated as businesses, not under higher education rules.

Yet, an absolutely key variable within the for-profit sector lies between institutions of abysmal quality, with dubious intentions, and institutions seriously pursuing gratification of students' interest in practical study aimed at the labor market.

It then comes as no surprise that public universities' denunciations are often leveled at the for-profit institutions (based on legal or behavioral status) as low quality, deceptive frauds, and businesses uninterested in true education. For-profits tend to launch the harshest critiques of the public universities as slow to change, out of touch with student-consumers' and employers' interests, too expensive and inaccessible, vague in their purposes, and feebly accountable to those who finance them. Often the for-profits launch these critiques simultaneously at the nonprofit private as well as the public institutions, making few distinctions between the two sectors. ■

Tertiary Education and Economic Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa: The World Bank Report

WILLIAM SAINT

William Saint is a coauthor of this report and an independent consultant specializing in the higher education of developing countries. Address: 3179 Colchester Brook Lane, Fairfax, VA 22031, USA. E-mail: wsaint@cox.net. This article is based on the World Bank report, "Accelerating Catch-Up: Tertiary Education and Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa."

The emergence of a highly competitive, globally integrated, knowledge-driven world economy is reshaping traditional understandings of the role of higher education in national economic development. Economic powerhouses from Asia offer concrete evidence of what can be achieved when governments consciously seek to foster capacities for higher-level-skills development and problem-solving research, and to align them with national economic strategy objectives.

What can be learned from these and similar experiences that might be applied to sustain and strengthen the nearly 6 percent economic growth rates in much of Sub-Saharan Africa since the year 2000? This is the question that frames a new World Bank report entitled "Accelerating Catch-Up: Tertiary Education for Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa." Linking international experience, particularly from Asia, with case studies of seven African nations and nine commissioned research papers, the report argues that ratcheting up growth on the continent will require sharp gains in allocative efficiency within the public, financial, and business sectors; substantial increases in the efficiency with which capital assets are utilized; and steady improvements in local capacities to search for and assimilate relevant technologies. All of this necessitates an accumulation of managerial and organizational skills derived primarily from postsecondary education. These in turn expand capacities for innovation and the "discovery" of new export goods. In short, a strong positive relationship is found between the skills imparted through secondary and tertiary education, and export competitiveness in developing countries.

INVESTING IN HUMAN CAPITAL

This argument is bolstered by an extensive review of relevant research from around the world. Notably, it highlights recent trends of rising rates of return to higher education as the demand for skilled workers strengthens in numerous countries. These trends call into question past research findings that social rates of return to higher education were lower than those for primary and secondary education and led the report to conclude: "Almost no one now doubts that modern econom-

ic growth anywhere in the world is becoming more, rather than less, skill intensive, and is requiring increasingly higher levels of education, technical competence, and computer literacy" (p. 6).

The analysis softens the long-standing confrontation between basic and higher education. It affirms that both are necessary for social and economic development, the priority accorded to one or the other being dependent upon specific country circumstances. Moreover, it distances higher education from this intrasectoral competition for legitimacy (and shares of the national education budget) by showing how higher education now extends beyond its traditional role as a social service to play an important part in the drama of national economic development. From this perspective, higher education expenditures can now be justified as strategic investments in human capital formation that boost productivity and enhance national economic competitiveness.

Despite recent reform efforts and achievements by some institutions, higher education systems in sub-Saharan Africa have not yet adapted to the new rules imposed by a global knowledge economy. The report offers support for this conclusion in its assessment of progress and shortcomings in eight determinant aspects of higher education performance: strategic orientation, autonomy and accountability, governance, management, financing, relevance, research and development, and regional collaboration.

These trends call into question past research findings that social rates of return to higher education were lower than those for primary and secondary education

With regard to finance, for example, the report notes that finding the funding to bankroll future enrollment expansion is expected to become increasingly difficult. African countries contribute an above-the-world-average 4.5 percent of GDP to education. On balance, nearly 20 percent of this amount is earmarked for higher education, a share that approaches the limit of what is appropriate for low-income countries. At the level of individual institutions, the opportunities for income generation have been largely exploited. Likewise, although substantial gains in revenue generation for higher education have been achieved in many African countries through increased cost-sharing, the financial possibilities of most families are now being stretched. In consequence, additional resources for higher education are most likely to come from efficiency gains within the tertiary system, from creative partnerships with noneducational institutions, and from innovative methods of revenue raising.

RELEVANCE IS THE KEY

The report repeatedly supports shoring up the quality and relevance of higher education, noting that quality education is more closely associated with economic growth. Record rates of enrollment increase over the past decade have driven down expenditure per student and placed quality at risk. Labor market surveys document employer dissatisfaction with graduate competence, and show high levels of graduate unemployment in a number of countries. Thus, the World Bank cautions that “Though social and political demands press for expansion of public tertiary enrollments, these must be balanced against the need to increase the relevance of education and research, and to encourage the production of the technical skills and applied research capabilities that will promote competitive industries” (p. xxii).

In conclusion, the report posits that tertiary institutions in Africa will need to transform themselves into a different type of educational enterprise: networked, differentiated, and responsive institutions focused on the production of strategically needed human skills and applied problem-solving research. To this end, governments will need to fashion national human resource development strategies that choose and strategically fund a limited number of disciplinary and research areas that directly support national economic goals. Africa's mounting crisis in academic staffing—caused by retirements, brain drain, major diseases and weak recruitment

The report posits that tertiary institutions in Africa will need to transform themselves into a different type of educational enterprise.

incentives—will have to be addressed through an aggressive expansion of national and regional postgraduate programs. Research must be resuscitated through funding incentives and partnerships with the productive sector that lay the groundwork for an eventual national innovation system. Increased autonomy is necessary to enable institutions to innovate and differentiate, while system-oversight bodies hold institutions accountable for their performance in the use of public funds, in part through quality assurance mechanisms. Pedagogical reform may be the most difficult, yet most significant, of the changes foreseen as necessary: interdisciplinary rather than disciplinary perspectives; flexibility in learning; group work instead of lectures; problem solving rather than memorization of facts; practical learning as a complement to theory; learning assessment through project work that demonstrates competence, instead of multiple choice examinations; communication skills; and computer literacy. In the medium term, alternative lower-cost educational delivery models must be devised if access is to increase. These may take the form of lifelong learn-

ing, information and communications technology applications to education, online distance education, open-source courses, self-paced learning, and educational gameware. Success in these undertakings would constitute the 21st-century version of the African “development university.” ■

The World Bank's Perspective on African Higher Education

DAMTEW TEFERRA

Damtew Teferra is director for Africa and the Middle East of the Ford International Fellowship Program. He is also director of the Boston College Center for International Higher Education's International Network for African Higher Education. E-mail: teferra@bc.edu.

Accelerating Catch-up, a 2008 third major installment by the World Bank on higher education in Africa, further liberates the continent from the yokes of the imposed, and most importantly, its own flawed intellectual discourse that gripped the system for a long time.

The report is indeed a welcome boost to several other voices that have always recognized the critical role of higher education on development but is a far cry from the World Bank's position in the past. It now declares “neglecting tertiary education could seriously jeopardize SSA's [sub-Saharan Africa's] longer-term growth prospects, and slow progress toward MDGs, [Millennium Development Goals] many of which require tertiary-level training to implement.” This is indeed a major turnaround from the time when higher education was declared a luxury the continent could ill-afford.

The report stresses that each country should map its own course, using its own national development strategy, and drawing lessons of good practice from other countries. It recognizes that the countries in Africa have achieved sufficient diversity in their higher education systems and advises that the World Bank's own analyses and recommendations should be linked to country-specific realities.

COUNTERING HOMOGENEITY: RESTRAINING EGALITARIANISM

In the last 15 years, unprecedented growth among private providers, new and upgraded public institutions, and unconventional forms of delivery have expanded the system in Africa considerably. However, with about a 5 percent enrollment rate, higher education on the continent remains elitist.

Differentiation and diversification have not kept pace with dramatic expansion of the system. Most of the for-profit private institutions have focused on limited market-oriented programs, creating homogeneity. Meanwhile, the “flagship” uni-

versities are competing for resources with the newly established and elevated public universities, as egalitarianism has become a benchmark for disbursing resources.

As access is expanding and new institutions are opening, the need to establish some hierarchy in the sector has become more imperative—allowing the building of strong research institutions to enhance socioeconomic development. Research is an expensive undertaking; thus, the economic state of African countries dictates that institutions cannot and should not be nurtured equally. Egalitarianism in establishing national knowledge systems and research is out of place. A nation must identify its “mother” institution(s) that could effectively leverage other national academic, economic, and social institutions. The report rightly underscores that public expenditure for higher education has reached a threshold at which there is a need to replace homogeneity with heterogeneity and egalitarianism with “favoritism.”

The report stresses that each country should map its own course, using its own national development strategy, and drawing lessons of good practice from other countries.

PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

Private providers—both for-profit and nonprofit—are expanding higher education access on the continent. In many countries they have eased pressure on public institutions and governments, created financial opportunity for the academic community, and developed dynamic and diversified programs. The report's recommendation that these providers receive loans and grants is thus an important intervention.

Yet, expansion did not come without a price. A large proportion of faculty at private institutions are part time, while maintaining full-time positions at public universities. This has created divided loyalty, attention, and commitment, leaving little room for research. In an already financially constrained environment, whatever research interest existed has been overtaken by the drive to generate more income externally. While the expansion of private providers is to be welcomed, it has unintended consequences on the knowledge-generating capacity of nations, which the report barely mentions.

GENERATING RESOURCES

In the last several years, resource generating efforts have increased as part of the many strategic planning initiatives executed in several institutions. The report singles out the impact of these activities in raising income for institutions and improving living and working conditions for the university community, particularly academia.

Among the institutional efforts, the most common approach allows for fee-paying and non-fee-paying students at

the same public institutions. In some cases the fee-paying students already outnumber the non-fee-paying by a substantial margin.

In a few countries, the faculty have become more engaged and focused on the fee-paying students, as faculty compensation depends on the number of these students. Despite the positive changes these resources have brought about, they have also pushed the academic community away from research, as intensive teaching consumes faculty time.

ENSURING QUALITY

Concurrent with mobilizing nonpublic resources and opening up the market to internal and external private higher education providers, a growing number of dubious institutions and fraudulent schemes have emerged. These pursuits pose a serious threat to the quality of higher education and the development of strong knowledge systems as a whole. The World Bank's ongoing efforts and its recommendation to strengthen regulatory mechanisms are laudable. However, the absence of analysis of the World Trade Organization's effects on higher education is a visible gap.

NEGLECTED HISTORY

The report states that “higher education has always been part of its [the World Bank's] agenda.” However, such a claim clearly contradicts the World Bank's long-standing, albeit recently shifted, position that hampered higher education development on the continent. In fact, the World Bank has recognized its own oversight. Numerous institutions and individuals have

Differentiation and diversification have not kept pace with dramatic expansion of the system.

been at the forefront of confronting the flawed policy since its inception. The report actually contradicts itself by stating that “many of the earlier reservations to the Bank's engagement with tertiary education in Africa faded from prominence because of achievement and change, even as compelling new justifications for tertiary education development pushed to the fore.” Other development partners are charged for following its lead—unfairly spreading the blame.

Steven Sakar, the BBC Hardtalk host, on October 22, 2008—in his opening remark on the growing financial crisis as he hosted Professor Mark Gertler, one of the leading US economists—asked whether “economists who brought us the current economic crisis can be trusted in rebuilding [the economy].” Is it unfair or irrelevant to pose the same question to the World Bank, which has a similar history?

CONCLUSION

The list of resources in the report is exhaustive, and the composition of the external advisory panel is also diverse. Yet, some

of the data in the report are out of date. For instance, the document reports 12 private colleges in Ethiopia, while that figure has grown by more than fivefold, to over 60, in recent years. If anything, this situation reflects a lack of a systematic, sustained, and visible source of information and research on higher education in the region.

The absence of major research institutions in Africa is further exhibited by the production of such major reports by an external institution such as the World Bank. With the expansion, differentiation, and complexity of higher education systems on the continent, strengthening research capacity to study the sector is paramount. It is thus urgent that institutions that promote alternatives to the World Bank's undisputed dominance in African higher education discourse be strongly nurtured. ■

India's Effort to Join 21st-Century Higher Education

PHILIP G. ALTBACH AND N. JAYARAM

Philip G. Altbach is Monan professor of higher education and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College. N. Jayaram is professor and dean, School of Social Sciences, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai, India.

India's central government will create 12 new central universities, adding to the 18 that currently exist. This is a mammoth undertaking—Rs. 3,280 crores (about \$73 million) has been allocated from the central government budget to it. Earlier in the year India announced it will create 30 “world-class” universities, 8 new Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs), and 7 Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs) in the coming five years. On the recommendation of the National Knowledge Commission, the central government is planning massive investment to upgrade and expand higher education. Other plans include enhancing the salaries of college and university academics—boosting salaries by as much as 70 percent.

This prospect represents welcome news since India currently lacks world-class universities according to the international rankings, and Indian academics, when compared internationally, are rather poorly paid. Students also suffer an immense shortage of places in India's top academic institutions and throughout the higher education system. India today educates only half as many young people from the university age group as China and ranks well behind most Latin American and other middle-income countries.

India exhibits a special problem at the top of its higher education hierarchy. With the notable exceptions of the IITs and IIMs, and a small number of outstanding nonuniversity research and training institutions—such as the All India Institute of Medical Sciences—top-notch schools are rare. Indeed, none of India's 348 universities is ranked in the top 100 in the world. Generally, when India has wanted to innovate in the higher education sector, it has sidestepped the universities and has started entirely new institutions such as the IITs.

If India invests large amounts of money and human capital into academic improvement and expansion without undertaking strategies to ensure that the investment will yield results, resources will be wasted and failure will be assured.

However, if India invests large amounts of money and human capital into academic improvement and expansion without undertaking strategies to ensure that the investment will yield results, resources will be wasted and failure will be assured. Despite a discussion of organizing some of the new university based on the American model, so far neither the ideas nor the funding seems adequate. Yet, a newspaper reported that one official said: “The view was that there should be no hierarchy or disparity in standards amongst universities, and the reforms and changes suggested for world-class universities should be applied to all universities.” This attitude shows a complete misunderstanding that the American system institutes significant hierarchy among the public universities.

Just pumping money and resources into a fundamentally broken university system is a mistake. Establishing new universities, especially those intended to be innovative, requires careful planning and an understanding of the weaknesses of the current system. Let us outline some of the problems that need fixing before resources are given.

BUREAUCRACY WITHOUT ACCOUNTABILITY

India is world famous for sclerotic bureaucracy, and higher education fits into that mold. Few decisions can be made without taking permission from an authority above, and the wheels of decision making grind slowly. Fear of corruption or of a loss of control entrenches bureaucracy. Teachers and academic leaders at colleges and universities have little incentive to innovate higher education—indeed quite the opposite. It is completely impossible to build world-class universities in this bureaucratic context. If the new institutions must tolerate responsibilities to both the central government and the states in which they are located, the bureaucratic burden will be completely overwhelming.

LOCATION

Great universities need to be located on friendly soil. In general, the best universities worldwide are in or near major urban centers or in places with intellectual traditions and strength. While it is entirely appropriate to have a good university in each of India's states, the idea of a truly world-class university (an institution that can compete with the best universities in the world) in cities like Guwahati or Bhubaneswar is simply unrealistic. It would be extraordinarily difficult to attract top professors or even the best students, and the “soft” infrastructures, such as most cultural amenities, are missing. High-tech industry is also absent in these locations and would be difficult to lure. No amount of money will guarantee the establishment of a world-class university in such places.

THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION

Indian academics deserve higher salaries, and the current move to dramatically improve remuneration is a positive step. It would be a serious mistake to simply give more money to the professoriate without at the same time demanding significant reforms in the structure and practices of the profession. Indian academics are rewarded for longevity, rather than productivity, and for conformity rather than innovation. The most productive academics cannot be rewarded for their work, and it is almost impossible to pay “market rates” to keep the best and the brightest in the universities. World-class universities require a salary structure that rewards productivity.

It would be a serious mistake to simply give more money to the professoriate without at the same time demanding significant reforms in the structure and practices of the profession.

ACADEMIC CULTURE AND GOVERNANCE

Indian universities are enmeshed in a culture of mediocrity, with little competition either among institutions or academics. Universities are subject to the whims of politicians and are unable to plan for their own futures. Academics are seldom involved in the leadership and management of the universities. Bureaucracy governs everything and holds down innovation. Without essential and deep structural change in how universities are governed and in the culture of the institutions, there is little possibility for improvement. An additional challenge is that some of the world-class universities are to be created by improving existing state universities. This will be extraordinarily difficult, since these institutions are, with very few exceptions, mired in mediocrity and bureaucracy, and hardly amenable to change and improvement, even with the carrot of additional resources.

An element of corruption exists at many levels of the higher education system, from favoritism in admissions, appoint-

ment to faculty positions, exam cheating, questionable coaching arrangements, and many others. Damaging at all levels, corruption destroys a research culture and makes a world-class university impossible.

If India is to succeed as a great technological power with a knowledge-based economy, world-class universities are required.

MERITOCRACY AT ALL LEVELS

World-class universities are deeply meritocratic institutions. They hire the best professors, admit the most intelligent students, reward the brightest academics, and make all decisions on the basis of quality. They reject—and punish—plagiarism, favoritism in appointments, or corruption of any kind. Much of Indian academe, unfortunately, does not reflect these values. Some of the problem is structural. The practice of admitting students and hiring professors on the basis of rigid quotas set for particular population groups—up to 49 percent—however well intentioned or justified, virtually precludes meritocracy. Deeply ingrained in Indian society and politics, the reservations system may well be justified—but to have successful world-class universities, meritocracy must be the primary motivating principle.

THE ROLE OF RESEARCH

World-class universities are research intensive. All highly ranked universities in the world exhibit this characteristic. India faces several problems in developing a research culture. It is fair to say that no Indian university today is, as an institution, research intensive. India's universities can claim a small number of departments that have a high level of research—and many highly accomplished professors work in the system. And some institutions, such as the IITs and some nonuniversity agencies like the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research and the All India Institute of Medical Sciences, produce impressive research and are respected internationally. The creation of a research-intensive university is mandatory to achieve world-class status.

RESOURCES

Rs. 3,280 crores for the 12 new central universities, plus the other impressive amounts announced for related projects, sounds like a lot of money. In fact, it is very inadequate. Creating a world-class research university that can play in the best international leagues is an expensive undertaking—to establish and then to sustain. As an example, one large research-intensive new Chinese university cost around \$700 million to build and has a total annual budget of close to \$400 million.

CONCLUSION

The challenges facing the creation of world-class universities are daunting. Indeed, if India is to succeed as a great technological power with a knowledge-based economy, world-class universities are required. The first step, however, is to examine the problems and create realistic solutions. Spending large sums in a scattershot manner will not work. Nor will copying the American academic model succeed. ■

Higher Education Transformation in Pakistan: Political and Economic Instability

FRED M. HAYWARD

Fred M. Hayward is an independent higher education consultant who has worked primarily on strategic planning and quality assurance in Asia, Africa, and the United States. E-mail: hayward.fred@att.net.

The news about Pakistan over the last few years has been dominated by reports of political turmoil, terrorism, religious fundamentalism, economic decline, and the Afghan War. What has been missed is the phenomenal transformation in higher education over the last six years, which represents a critical development for Pakistan and a potential engine for growth and national recovery.

Higher education in Pakistan has suffered from decades of neglect. It was among the world's laggards with only 2.6 percent of university-age students attending higher education in 2001. A mere 23 percent of university faculty had PhDs, little research took place, teaching was not emphasized, the infrastructure had deteriorated, and not a single university ranked in the top 500.

The crisis in higher education was acknowledged as early as 1947, followed by more than a dozen commissions and policy documents. In 1998 some small steps were finally taken to improve access by increasing the number of higher education institutions from 18 to 78 and encouraging private higher education. Despite agreement about the magnitude and seriousness of the problems, there was no consensus about what should be done or who should drive the changes—government or universities.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION

In 2000 President Pervez Musharraf asked the Ministry of Education to develop a plan for higher education. That was followed by a task force, a steering committee, and several other

efforts. The system was described to be in a virtual state of collapse, lacking the capacity for change. These deliberations resulted in a recommendation to create the Higher Education Commission, which was established in September 2002 as an autonomous and largely financially independent body. From the outset, the commission began a major reform effort producing the Medium Term Development Framework: 2005–10 that focused on faculty development, increased access, quality improvement, and relevance.

Since 2002 a number of extraordinary changes have taken place. Over the last six years almost 4,000 scholars have participated in PhD programs in Pakistan. More than 600 students have studied in foreign PhD programs. The Higher Education Commission instituted major upgrades for laboratories and information and communications technology, rehabilitation of facilities, expansion of research support, and development of one of the best digital libraries in the region. A quality assurance and accreditation process was also established.

The commission's goal for access was a 10 percent increase in enrollments per year. In fact, enrollments have grown 89 percent since 2001. In an effort to ensure faculty accountability and reward those who demonstrate excellence in teaching and research, a tenure-track system was introduced with salaries two to three times higher than existing civil-service levels for those who qualify.

The commission controls government funding for public higher education and some private education projects. Its successes have been remarkable as the recurrent and development budgets increased 340 percent in real terms from 2001 to 2005/06. Nonetheless, these increases basically restored university capacity lost over the years. Much of the budget growth was needed to cover the costs of increased enrollment, with expenditures per student increasing only 41 percent during that period. After 2005/06 the budget continued to increase the next year by a little more than 30 percent but remains low by international standards. The proportion of the age group attending university remains well under world standards, at 3.9 percent.

The change process was not without critics. Indeed, at the outset, many of the major institutions refused to cooperate. They argued that the commission was trampling on their autonomy, infringing on faculty authority, usurping powers delegated to the regions, and instituting changes without consultation. Indeed, the commission saw its change process as being top down by necessity, arguing that was the only viable alternative after decades of institutional failures. In addition to its academic critics, the commission's successes in obtaining funding resulted in criticism from several other ministries that did not fare as well and in jealousy about its achievements and autonomy.

By 2008, as a result of its policy and financial successes, most universities had become strong proponents of the Higher Education Commission. For the first time in decades university budgets were at reasonable levels. Quality had increased sig-

nificantly, and several institutions were on their way to becoming world-class institutions. Most universities had signed onto the tenure-track system. The first master's and PhD students were returning from their studies to good facilities and substantial research support. Many expatriate Pakistanis returned from abroad with access to competitive salaries. About 95 percent of people sent abroad for training returned, an unusually

Higher education in Pakistan has suffered from decades of neglect. It was among the world's laggards with only 2.6 percent of university-age students attending higher education in 2001.

high result for a developing country in response to improved salaries and working conditions at universities as well as bonding and strict follow-up by the commission, Fulbright, and others. Student enrollment increases brought the total enrollment of college age students to 3.9 percent—well on the way to the target of 5 percent by 2010.

Research publications more than doubled between 2004 and 2006. Especially important was the emphasis on quality in all areas including recruitment, PhD training, tenure, publications—all requiring external examiners. While the percentage of PhD faculty has slipped slightly from 29 to 22 percent, largely because rising enrollments have taken place faster than increases in PhD training with higher standards, the extensive faculty development programs of the commission will soon result in the return of sufficient numbers of PhDs to more than reverse that trend. During this time the student/faculty ratio has improved from 1:21 to 1:19, and a number of universities have focused on upgrading the quality of their teaching programs. By 2008, a broad transformation of higher education had taken place.

POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CRISES

In early 2008 the political and economic situation worsened. The Pakistan People's Party and the Muslim League coalition was shaky and the government unable to exert effective leadership because of disagreements about reinstating fired supreme court judges and dealing with President Musharraf. This led to the withdrawal of several ministers from government, including the minister of education, and their eventual withdrawal from the coalition. During this period the major crises worsened, complicated by growing insecurity. Inflation increased to 21.6 percent, the fuel import bill grew 66 percent, the cost of imported food doubled, and the trade deficit increased more than 50 percent. The election of President Asif Ali Zardari did little to reverse a growing sense of unease, frustration, and anger.

In July, the government reduced its quarterly payment to the Higher Education Commission by one-third and announced a decline in the recurring budget of 20 percent—a decrease of 13

percent from the previous year—and cut the development budget by 14 percent. These cuts would be problematic under normal circumstances. In a period of growth, when the commission has commitments to new faculty members, fellowships for more than 2,000 people working on PhD and master's degrees abroad, and the automatic effects of increased admissions, the economic crisis is potentially crippling to the transformation process.

CONCLUSION

Uncertainty about the budgetary situation, political instability, and the deteriorating security situation have created a loss of confidence in government and new questions about the future of higher education. These factors threaten to reverse the phenomenal progress in higher education, limit quality improvement, reverse the attractiveness of university positions, curtail enrollment increases, and undermine the prospects for national development. In addition, there is growing uncertainty about the future of the Higher Education Commission, including its administrative and financial autonomy. Thus, one of the few hopeful signs of progress in Pakistan appears to be in jeopardy. While there are many claimants on the national budget in this period of economic difficulty, the failure of higher education transformation would be a devastating reversal for Pakistan and make economic growth, social recovery, and political stability even more difficult than at the present time. ■

Higher Education and the Wayward Labor Market

WIETSE DE VRIES, ALBERTO CABRERA, AND SHAQUANA ANDERSON

Wietse de Vries is professor of educational management and Vicerrectoria de Docencia, Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Av. Juan de Palafox y Mendoza 219, 72000 Puebla, Puebla, Mexico. E-mail: cs000803@siu.buap.mx. Alberto F. Cabrera is professor in the Department of Education Leadership, Higher Education and International Education, University of Maryland, 2205 Benjamin Bldg., College Park, MD 20742, USA. E-mail: cabrera@umd.edu. Shaquana Anderson is a graduate assistant in the Department of Education Leadership, Higher Education and International Education, University of Maryland, 2205 Benjamin Bldg., College Park, MD 20742, USA. E-mail: sanders7@umd.edu.

Sometimes the labor market for university graduates seems unwilling to comply with predictions, most of all those launched by policymakers. In a recent alumni study by the Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, in Mexico, traditional majors were found better suited to local labor

demands than novel options. Traditional majors showed higher levels of employment and job satisfaction. Alumni from these majors also indicated higher levels of congruence between work and education.

These findings run contrary to at least two decades of public policies—not only in Mexico, but throughout Latin America. Beginning in the 1990s, policymakers and institutional managers, inspired by reports from international organizations including the World Bank and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, began diversifying major offerings based on the notion that traditional options were ill-suited for the demands of the new knowledge-based society. These policies were mostly based on predictions for future regional economies. Students were advised, encouraged, and sometimes pressed to avoid majors such as law, accountancy, administration, medicine, or civil engineering, and to opt for promising novel options like nanotechnology, tourism, environmental engineering, or design.

Sometimes the labor market for university graduates seems unwilling to comply with predictions, most of all those launched by policymakers.

However, these policies have been mostly based on assumptions on what could or should be happening in the regional economies. Alumni studies have been absent and information about labor markets is scarce. Now that these data start to be generated, the assumption about saturated majors is being increasingly questioned.

CHANGING SYSTEMS

Based on the new data, the logical conclusion indicates that course offerings should be adjusted. That trend, however, is not as simple as it looks. Two decades of policies based on the assumption of saturated majors have modified the systems of higher education throughout Latin America. In all countries, governments have created new majors or new institutions. In several cases, funding decisions have been made that foster new majors or punish universities for offering the traditional ones.

Furthermore, money has been allocated to novel programs, hiring qualified faculty, and buying equipment to create attractive options. In the Mexican case, the federal government even opted to establish completely new public sectors, such as over 80 technical universities or, recently, 10 intercultural universities. All these institutions were set up with the overt mission to offer alternatives to the saturated traditional options.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE

At the same time, the introduction of enrollment caps for tra-

ditional majors in the public universities has led to a sometimes massive flight of students to the private sector. These universities readily offer the traditional options to applicants rejected by the public sector. Several of these private institutions charge high tuition fees for the traditional majors and can do so because students, in spite of governmental warnings that a traditional major can seriously damage one's future, have voted with their feet. As a result, in Mexico, law, accountancy, and administration still constitute 30 percent of national undergraduate enrollments, just as they did 10 years ago, but over 50 percent of students majoring in these options now attend private institutions.

REASONS FOR SUCCESS

The sustainability of demand for traditional majors in the Mexican labor market can be explained by a number of reasons. First, the labor market demand for college graduates of traditional majors has remained consistent. This is perhaps due to the possibility that several new niches predicted for the future knowledge-based society never materialized. Also, majors in the sciences or the humanities prepare for teaching or research, but research remains concentrated in a few public universities with little new job positions.

Additionally, several novel options appear to be too specialized, preparing graduates for very specific positions such as ecotourism. For these positions, college graduates largely need to compete with graduates from traditional majors whose qualifications and skill base might be more easily recognized by employers. Taken in total, traditional majors in Latin America seem to offer a broader and more flexible preparation, not unlike general education in the United States.

Based on the findings from our study, it would appear that policies and changes in system design over the last two decades have been poorly informed by data on the complex relationship between higher education and the labor market. Consequently, public institutions appear to be less likely to prepare their graduates to meet the real demands of the labor market, perhaps even less so than a decade ago. As such, governmental policies have been successful in diversifying the supply side of higher education, but remarkably ineffective in changing student preferences or the labor market for graduates. Our results suggest that students might have a better feel of what the market demands than policymakers do and that the simple introduction of new majors is unlikely to change the economy.

An extensive analysis can be found in: Cabrera, A., Wietse, de Vries, and Shaquana Anderson (2008). Job Satisfaction Among Mexican Alumni: A Case of Incongruence Between Hunch-Based Policies and Labor Market Demands, *Higher Education* (<https://commerce.metapress.com/content/01181ux724u715r1/resource-secured/?target=full-text.pdf&sid=eeduhi451cihtemtlonkez45&sh=www.springerlink.com>)

The Impact of the US Financial Crisis on How Students Pay for College

ARTHUR M. HAUPTMAN

Arthur M. Hauptman is an independent public-policy consultant specializing in higher education finance issues. He is based in Arlington, Virginia. E-mail: art.hauptman@yahoo.com.

The recent failure of several major financial institutions, widespread credit squeeze, and big drop in stock prices have led to what is considered by many as the worst financial situation in the United States since the Great Depression in the 1930s. This crisis has had or will have major impacts on most sectors of the US economy—including higher education, which now accounts for roughly 3 percent of the US gross domestic product. While this article views American issues, the global impact of the financial difficulties in the United States means that many countries around the world may face similar challenges in charting the course of their economies and in financing their higher education systems.

The impact on the ability of students and their families to pay for college will likely extend, including whether many families can still use home equities to pay for college and how the downturn in the stock market affects the growing dependence on family savings for tuition and other expenses.

Most comments about the effects of this financial crisis on higher education have focused on the possible drying up of student loans. However, the impact on the ability of students and their families to pay for college will likely extend, including whether many families can still use home equities to pay for college and how the downturn in the stock market affects the growing dependence on family savings for tuition and other expenses. The financial crisis will also involve large ramifications for many aspects of institutional finance such as whether endowments and gifts continue to grow as they have in the recent past, as well as how colleges and universities price themselves.

Complicating this discussion is the lack of comprehensive or reliable data on the effects of the current financial squeeze on any of these resources for higher education. But each of these plausible effects is worth investigating and policymakers ought to consider how to deal with them.

STUDENT LOANS

Three basic kinds of student loans now exist in the United States—two of them created in federal legislation. The largest source of student borrowing in the United States is the federally guaranteed program first established in 1965. The private lenders are insured against most losses via federal and state guarantee arrangements; these loans account for more than half of all student loans in the United States, which now amount to nearly \$100 billion annually.

In the 1990s, the federal government created a direct-loan program working directly with institutions to provide loans to students. Although this federal program now represents less than one-fifth of all student borrowing, it has introduced competition into the marketplace as private lenders and servicers can no longer threaten to vacate the student-loan field if their legislative demands and needs are not met.

Private student loans will be most affected, as the credit crunch will most likely impact nonguaranteed and unsubsidized loans.

Private loans without federal involvement or guarantee have been the fastest-growing component of the student-loan market in the United States in recent years, for they have been used to make up for the difference in what colleges charge and what aid is available from various sources, including federally based loans. These private loans have mushroomed over the past decade to account for 20 percent or more of the total student borrowing.

Based on statistics provided for the 2007/08 academic year, the current financial crisis seems to have had thus far a relatively modest impact. The federal student loan volume grew by about 10 percent between 2006/07 and 2007/08. By contrast, private loans reached a plateau, and volume stayed fairly level. This status reflects the fact that most students and parents had made their borrowing arrangements for the current academic year before the worst of the crisis hit.

In the 2008/09 academic year, student borrowing will likely be affected by recent events in the financial markets. Clearly, private student loans will be most affected, as the credit crunch will most likely impact nonguaranteed and unsubsidized loans. Private nonguaranteed lending may drop by half or more over the upcoming year as previously available sources of capital will dry up and disappear. The effect of this drop-off will be most pronounced for students in higher-priced private institutions and for-profit trade schools, where in recent years a growing number of students and parents have come to rely on private loans to make up the difference in federal loan limits and the higher prices charged at these institutions. At private, nonprofit institutions, tuition and fees now average \$25,000 per year, and total costs of attendance including charges for housing and meals average nearly \$35,000. Annual costs at

for-profit trade schools—on average, \$13,000 in 2008/09—are less than at private nonprofit institutions but still twice as much as the tuition and fees charged at public four-year colleges and universities, which average \$6,600 in 2008/09.

By contrast, federally guaranteed loans and direct-loan volume have only marginally been affected by recent events. In fact, Congress this year took steps to ensure the continued availability of federal capital so that students could be assured that loans will be available next year and the following year.

HOME-EQUITY LINES OF CREDIT

With the rapid increase in tuition over the past quarter century and the even more rapid growth in housing prices over the past decade, lines of credit based on the value of a family's home equity have become an increasingly popular way for many American parents to pay for college. Under this arrange-

The next year or two will be marked by re-evaluations of how family savings will be used in the future to pay for college.

ment, parents can borrow against the portion of the value of their home that exceeds what they owe on it. Also, those using home equity lines of credit qualify to take tax deductions on the interest they pay on these lines of credit under current tax rules. Although precise data are not available, a reasonable estimate is that this form of finance provides perhaps \$10 billion dollars in loans used to help pay expenses related to higher education.

But the current financial crisis is likely to put a real squeeze on this popular source of student finances. Many banks are simply reluctant to lend in a market where the value of houses—the collateral for these loans—has dropped sharply, making this form of financing much more problematic. It is reasonable to assume that the amount available through this source to help parents pay for college also will drop sharply in coming years, at least by one-quarter and perhaps by as much as half.

DRAWING ON SAVINGS

Because of the high and growing prices for higher education in the United States, parents increasingly realize they must save while their children are young in order to pay for at least some of their college costs. This saving takes many forms including investing directly in stocks and bonds and through participation in mutual funds, retirement accounts, and pension funds. The use of savings for college in the United States has further expanded through the enactment of a series of provisions that extend tax benefits for savings allocated into designated college savings accounts. But the recent loss in stock market values of more than one-third from previous highs could have a huge negative impact on the ability of many parents to pay the high

prices of college in the United States.

As in the case of home equity lines of credit, the amount of savings used to pay for college has expanded sharply in recent decades. The next year or two will be marked by re-evaluations of how family savings will be used in the future to pay for college. A reasonable surmise is that the changing financial situation will have a greater impact on where students go to school than whether they continue their educational career at the postsecondary level. Thus, parents may be more likely to tighten their belts and ask or require their children to attend public institutions located in state where tuition and fee levels are one-fourth of what private colleges charge. Again the effect is likely to be most evident in the admissions process for the 2009/10 academic year as students and their families make plans for next year.

In sum, the financial crisis could affect the plans and decisions of hundreds of thousands if not millions of current and prospective students in the United States, regarding whether and where they enroll in postsecondary education. The institutions most likely to be affected are those in the private sector because of the higher prices they tend to charge, but enrollments in all types of institutions will be affected by recent financial events here in the United States. It would not be surprising to discover similar if perhaps milder effects in many other countries experiencing the effect of worldwide financial difficulties. ■

Arab Open and Virtual Universities

DAVID PORCARO

David Porcaro is a doctoral student in instructional technology at the University of Georgia. E-mail: dporcaro@uga.edu.

The value of open and virtual universities in the Middle East and North Africa can be measured through their recent explosive growth. In the eight years since André Elias Mazawi called for the establishment of the Arab Open University in the Winter 2000 *International Higher Education*, several Middle Eastern universities have opened their virtual doors.

REGIONAL UNIVERSITIES

The Arab Open University (www.arabou.org), a UNESCO-sponsored institution established in 2002, is the most widespread Arab-language open university. Headquartered in Kuwait, with degree-granting branches in Bahrain, Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Oman, in 2003/04 Arab Open University enrolled nearly 17,000 stu-

dents. The institution is currently accredited through the United Kingdom's Open University, from which it receives much of its English-language content, including courses in business administration, information technology, and English. The remainder of the courses are in Arabic (e.g., education). While most of the instruction is online, several courses are taught in blended environments using regional education centers. Even as the university matures slowly, its attachment to Western institutions limits its ability to provide local solutions to Middle Eastern educational problems.

While many laud the idea of a regional Arab-language online university, the realities of multinational agreement (or, better stated, disagreement) have limited the reach of regional online universities.

Collaborating with Arab North Africa is the African Virtual University (www.avu.org). While its focus is sub-Saharan Africa, students can obtain a degree in computer and information systems from Mauritania's Université de Nouakchott, with content from Canada's Université Laval and oversight from the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. The university also has proposed adding Egyptian and Libyan universities to its network of African online universities. Although the African Virtual University has failed to live up to initial expectations, recent structural changes may provide greater options for the future.

NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES

While many laud the idea of a regional Arab-language online university, the realities of multinational agreement (or, better stated, disagreement) have limited the reach of regional online universities. For many countries, national open or virtual universities, often accredited by education ministries, serve students at home and abroad. The oldest of these and in many ways a model for open education in the region, Al-Quds Open University (www.qou.edu), initiated classes in 1991, though materials were produced from its Amman, Jordan, office as early as 1985. The university was established to educate Palestinians unable to access traditional universities. It now offers courses in technology, science, business, social sciences, and education through centers in Palestine as well as in the United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia.

The Open University of Libya (www.libopenuniv-edu.org) began admitting students in 1987 and now claims 7,000 students and around 5,600 graduates. It awards undergraduate and graduate degrees in Arabic, Islamic studies, law, business, social sciences, and education from centers across the country. The university also prides itself in its Arabic-language academic press.

The Syrian Virtual University (www.svuonline.org) claims the distinction of the "very first Arab institution of its kind," after opening its virtual doors in 2002. It partnered with North American and European universities to provide content in English and Arabic for bachelor's degrees in information technology and a preparatory degree in e-business. In 2003, the school reported an enrollment of 702 students, participating in 13 telecenters across Syria, as well as accessing courses online from across the Middle East and Europe.

The Virtual University of Tunis (www.uvt.rnu.tn) was established in 2003. Currently 5,427 students are enrolled in ISET, Licence and Mastère Professionnel degrees (some in partnership with Tunisian "brick-and-mortar" universities) in information technology, business management, neural radiology, and distance education. In addition to fully or partially online degree courses, this virtual university has over 200 French, Arabic, and English courses on a variety of topics, including law, medicine, humanities, engineering and science, as well as professional certificates in a variety of subjects.

Also established in 2003, the Open University of Sudan (www.ous.edu.sd) now has 113,000 students enrolled in courses. It offers degrees in education, management, computers, language (English and Arabic), and law. Courses are taught online, via radio and television, and through 21 centers across Sudan.

The global reach of non-Arab national open universities also extends to the Arab Middle East and North Africa.

The global reach of non-Arab national open universities also extends to the Arab Middle East and North Africa. Two worth mentioning are the Indira Gandhi National Open University (www.ignou.ac.in) in India, which offers programs in Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Oman, Kuwait, and Bahrain, as well as the Open University of Israel (www-e.openu.ac.il), which provides Hebrew-language courses to Arab Israelis as well as Palestinians.

PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES AND NETWORKS

Within the Arab World, private (often unaccredited) online universities play a much smaller role than state-sponsored national, and intergovernmental-organizations-funded regional universities. Two worth mentioning are the Knowledge International University (www.kiu.com.sa), a nonprofit, Islamic university based in Saudi Arabia, and the Arab Open Academy in Denmark (www.ao-academy.org), which labels itself an Iraqi university abroad.

Additionally, several networks link international online universities. The Agence Universitaire de Francophonie (www.auf.org) has Campus Numeriques de Francophonie in Tunisia, Morocco, Algeria, Lebanon, Syria, and Egypt; and the

European Community–initiated Mediterranean Virtual University (ls-ewdssps.ces.strath.ac.uk/MVU), joins universities in Europe, Lebanon, Palestine, Egypt, and Jordan. While neither are degree-granting universities per se, students can take online courses from other member institutions.

What emerges from this survey is the blossoming of open and virtual universities in the Arab Middle East.

CONCLUSION

While this overview is in no way exhaustive, it does provide a survey of the Arab open and virtual university landscape. Though regional institutions exist, national educational and political interests have prevented the creation of a single Pan-Arab open university. Instead, national open or virtual universities have become popular over the past decade, focused on technology or business degrees, and often receiving content from European or North American partner universities. While some universities, like the Virtual University of Tunis, create their own content in several disciplines, this is an expensive prospect many universities cannot support. Furthermore, universities like Al-Quds Open University or its Syrian counterpart have extended their reach not only virtually over the Internet but through international distance education centers.

What emerges from this survey is the blossoming of open and virtual universities in the Arab Middle East. While this growth can be measured simply through examining institutions' Web sites, the actual value of these universities to students and state economies is much more difficult to gauge. Many in the Arab world are wary of distance education and distrust degrees even from state-sponsored institutions. High attrition rates as well as infrastructure and content challenges plague even the richest of Middle East and North Africa nations. All the abovementioned institutions have failed to meet their optimistic early projections. However, as these countries become more amenable to online education, and as private and international universities extend their services to Arab-speaking students, the options for virtual and open education will continue to expand. Quality will surely increase as the market matures, and as more locally produced content emerges. The market for Arab-language distance education has proven a fertile field, one that will be the battleground between national, regional, and global players well into the foreseeable future. ■

New Publications

Byram, Mike, and Fred Dervin, eds. *Students, Staff, and Academic Mobility in Higher Education*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008. 313 pp. (hb). ISBN 1-84718-603-3. Web site: www.c-s-p.org.

A wide-ranging discussion of student mobility, focusing on Europe and Australia, this book considers the impacts of academic mobility on students. Chapters focus on such themes as study abroad and employment prospects, the impact on students in specific academic fields, adjustment issues of students in different national contexts, and student motivations for study abroad. The evaluation of the Erasmus program is featured. Cases from eastern Europe, Italy, Australia, Israel, and Scandinavia are included.

Center for the Studies of Higher Education, Nagoya University. *Researching Japanese Higher Education, 1998–2008*. Nagoya, Japan:

DAITEC Co., 2008. 188 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-86293-025-5. Address: DAITEC, 4-85 Chikara, Higashi-ku, Nagoya 461, Japan.

Focusing on the research agenda of the Nagoya University higher education center, this volume features essays on higher education improvement programs at Nagoya University, one of Japan's premier national institutions, in areas such as faculty development, student learning, and recommendations for student development.

Clark, Burton, R. *On Higher Education: Selected Writings, 1956–2006*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008. 575 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-80801-890215. Web site: www.press.jhu.edu.

Sociologist Burton Clark is one of the pioneers of the study of higher education in the United States. Later in his career, he also contributed to comparative higher education, particularly analyzing trends in Europe and North America. This book is a comprehensive overview of Clark's work over a half cen-

tury. His earlier US-focused research deals with student culture, the community college, organizational issues in higher education, the academic profession, and other topics. Many of these essays are classics. The second half of the volume is devoted to cross-national analysis.

Chism, Nancy Van Note, ed. *Faculty at the Margins*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2008. 120 pp. (pb). ISSN 0271-0560. No web site listed.

The American academic profession is becoming more "marginalized"—with the increased proportion of part-time and non-tenure-track faculty members. This book discusses the situation of these academics. Among the themes discussed are female faculty, governance and non-tenure-track appointments, employment issues in community colleges, preparing new faculty for teaching, and others. This book is part of the Jossey-Bass New Directions in Higher Education series.

Frontier of Private Higher Education Research in East Asia. Tokyo: Research Institute for Independent Higher Education, n.d. 161 pp. (pb). ISBN 4-902981-11-4. Web site: www.shidaikyo.or.jp/riihe.

The report of a seminar on East Asian private higher education held in 2006, this volume examines Asian private higher education trends. East Asia has a long tradition of private higher education and a majority of students are enrolled in private universities in many East Asian countries. Case studies of Japan, China, and India are provided as well as broader comparative perspectives.

Gornitzka, Ase, and Liv Langfeldt, eds. *Borderless Knowledge: Understanding the "New" Internationalization of Research and Higher Education in Norway*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2008. 193 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-1-4020-6282-5. Web site: www.springer.com.

Using the case of Norway, this book discusses the various aspects of higher education internationalization and how it affects Norway. Among the themes discussed are career impacts of student mobility, Nordic higher education cooperation, internationalization and industrial R&D, and others.

Internationalisation of European Higher Education: An EU/ACA Handbook. Stuttgart, Germany: Raabe Verlag, 2008. 420 pp. (loose leaf format with CD included). 129 Euros. (E-mail: Dr.M. Verweyst: internationalization@raabe.de)

This innovative book project, developed by the European University Association and the Academic Cooperation Association, provides practical information concerning internationalization strategies and developments in Europe. Among the issues included are institutional internationalization policies, partnerships and alliances among universities, marketing of international programs, future strategies, and others. This publication plans to issue updates every four months.

Kehm, Barbara M., ed. *Hochschule im Wandel: Die Universität als Forschungsgegenstand* [Higher Education in Change: The University as a Research Subject]. Frankfurt/aM, Germany: Campus Verlag, 2008. 490 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-3-593-38746-8. Web site: www.cam.ac.uk. This volume is a Festschrift in honor of Ulrich Teichler, one of Europe's most prominent higher education scholars. It features essays on themes that have been prominent

in Teichler's own research. These include higher education and employment, internationalization, and structural change and reorganization. The essays are a mix of German and English, and the authors are among Europe's most prominent higher education researchers.

Newfield, Christopher. *Unmaking the Public University: The Forty-Year Assault on the Middle Class*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008. 395 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-0-674-02817-3. Web site: www.hup.harvard.edu.

The author argues that conservative forces in the United States have gravely damaged the public universities and that these universities have provided both social mobility and high quality. Trends such as commercialization, marketization, and in general the withdrawal of public support for higher education are strongly criticized. The American public university and its social mission deserve support.

Tierney, William G. *The Impact of Culture on Organizational Decision Making: Theory and Practice in Higher Education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2008. 188 pp. \$29.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-57922-287-1. Web site: www.Styluspub.com.

Understanding organizational culture is a key to implementing change and reform in higher education. This volume discusses the nature of organizational culture and how to study it. Among the specific themes analyzed are the role of shared governance, academic work and institutional culture, communication issues, student participation, and others.

AACRAO Publications

Freeman, Kathleen Trayte, and Linda Jahn. *The Education System of France*. Washington, DC: AACRAO, 2008. 99 pp (pb). \$95, nonmembers; \$70, members. ISBN 1-57858-079-x Web site: www.aacrao.org/publications/.

Foley, Chris J, ed. *The Education System of the Russian Federation*. Washington, DC: AACRAO, 2008. 68 pp (pb). \$70, nonmembers; \$50, members ISBN 978-1-57858-083-5. Web site: www.aacrao.org/publications/.

Ezell, Allen. *Counterfeit Diplomas and Transcripts*. Washington, DC: AACRAO, 2008. 156 pp (pb). \$80, nonmembers; \$60, members ISBN 978-1-5785808-4-2. Web site: www.aacrao.org/publications/.

The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) has released three new volumes

in its series of books developed primarily as references for practitioners in international higher education. *The Education System of France and The Education System of the Russian Federation* are helpful references to anyone trying to evaluate the admissions qualifications and/or appropriate placement of students from these two countries. The books in this series are also extremely useful to anyone trying to evaluate the academic and professional qualifications of someone educated in a foreign system for employment purposes. The books provide a brief overview of each education system with some historical background but devote the majority of text to a systematic summary of the organization of each level of education with an emphasis on postsecondary study (including professional and graduate education). The detail provides the reader with the information necessary to understand the level and significance of each credential or degree awarded.

The third volume, *Counterfeit Diplomas and Transcripts*, is an important addition to the series and will be of interest to a larger audience. This book clarifies what constitutes counterfeit documents and offers the reader a rather stunning summary of the extent of fraud related to academic credentials and resumes. It also addresses how the Internet has facilitated the sale and circulation of fake documents. Chapters address the extent to which national and international law can (and cannot) combat fraud, recommendations for detecting and documenting fake documents, as well as recommendations for campus policy.

Liz Reisberg, Center for International
Higher Education

News of the Center

Philip G. Altbach, Monan Professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education, was given the Howard Bowen Distinguished Career Award by the Association for the Study of Higher Education at its annual conference in Jacksonville, Florida on November 5, 2008. The Bowen Award is presented to an individual whose professional life has been devoted in substantial part to the study of higher education and whose career has advanced the field through scholarship, leadership, and service. ASHE is the main scholarly organization that focuses on higher education research in the United States.

The Center's collaboration with Shanghai Jiao Tong University for publishing *International Higher Education* in a Chinese-language edition has been launched at a ceremony in Shanghai attended by CIHE director Philip Altbach. A meeting of the international advisory committee of the Graduate School of Education at SJTU also took place with Philip Altbach, Jamil Salmi of the World Bank, and Marijk van der Wende of the Free University of Amsterdam participating along with SJTU faculty. While in China, Altbach also participated in an internation-

al conference on higher education reforms and gave the Daixa Lecture at the East China Normal University and spoke at Fudan University.

The Center is working with UNESCO on writing a trend report on higher education developments over the past decade for the July 2009 UNESCO World Higher Education conference. Liz Reisberg and Laura Rumbley, along with Philip Altbach, are coordinating this work. Liz Reisberg, CIHE research associate, recently participated in a conference on the internationalization of Argentina's higher education in Buenos Aires. Laura Rumbley, CIHE research associate, participated in a meeting of the Coimbra Group on collaboration between European and North American universities in Graz, Austria.

The CIHE's long-awaited study on academic salaries in 15 countries, *International Comparison of Academic Salaries: An Exploratory Study*, has been released. Coordinated by Laura Rumbley and CIHE research assistant Ivan Pacheco, the report is available on the CIHE's Web site.

Your Subscriber Profile

Please visit the CIHE Web site to complete your subscriber profile (especially your e-mail and subscription preferences!).

Consider signing up as an "expert" in your field to be included in our new online Experts Database. The database will allow students and colleagues to locate scholars worldwide by their area(s) of research.

The form is available at: http://www.bc.edu/cihe_subscription.

THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION (CIHE)

The Boston College Center for International Higher Education brings an international consciousness to the analysis of higher education. We believe that an international perspective will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. To serve this goal, the Center publishes the *International Higher Education* quarterly newsletter, a book series, and other publications; sponsors conferences; and welcomes visiting scholars. We have a special concern for academic institutions in the Jesuit tradition worldwide and, more broadly, with Catholic universities.

The Center promotes dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions throughout the world. We believe that the future depends on effective collaboration and the creation of an international community focused on the improvement of higher education in the public interest.

CIHE WEB SITE

The different sections of the Center Web site support the work of scholars and professionals in international higher education, with links to key resources in the field. All issues of *International Higher Education* are available online, with a searchable archive. In addition, the International Higher Education Clearinghouse (IHEC) is a source of articles,

reports, trends, databases, online newsletters, announcements of upcoming international conferences, links to professional associations, and resources on developments in the Bologna Process and the GATS. The Higher Education Corruption Monitor provides information from sources around the world, including a selection of news articles, a bibliography, and links to other agencies. The International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA), is an information clearinghouse on research, development, and advocacy activities related to postsecondary education in Africa.

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

The Center is closely related to the graduate program in higher education at Boston College. The program offers master's and doctoral degrees that feature a social science-based approach to the study of higher education. The Administrative Fellows initiative provides financial assistance as well as work experience in a variety of administrative settings. Specializations are offered in higher education administration, student affairs and development, and international education. For additional information, please contact Dr. Karen Arnold (arnoldk@bc.edu) or visit our Web site: <http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/>.

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

**Center for International Higher Education
Boston College
Campion Hall
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467
USA**

EDITOR

Philip G. Altbach

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Salina Kopellas

EDITORIAL OFFICE

Center for International
Higher Education
Campion Hall
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467
USA

Tel: (617) 552-4236

Fax: (617) 552-8422

E-Mail: highered@bc.edu

<http://www.bc.edu/cihe>

We welcome correspondence, ideas for articles, and reports. If you would like to subscribe, please send an e-mail to: highered@bc.edu, including your institutional affiliation, your position (graduate student, professor, administrator, researcher, policy maker, etc.), and area of interest or expertise. There is no charge for a subscription.

ISSN: 1084-0613