

*International Higher Education* is the quarterly publication of the Center for International Higher Education.

The journal is a reflection of the Center's mission to encourage an international perspective that will contribute to enlightened policy and practice. Through *International Higher Education*, a network of distinguished international scholars offers commentary and current information on key issues that shape higher education worldwide. *IHE* is published in English, Chinese, Russian, Portuguese, and Spanish. Links to all editions can be found at [www.bc.edu/](http://www.bc.edu/)

## International Issues

- 2 Does Higher Education Equalize Income Distribution?  
**Martin Carnoy**
- 3 Branding Universities: Trends and Strategies  
**Gili S. Drori**
- 5 Religion and Higher Education Achievement in Europe  
**Gaële Goastellec**
- 6 Imagining the University  
**Ronald Barnett**

## For-Profit Higher Education

- 8 The For-Profit Motive  
**Andrés Bernasconi**
- 10 Squeezing the Nonprofit Sector  
**Daniel C. Levy**
- 12 The Quality-Profit Assumption  
**Kevin Kinser**

## Internationalization Themes

- 13 International Student Mobility in the United States  
**Christine A. Farrugia and Ashley Villarreal**
- 15 China's Confucius Institutes—More Academic and Integrative  
**Qiang Zha**
- 17 Finally, an Internationalization Policy for Canada  
**Roopa Desai Trilokekar and Glen A. Jones**
- 19 Branch Campuses Weigh Start-up Options  
**David A. Stanfield**

## Latin American Perspectives

- 20 New Dynamics in Latin America  
**José Joaquín Brunner**
- 23 Argentine Public Universities: Inefficient and Ineffective?  
**Marcelo Rabossi**
- 24 Central America: The Value of International Academic Cooperation  
**Nanette Svenson**
- 26 Mexico: Enrollment Competition, Accreditation, and the Public-Private Market  
**Juan Carlos Silas Casillas**

## Departments

- 28 New Publications
- 31 News of the Center

# Does Higher Education Expansion Equalize Income Distribution?

MARTIN CARNOY

*Martin Carnoy is Vida Jack Professor of Education, at Stanford University, Graduate School of Education, Stanford, CA. E-mail: carnoy@stanford.edu. This article is based on University Expansion in a Changing Global Economy: Triumph of the BRICs?, to be published by Stanford University Press in June 2013.*

A widely held belief about the benefits of expanding access to education is that greater access extends social mobility and income equality. In the case of higher education, as enrollments expand, bright youth from lower-income families are more likely to enter and complete universities. In theory, this should increase the chances of such individuals to move upward economically, by making them more able to compete for higher-paying jobs associated with a higher degree. Further, with rapid increases in the number of higher education graduates, their relative earnings may fall, eventually making overall income distribution more equal.

This belief runs up against a contrary reality. In many countries where the number of secondary and higher education graduates is expanding at high rates, income distribution is becoming more *unequal* and, in some cases, social mobility is at a standstill.

Recent research, by a group of international scholars, studied this phenomenon empirically, trying to understand whether educational expansion creates greater income equality. This research focused on Brazil, Russia, India, and China, known as the BRIC countries. The BRICs have 40 percent of the world's population and, in the past 15 years, have managed an enormous leap in their higher education enrollment.

## MODELING EARNINGS VARIATION

Traditionally, economists have modeled earnings variation as a function of the level of schooling in the labor force, the dispersion (variance) in the number of years of schooling in the labor force, the economic payoff to a year of schooling (the rate of return to schooling), and the dispersion of rates of return to different levels of schooling. Economists have usually assumed that as levels of education in the workforce increase to fairly high levels, the payoff to schooling falls, and the dispersion in years of schooling also declines. This is quite logical, given economic theories about competitive labor markets and the fact that schooling seems to ex-

pand much more rapidly than employer demand for more schooled labor.

On the other hand, it has been observed that even as school systems expand, including the rapid expansion of university graduates for the labor force, the payoff for these graduates does not fall, and even tends to increase relative to the payoffs for secondary school graduates.

Why does this happen? There are many possible explanations. One is that higher educated labor can be substituted for lower educated labor. Thus, this tends to drive down the wages of the less educated. Even if the wages of the higher educated stay fairly constant—as they did, for example, in the United States in the 1980s—the wages of secondary school graduates tend to fall, as that market becomes increasingly “crowded” with the less educated. A second possible explanation regards the expanding knowledge intensity of production and services, the demand for higher educated workers grows faster than the higher education system expands. A third possible explanation is that countries pursue fiscal policies that favor higher-income individuals, antiunion policies that put pressure on the earnings of lower-educated workers. Such policies would have increased income inequality

---

**In many countries where the number of secondary and higher education graduates is expanding at high rates, income distribution is becoming more *unequal*.**

---

## OUR RESEARCH FINDINGS

Whatever the explanation, even as higher education expanded apace in the four studied countries, it appears that the payoff for university graduates tended to increase (not decline) in the past decade, and it tended to expand, relative to the payoff for secondary education. This also raised the dispersion in rates of return among levels of education. Together, these “payoff effects” contributed to the rising *inequality* of earnings and tended to offset whatever equalizing effect the higher level of education and the declining variance of years of schooling in the labor force.

Thus, these results for the BRICs show that in the past decade, higher education expansion and the associated change in the rates of return to education seemed to maintain or broaden income *inequality*. In Brazil, two opposite forces in education affected income distribution: the increase in the variance of the rate of return to education times the rising average level of education contributed to increased income inequality. However, countering that

tendency, the falling average payoff to education in Brazil, combined with the increased variance in years of education in the labor force, helped decrease income inequality. In China, the rate of return to education and the growth of the years of education in the labor force especially contributed to higher income inequality. In India, inequality probably rose, due to factors outside the rapid rise of education levels in the labor force. Finally, in Russia, it appears that education expansion contributed in a small way to higher income inequality, despite small changes in the rates of return to education. In Russia, as in India, the main change in income inequality probably was due to other unobserved factors.

Two other factors may be contributing to the rising income inequality in China, Russia, and India or, as in Brazil, to keeping income inequality steadier than it might have been otherwise—in the face of more general income redistribution policies. The first of these factors is the increased differentiation of spending on elite and mass higher education institutions in Brazil, China, and Russia (not evidenced in India). Over the past 5–10 years, spending has increased per pupil in elite institutions, whereas mass institution may even face decreased spending per pupil. Since higher social class students more likely dominate elite institutions, they disproportionately benefit from this differentiation.

---

**Economists have usually assumed that as levels of education in the workforce increase to fairly high levels, the payoff to schooling falls, and the dispersion in years of schooling also declines.**

---

The second factor is the distribution of overall public spending on higher education. This public spending—even in a country such as Brazil, where 75 percent of students attend private universities not subsidized by the government—is skewed heavily toward students coming from the highest 20 percent of income families. Higher-income students in Brazil, China, India, and even Russia, approaching almost universal attendance in postsecondary education, are the ones heavily subsidized by the state.

The enormous expansion of higher education in the BRICs has, therefore, not been effective in equalizing income distribution. The implication of these results is that, without powerful fiscal and social spending policies aimed directly at reducing income inequality, it will remain high and may even continue to rise. ■

## Branding of Universities: Trends and Strategies

GILI S. DRORI

*Gili S. Drori is associate professor of sociology and anthropology, at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel. E-mail: gili.drori@mail.huji.ac.il.*

A sense of fierce, global competition over resources, students, and faculty is driving universities worldwide to launch strategic exercises and branding initiatives. Universities, like corporations, articulate their vision and mission statements for brand differentiation and marketing campaigns. One result is that, with the guidance of marketing and branding consultants, universities across the world have been replacing their traditional seals and emblems with stylized, eye-catching logos. This act wholly symbolizes the transformation of universities from professional (and often public) institutions of research and learning into market players.

---

**Austere and minimally ornate, the restyled logos are characteristic of either new universities or those that underwent a strategic planning campaign.**

---

### BRANDING TRENDS

Brands are artifacts that uniquely identify the organization; they are taken to convey the personality of the particular university. In the bewildering global economy, where products barrage consumers with calls for attention, branding is considered an imperative for marketing success. This logic penetrated the global field of universities: while universities have always proudly rallied behind their seal and regarded them as symbols of the university's community, academic branding is linked with a marketing strategy aimed at differentiating the university from the (presumably) competing 14,000 universities in the world.

Three trends of branding are identified in universities. First, in the past two decades many universities have restyled their insignia, or representative symbol: the traditional emblem, which is loaded with signals of the profession, is restyled into a logo, which can be easily mistaken for a commercial brand. Noticeably, this is a change to the aesthetics of the university's insignia: from a symbol that is

loaded with figurative images (a book, a source of light such as a torch signifying the Enlightenment, or national icons) and invariably also meaningful texts (the name of the university and its year of founding, for example) to a “swoosh” image, which is only vaguely, if at all, reminiscent of the university’s history (its founding fathers), mission (lab tools or open books), or character (natural environment, campus life, sports, and alike). Austere and minimally ornate, the restyled logos are characteristic of either new universities or those that underwent a strategic planning campaign. Therefore, the adoption of logo style signals that the currently legitimate form of visual representation for universities resembles that of corporations: an instantly recognizable and marketable image of a distinct organization.

The second trend is for universities to add to, rather than replace their traditional emblem. In this trend, these new icons serve different purposes: university seals, for example, are still commonly used for official university documents such as diplomas. Logos, in contrast, would be reserved for banners, and digital markers on Web pages and word marks (a simplified image of the traditional emblem along with the university name) are used for stationary and business cards. This is a visual expression of identity differentiation, by audience and function; for example, universities rely almost exclusively on their logos in order to appeal to the young audience of prospective students, while reserving their traditional emblems for formal events such as graduation ceremonies.

The third and last trend is for universities to establish proprietary claims to their icons and tag lines by protecting these as intellectual property—to register these as trademark or service mark. Once registered as such, university insignia become sources of revenue through merchandising, where the university licenses the use of its icon to manufacturers who then produce and sell the well-known university sweatshirts and T-shirts. This act of proprietary protection of insignia is based on value propositions: university icons are no longer mere identity markers of the university as an academic community, but rather they have become commodities that leverage the university’s reputation.

#### STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

Now that branding is regarded as imperative and universities launch branding campaigns, it turns to professionals for guidance. Indeed, university branding becomes a subspecialty of branding and marketing consultancy: consultancy firms offer specialized branding and marketing services to universities, and branding associations establish chapters in university campuses. Such professionalization also drives managerial changes in universities, often with the creation of an administrative unit charged with brand

management or with changing the orientation of the university spokesperson away from mere posting of information about university activities and toward proactive marketing of the university to prospective students and their parents, donors, and partnering firms.

Once a branding campaign concludes with a newly stylized icon or set of icons, operational adjustments in universities follow. Most often, universities formalize their brand guidelines into regulations: many universities produce “brand books” to specify the logo’s color and size, describe the various icons and their functional roles, and explicate the laws regarding brand use. Also, any deviation from, or infringement of, these specifications are subject to penalty. Universities file lawsuits on other institutions that trespass upon the logo’s proprietary claim, and some universities also penalize academic departments within the university that do not follow the guidelines. These administrative steps are formally explained as matter of building a university-wide identity, but such explanations are also heavily infused with managerial arguments about administrative cohesion among organizational subunits.

---

**The second trend is for universities to add to, rather than replace their traditional emblem.**

---

#### CULTURAL MEANING

Branding is more than mere fashion, where universities learn marketing practices from firms and other successful universities; rather, branding is a meaningful change in the identity of the university. University logos convey little of academia as a profession, a national institution, or a knowledge organization; and furthermore, logos convey little of the university’s legacy or location. The act of taking on a logo-style icon is therefore an act of metamorphosis: shedding the signals that convey the meaning of academe as a guild-like professional institution and taking on signals that convey the commercial recognition of a brand and its value. Indeed, branding is an offshoot of the entrepreneurial university and related processes of commodification and marketization: initially the entrepreneurial, socially engaged university was marketing its research through patenting, while today the university also markets its reputation through its brand.

Branding lends new meanings to long-standing academic categories. Branding brings market logic and managerialism to the university and heightens the sense of academic competition. In this way, the university was

transformed into a “promotional university.” And promotion and marketing change the tone, if not the core, of academic work: from a branding perspective, excellence is a differentiation strategy rather than solely a professional duty. Emphasis on promotion is also accompanied by a redefinition of what a university does; such emphasis subjects knowledge creation, teaching, and study to the logics of marketing and service. Specifically, since brand reputation is built upon customer service and product benefits, universities become particularly attune to student evaluations of teaching and postgraduation salary benefits, and, as a consequence, curricular decisions (such as the decision to offer a particular course or to open a new academic program) are made in response to student satisfaction. For example, a course may be offered because of its popularity among students and high registration, rather than because of its place in the overall path of professional development and knowledge acquisition. Last, branding redefines the academic profession: by allowing consultants to guide strategy, faculty members delegate the responsibility of steering the university to “outsiders” and surrender the sense of academic community and autonomy to professional managers. In this way, the university is transformed from a guild-like institution into a modern organization. These, combined, signal the coming of “brand society” onto academe and onto its prime institution, namely the university. ■

## Religion and Higher Education Achievement in Europe

GAËLE GOASTELLEC

*Gaële Goastellec is assistant professor at the University of Lausanne, Switzerland. E-mail: Gaele.Goastellec@unil.ch.*

**A**lthough religion has historically been a structuring dimension of higher education systems in Europe, little research interrogates the contemporary link between religion and higher education. Such an analysis would be of interest, at two levels. First, it is about understanding the role played by higher education in a given society. Are there some specific religious contexts, in which higher education appears more or less developed, and what do we learn from these contexts’ comparison? Second, it is about taking religious backgrounds or belongings into account, in the reading of inequalities of access to higher education. Historical-

ly, some groups have been refrained from accessing higher education, and European societies are, today, still more or less organized along religious lines. This calls for the consideration of religion as a potential indicator of inequalities, along with an ethnic and socioeconomic background.

To understand these issues, data are used from the European Social Survey. From the five waves of this survey (2001–2010), we obtained a sample of 181,492 individuals born between 1939 and 1979, from 30 European countries. We then built an original research design to compare tertiary-degree holders to the rest of the population, looking at their religious background.

---

**In Europe, the most secular societies tend to be those with a higher level of education.**

---

### RELIGION, EDUCATION, AND SOCIETY

The first striking result consists in a global trend: In Europe, the most secular societies tend to be those with a higher level of education. Comparing the two groups of societies—the most secular ones with a higher level of tertiary education and the most religious ones with a lower level of tertiary education—another trend appears: Countries of a Protestant tradition are more likely to have a high level of tertiary education, compared with countries of Catholic tradition. How can one explain these trends? Some research shows that Protestantism has not only generated a high level of economic prosperity, as Max Weber identified, but also a high level of literacy and more education necessary for reading the Bible. Indeed, based on the history of Protestantism and Catholicism, one finds a major difference regarding these religions’ role in society: In Protestantism, the individual relationship to knowledge is straight, the Bible has early been translated into German (by opposition with the long-lasting domination of Latin in Catholicism), and the development of schooling was supported during the Reformation. So, today’s differences of higher education system development can be interpreted, at least partly, as the consequence of historical choices; in this case, the choice of a common language of religious instruction, which came with a less hierarchical structure of Protestantism, compared with Catholicism. This is coherent with the fact that, in 1900, countries with a majority of Protestants had nearly reached a universal level of literacy, which was not the case of any Catholic countries.



This shows how a choice made by the religious institution at some point of history can have long-lasting effects on the development of education. It also calls for the development of a societal and historical approach, to explore the complex link between higher education and religion.

#### RELIGION, EDUCATION, AND INDIVIDUALS

The second important results concern the weight of religious background on the individual probability to access tertiary degrees, everything else being equal. To address this issue, the impact of the religious background has been investigated on access to higher education—for each country—controlling for age, gender, the parental level of education, parental profession, parental and respondent's country of birth, citizenship, sense of belonging to an ethnic minority, or a discriminated group as well as language spoken at home. Is there a residual impact of religion, once these variables are controlled for?

---

**It appears that individuals without any religious belonging are often more likely to hold a tertiary degree, in countries where a majority of respondents declare a religious belonging.**

---

First, it appears that individuals without any religious belonging are often more likely to hold a tertiary degree, in countries where a majority of respondents declare a religious belonging. For example, in Portugal, Spain, Poland, Austria, and Slovakia—countries where the majority of the population is Catholic—the respondents who declare themselves “without religion” are more likely to hold a tertiary degree than those who declare a religion. It is also the case in Greece and Russia, two countries with a majority of the population being of Orthodox faith.

Second, in countries where most respondents declare no religious belonging, respondents who affirm a religious belonging, tend to have more probability to hold a tertiary degree. This is, for example, the case for Catholics in the United Kingdom, Sweden, or Belgium and for Protestants in the United Kingdom, Sweden, and Latvia.

Third, if based on the access to tertiary education of different religious minority groups by comparison with the largest groups, Muslims appear less likely to hold a tertiary degree in at least five countries (Austria, Belgium, Germany, Greece, and Switzerland) and Orthodox in one

(Switzerland). Furthermore, regarding different age groups of national populations, changes are observed in the representation of various religious communities holding tertiary degrees. This means that the impact of religious belongings changes overtime.

#### RELIGION AS AN INDICATOR

So why dig in the burning societal issue of religion, when questioning access to higher education? The trends previously underlined are obviously hard to explain, as they are the product of complex and obscure processes. Still, digging further seems worthwhile for at least three reasons. At a theoretical level, interrogating the multicausality of the relation between religion and higher education should help understanding the dynamics at play between higher education and society. At a more pragmatical level, this examination offers an opportunity to analyze how societal dynamics are intertwined with individual ones in education trajectories. What is the role of higher education in the building up of nation states integrating diverse religious communities? Finally, it also underlines the interest of not limiting an analysis of inequalities in education to the classical socioeconomic and ethnic background but of enlarging it to the different belongings individuals express as part of their world.

---

## Imagining the University

RONALD BARNETT

*Ronald Barnett is emeritus professor of higher education, at the Institute of Education, University of London. His latest book is *Imagining the University* (Routledge, 2013). E-mail: R.Barnett@ioe.ac.uk.*

The pages of *International Higher Education* are witness to continuous changes in universities across the world. These capacities easily identify with changes and hold conversations about them even across quite different settings—so that a worldwide conversation is taking place here.

These reflections open up some major issues. That conversations can be conducted cross-nationally is indicative of the changes underway being global in nature. These changes have been identified over the past 30 years, including attached terms such as the emergence of a global knowledge economy and marketization and neoliberalism. More recently, terms such as cognitive capitalism and knowledge capitalism have been offered. Connected, too, are develop-

ments in computing technologies that are making possible public, interactive, and multimodal engagements with knowledge.

Partly as a result of such global forces, one witnesses the rise of the entrepreneurial university. This university has come to understand to be in command of services and products—intimately connected with the formation and transmission of knowledge—that have exchanged value in the market. From being a small institution on the fringe of society, the university has become a major institution centrally involved in the formation of a cognitively based world.

---

**Partly as a result of such global forces,  
one witnesses the rise of the entrepreneurial university.**

---

#### RESPONSES

There have been several reactions to these phenomena. First, responders are those who write up the very idea of the entrepreneurial university. They are a composite of those in the political sphere; the senior levels of the management and leadership of universities; state agencies; independent consultants; and think tanks. Second, the academic critics espouse a language, in a critical vein, of neoliberalism, performativity, academic capitalism, and commodification. Third, a group of critics critique the university for being laggardly in taking on the challenges of the age. Such critics point to the opportunities for the emergence of the edgeless university, the borderless university, and the collaborative university. In this conception, the university is always behind the game, and rather slow to embrace opportunities.

Last, there are the philosophers and social theorists: in expounding their views of the university, they tend to operate at a rather abstract level. In critiquing the university, they desist from offering specific proposals but rather focus on the communicative conditions that need to be satisfied by any university worthy of the name. Such an institution could be exemplified in a university of dissensus, or an ideal speech situation, or (even more vaguely) a university without condition.

#### FORMS OF IMAGINATION

It would be tempting to characterize this whole debate as one lacking in imagination, but that would be unfair. On

the contrary, as is evident in our observations, there are several forms of imagining of the university, and these forms of imagination are amplified in the (sometimes obscure) academic literature.

Forms of the imagination fall along certain fault lines. Those in favor of the entrepreneurial university are full of breezy optimism, while those evincing the standard academic critiques are characterized by a dismal pessimism (to the effect that the world of higher education apparently can be no other than its current state). Some imaginations work on the surface level (speaking uncritically of quality, excellence, and technology), while others attempt to dig down to the deep underlying global structures affecting the university. Also, as stated, some forms of imagination implicitly endorse the way matters are running for the university, while others seek to critique it.

#### POVERTY OF IMAGINATION

It turns out, then, that far from being a dearth of the imagination, over recent years, there has been a veritable flow, if not tsunami of ideas. There are, though, two critical points to be made.

First, as implied, few ideas of the university are emerging out of the academic literature into the public debate. Thus, one reason is that the majority of those ideas do not fit with the mood of our time. That mood is one of value for money from public services, the customer pays, and the

---

**As is evident in our observations, there  
are several forms of imagining of the  
university, and these forms of imagination  
are amplified in the (sometimes ob-  
scure) academic literature.**

---

belief that a test of the value of an enterprise is the presence of purchasers for it. There has emerged, therefore, a discursive regime in which the idea of the entrepreneurial university sits very nicely. It is hardly surprising if it seems to be the only game in the university town.

But another reason is helping to explain the dearth of ideas in the public domain: perhaps those ideas in the academic literature do not deserve to enjoy wide circulation. After all, an imaginative idea of the university is not necessarily a good idea. Perhaps more than an increase in the ideas of the university, therefore, better ideas are needed.

Second, despite the fecundity of ideas, one can still speak of a poverty of the imagination in this sense. By and large, ideas are required of the university that are at once critical in tone, positive in spirit, and with an awareness of the deep and global structures that undergird universities. Much of the academic literature is, as stated, unduly pessimistic: can we therefore be at once realistic about the situation in which the university finds itself worldwide and yet be optimistic, coming forth with imaginative ideas about the university that just might be brought off, even if the cards are stacked against the university? What are needed, surely, are not merely utopias of the university but feasible utopias.

#### FEASIBLE UTOPIA?

Here is a contender for being one such feasible utopia, namely that of the ecological university. The ecological university would be seized of its being intertwined—at very deep levels of its being—with the global knowledge economy and with forces for marketization and competition. But it would look for spaces in which it could live out the values and ideas deeply embedded in the university—of truthfulness, inquiry, critical dialogue, rational dispute, and even iconoclastic endeavor. The ecological university would also be sensitive to its engaging with different ecologies, such as those of knowledge, culture, institutions, and the economy; and it would be sensitive to these ecologies working at all levels from that of the individual person through communities and societies to the world itself. Further, while the idea of ecology is characteristically associated with that of sustainability, the ecological university would not be satisfied with that idea (with merely sustaining students, or society, or even the world) but would look to promote well-being at every level.

#### CONCLUSION

The main point of this article is to urge for more imagination in thinking about the university; imagination that even offers feasible utopias. The suggestion here of an ecological university is but one offering in that vein. However, a university that wanted to see itself as an ecological university would become an imagining university. For the task of becoming an ecological university requires collective imagining. The art of university leadership, accordingly, becomes here in part one of encouraging and orchestrating collective imagining, so that a university realizes its possibilities at every level and in all of its activities. This, in turn, calls for nothing less than that a new kind of spaciousness should open in our universities, a spaciousness of air, no less. ■

The regular PROPHE (Program for Research on Private Higher Education) contribution to the *IHE* comes this time as a *Special Section on For-Profit Higher Education*.

Often the subject of polemics, for-profit higher education is growing globally. The following three articles reflect on the nature of the sectors and its relationship to the non-profit and public sectors. What is for-profit higher education and what is distinctive about its pursuit of profit? What is the sector's interface with nonprofit and public higher education? Much of what for-profits do, the other two sectors do. Like it or not, for-profit higher education cannot be dismissed as simply aberrant or peripheral.

Daniel C. Levy

## The Profit Motive in Higher Education

ANDRÉS BERNASCONI

*Andrés Bernasconi is professor of higher education at the School of Education of the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. E-mail: abernasconi@uc.cl.*

Last year's massive student protests in Chile had, in the pursuit of profit in education, one of their main targets for denunciation. The argument defended by demonstrators and shared—according to opinion polls, by a large majority of Chilean society—was that seeking financial gain from education is morally illegitimate and ought to be legally banned. Under any circumstance, education cannot be a business enterprise, as most people seem to believe.

One query concerns the actual state of affairs students were complaining about. Schools in Chile can operate as for-profit firms in all levels of K–12 education and at the nonuniversity sector of higher education. Only universities are required to organize themselves as nonprofit charities. However, this rule is shunned by many, possibly the majority of private universities in the country resorted to clever triangulation with companies owned by the proprietors of the university—to make earnings available to the founders or owners of the university.

From the point of view of policymaking, accommodating the demands of mobilized students was technically easier in the case of universities, for it was solely a matter of enforcing the laws as they appear in the books. Whereas at the other levels of education, current for-profit providers would have needed to be expropriated of their legitimate



businesses by the government, a constitutional quagmire, and foreseeable lawyers' paradise of legal wrangling.

Politically, a change of the state of affairs involved a nonstarter for a rightist coalition government that places high value in private education and free enterprise, solely or combined, as well in the stability of the rules of the game for the sake of investors.

Beyond the case of Chile, it may be a worthy exercise to consider, in abstract, what are the pros and cons of for-profit higher education. Can higher education be a legitimate business? Is it a necessary business?

---

### **Only universities are required to organize themselves as nonprofit charities.**

---

#### **A FAIR GAME FOR BUSINESSES SEEKING PROFIT?**

For a long time, all of higher education around the world has been public, private-philanthropic, or affiliated with religious institutions. But the participation of profit-seeking providers is growing, not only in the United States, but also in Latin America. Some estimates, for instance, put the share of Brazil's for-profit sector at over 30 percent of total enrollments in higher education, public and private. But Brazil, as well as Peru or Costa Rica, allows profits in higher education. In addition, perhaps a few million students globally are enrolled in ostensibly nonprofit institutions whose controllers ignore the ban on profiting via under-the-table dealings.

Why should there be no space in education for economic gain? One argument underscores the confidence-based nature of the education relationship. Such a conformation is subverted when the dominant goal of the undertaking is not to educate people but to make money from educating people. Those receiving the education may reasonably ask themselves whether the owners are in fact investing as much as they should in instruction, as opposed to cutting corners to maximize earnings. The counterargument here is that for an education business to remain in business it must deliver good-quality education; otherwise, people will take their business elsewhere. This pressure for performance creates an exogenous virtuous effect, even where there might not be any virtuous endogenous motives. Evidently, for this beneficial competitive outcome to materialize, as with any other market, good-quality information on performance is needed for consumers.

An additional issue has emerged with the concentration of enrollments in a few large-scale providers within the for-profit universe—a phenomenon observed in the United States as well as in Brazil, Mexico, and Chile—possibly fostered by economies of scale in management and in instructional design and delivery: For-profit private higher education apparently applies to the formation of large institutions (or conglomerates), much more than nonprofit privates and publics. Whether this is good or bad depends on one's take on market concentration or diversification.

Proponents of education as a business often point to the efficiency gains derived from a focus on maximizing profits. If the enterprise is to obtain economic gain for its owners, waste has to be reigned in, downtime minimized, investments carefully measured and approved by their expected returns, and incentives smartly tailored to make everybody in the organization produce their best. These measures not only benefit customers but typically do not take place at nonprofit and public institutions. Moreover, the legal structure of for-profits could be considered better suited to the unforgiving competitive environment of higher education of today than the cumbersome configuration of foundations and other charitable forms in the private, not for-profit domain. This greater expedience for management and mobilization of financial resources, found in the for-profit organizational form, is the trend noted in the past few years toward large investments in education facilities and equipment by proprietors of these institutions leveraging money from shareholders through initial public offerings or from financial institutions or investment funds—a scenario not unthinkable for nonprofits, but perhaps less frequent and more complicated to pull out.

---

**It may be a worthy exercise to consider, in abstract, what are the pros and cons of for-profit higher education. Can higher education be a legitimate business? Is it a necessary business?**

---

#### **EFFECTS ON QUALITY**

Yet, the empirical question arising from this arrangement is not just whether it is true that publics and nonprofits operate less efficiently, but more critically, whether the efficiency advantage allegedly obtained by for-profits over charitable and public entities is larger than the share of income that goes to remunerate the executives and owners and for that reason cannot be reinvested in education. In other words,

what is the net effect of profit seeking, based on how much is left for funding quality education? Opponents also stress that the organizational mechanisms, individual rewards, and overall culture of efficiency maximization is deleterious to academic integrity: programs in undersubscribed fields in the humanities may be closed because they have too few students and do not break even, regardless of quality. Also, large minimum class sizes may be good for business but bad for teacher-student contact; expensive faculty may be shirked for less costly and inferior colleagues, who can nonetheless deliver the basics, and the like.

### Why should there be no space in education for economic gain?

Based on the issue of quality, can a profit-seeking institution, redirecting part of its income to shareholders, deliver more quality—quality measured, let's say, as fitness of graduates for the workplace, which is the mainstay of the promise of value in for-profits—than comparable nonprofits, free to spend all of their income in the requirements of education? Thus, an empirical question includes the issue of the magnitude of the efficiency premium in for-profits, compared to the size of the remuneration to the owners. Observers in Latin America maintain that local institutions in Chile and Costa Rica improved after being acquired by international education companies. As Brazil, a worldwide leader in testing of graduates, continues to expand its national program to test all graduates of higher education institutions in all disciplines and professions, data will become available to approach this question. Preliminary analyses of average scores by type of institution show mixed, inconclusive results.

#### IS FOR-PROFIT HIGHER EDUCATION NECESSARY?

Even if profit seeking in higher education gave ground to more cons than pros, it may still be “a necessary evil” of sorts, necessary to provide access in times of worldwide massification of higher education, where the state is not financially capable to support the growth of the public sector. Moreover, philanthropy is in short supply—a combination of factors that pretty much describes the whole of the developing world. Indeed, it seems a good risk to stake that legal or illicit profit making is more prevalent in the developing South than in the industrialized North. If in these latitudes higher education is not provided as a business, it has been argued that the system will not be provided at all. However, adjudicating on this proposition would require accurate ac-

counting of what is for-profit and what is not—a difficult task in the current information-starved environment.

Finally, why would people be barred from choosing to take their education from a profit-seeking provider? Regardless of the response to this question, there is one condition of plausibility for this argument nobody can negate: information. Customers must know whether the institution they are dealing with is a for-profit; and financial performance summaries of all institutions, whatever their corporate form, must be readily available. But the worldwide reluctance of for-profits to make of this condition a central element of their public persona should give us pause as to the social legitimacy accorded to educational businesses in our societies. ■

## Squeezing the Nonprofit Sector

DANIEL C. LEVY

*Daniel C. Levy is SUNY Distinguished Professor at the University at Albany, State University of New York, and director of PROPHE. E-mail: dlevy@albany.edu.*

The world's higher education is usually categorized sectorally as public and private but the latter encompasses both nonprofit and for-profit parts. We can speak of three sectors, as commonly done for hospitals, child-care facilities, and prisons: public, nonprofit, and for-profit.

#### THE TWO PRIVATE SECTORS

However, whether one chooses to call nonprofit and for-profit subsectors of private higher education or sectors of their own, an unfolding and surprising international reality is that, while for-profit private higher education is growing, nonprofit private higher education is being squeezed—its decades-long growth in share of higher education enrollment seriously threatened. The squeeze comes from the for-profit side and from the public side.

The nonprofit sector is often called the “third sector,” lying in between the public and for-profit sectors and affected by each. For decades, the nonprofit sector benefited from the public sector's failure to meet massively accelerating demand: private higher education soared to roughly 30 percent of total global enrollment, with the bulk of that 30 percent in nonprofit institutions.

Or, at least the bulk is in institutions that are nonprofit by their legal status. In reality, many of these nonprofit institutions are functionally much like for-profits. They are often what the literature on nonprofits calls “for-profits in disguise.” The difference between what is legally and functionally nonprofit gives rise to confusion. The concept of nonprofit private institutions is generally much less understood outside the United States than inside. One important nonprofit principle is a private voluntary action for motives other than financial gain—private ownership acting for public good. Legally key is the prohibiting distributing financial gains to owners or investors; there is no condemnation against generating surpluses that are then plowed back into the institution. But, many legal nonprofits are adept at finding ethically dubious ways to route gains to their controlling businesses, family, or friends.

There are wildly different estimates of the size of for-profit higher education. Counted by legal definition, for-profits comprise only a small share of the world’s private higher education; perhaps, most countries do not even authorize legal for-profit higher education. Indeed, many observers doubt that outside the United States true nonprofits extend much beyond religious and a few semielite institutions. In considering the factors that squeeze nonprofit higher education, it is worth pondering which fall more on genuine nonprofits or ones that are functionally for-profit.

#### **ACCELERATED PUBLIC SECTOR GROWTH**

Historically, in most of the world, public higher education had long been the natural order. This, in turn, made subsequent private growth striking. As long as private higher education increased its share of enrollment, growth was the dominant theme. But in the new century, with private higher education already widely entrenched, increasing private shares cease to be inevitable. Now, a notion of a private sector being squeezed from the public side becomes relevant.

In several countries the private share has actually decreased. This is sometimes the result of radical government policy that vastly expands the public sector into forms or quality levels previously unknown, as in Hugo Rafael Chavez’s Venezuela. Less radically but often in fresh higher education modalities, public expansion has been sufficient—as in Colombia and the Philippines—to bring a decrease in the private enrollment share, despite continued increases in absolute private enrollment. Or, the sharp public expansion at least prevents further growth of private shares, as in Brazil, or slows its otherwise greater growth, as in China.

#### **SQUEEZED BY PUBLIC SECTOR “ENCROACHMENT”**

It is only when private higher education is firmly established that accelerated public growth is reasonably seen

as coming at the expense of private higher education. Private entrepreneurs rail against encroachment. In the past they could complain (about stultifying regulation or lack of government aid for their students) and yet still grab an increasing share of higher education’s expansion. More and more they now feel squeezed by public encroachment onto “private” turf. That encroachment comes not only through accelerated public expansion but also where the public sector reaches for “private” constituencies by adopting its methods. Examples include public universities becoming more entrepreneurial, and sometimes opening fee-paying modules alongside their traditional low or no tuition base.

The squeeze is especially tight when it comes in times of overall system enrollment stagnation or even decline. The demographic realities that have brought shrinking enrollment to Japan and South Korea are poised to do so in Poland and some other eastern European countries. Nothing increases conflictual intersectoral dynamics faster than a shrinking pie. Since public institutions usually hold the status level over the private institutions and carry out a lower tuition, they have major advantages in maintaining

---

**The nonprofit sector is often called the “third sector,” lying in between the public and for-profit sectors and affected by each.**

---

their enrollments at the expense that had previously been ticketed for the private sector. The relatively high-status private universities—disproportionally the truly nonprofit ones—have more resources to cope with the competition, to resist enrollment incursions by the other sectors, though even they too are troubled. But the large majority of legally nonprofit institutions, both the truly nonprofit ones and the functionally for-profit ones, are low status and vulnerable.

#### **SQUEEZED BY FOR-PROFIT SECTOR GROWTH**

While some of the legally for-profit institutions are also threatened by public growth, they have been expanding in many places. Clearly, for-profit dynamics, behavior, and norms are spreading.

Even in terms of enrollment, legally for-profit enrollment is notably growing. Brazil has led the way in Latin America since the mid-1990s and now one-fifth of its total enrollment is in legally for-profit institutions. Peru and a few other Latin American countries likewise permit legal for-profit higher education. In Chile and Mexico only

nonprofit universities are legally permitted. Legal for-profit higher education has been more widespread in Asia, and now the Chinese government has authorized a period of experimentation with for-profits.

Such for-profit growth risks the nonprofit sector both directly and indirectly. It leaves the nonprofit sector with fewer tuition-paying students. Moreover, if the Brazilian case is an example, creation of a legal for-profit sector sets up a dilemma for existing nonprofits. The government's fundamental rationale in legalizing the for-profit form was that functionally for-profit institutions pretending to be nonprofits should lose their tax breaks and be forced to pay taxes on their profits. This threatens the size of the nonprofit sector in two ways. One way is obviously that some institutions feel compelled to leave the sector, while some new institutions set up outside it. The other way is that institutions that preserve their legal nonprofit status come under increased regulatory scrutiny.

#### HOW FOR-PROFIT HIGHER EDUCATION GAINS GROUND

Of course, increased scrutiny can make life rough in the legally for-profit sector, as well. Congressional clamoring has chilled the US for-profit sector and has recently curbed its growth, partly diverting it into nondegree activities. However, no strong global evidence reveals that any regulation could stem the net growth of shoddy for-profit higher education enterprises (whether legally for-profit or legally nonprofit). Often these institutions thrive either by deceit or exploiting a vulnerable student body with poor or unclear alternatives.

As both other articles in this special section show, profit *can* go hand-in-hand with quality, at least in career-oriented teaching. Indeed large for-profit businesses may have some inherent advantages in this sort of provision. They can enjoy economies of scale and function with largely uniform programs across institutions and even countries: (1) business discipline for a higher education reality; (2) access to finance, sometimes to absorb short-term losses for long-term gains; (3) they can be consumer-oriented particularly when the student demand is for efficient training.

Thus, the nonprofit sector is squeezed from both other sectors, albeit mostly in different ways. This squeeze comes as traditional noncommercial pillars of demand for nonprofit supply have diminished—education founded on religious or other distinctive values and on trust in the worth of broad learning. ■

## The Quality-Profit Assumption

KEVIN KINSER

*Kevin Kinser is associate professor at the University at Albany-State University of New York. E-mail: kinser@albany.edu.*

Much of the criticism of for-profit higher education relies on an assumption of an unavoidable tension between quality and profit. This tension typically is framed in which the pursuit of profit is directly connected to reduction in quality, requiring countervailing external regulations, and explicitly enforced internal safeguards. An educational institution will make greater profit, in other words, if it provides lower quality. The regulatory environment is therefore a necessary bulwark against this possibility, setting a quality floor, beneath which private higher education loses legitimacy and government authority to operate.

The attractiveness of this position—in which profit reduces quality—comes in part from the traditional provision of education as an altruistic activity. The charitable purpose of education has historically been supported by the state in the public sphere and by religion in the private sphere. A new population of education providers emerged in recent decades; however, that has neither become state supported nor religiously affiliated. They are dominated by obviously low-quality, demand-absorbing institutions. Campuses are more like storefronts and students like customers, with faculty holding marginal qualifications, and curricula pegged to minimal standards.

Because these new private-sector providers largely serve a student population that is unable to gain entry into the traditional institutions of higher education, they are able to charge tuition fees for the opportunity of educational access. Whether legally for-profit or not, this reliance on tuition fees and other operational characteristics suggests that many are for-profit institutions, even if in disguise (as Daniel C. Levy describes in the contribution to this special section). In any case, excess revenue generated by tuition fees demonstrates that the private sector is charging more for its educational services than services cost to provide. This is in contrast to the public sector, which often has higher costs, while charging the student less, and making up the difference through government subsidies.

The conflation of low quality and profit is suggested by this pattern. Low-quality programs are low-cost programs. Charging high-tuition fees for a low-cost program results in profit. Therefore, profit comes from low-quality programs. It follows, then, that since private-sector providers are making a profit, the quality of their programs must necessarily



In addition to our Web site and Facebook page, we are now tweeting. We hope you will consider "following" us on Twitter!

be suspect—as an imperfect logic. Simply because low-end, private-sector institutions are frequently seen making profits, from a poor product, this does not make quality and profit incompatible.

#### WHY THE QUALITY-PROFIT ASSUMPTION FAILS

Other routes to profitability do not require a low-quality product. The most familiar route is reducing costs for delivering an education program, gaining excess resources through improved instructional efficiencies. This could be done through increasing class sizes, standardizing curricula, and teaching practices, or accelerating time to degree through a modified academic calendar. Although efficiency may be a euphemism for cutting corners, it is also a strategy for reducing wasteful practices that can undermine more effective educational activities. A more efficient operation can serve the same number of students less expensively or more students at the same cost. Both are profitable outcomes for the private-sector provider that would not demand quality trade-offs.

A second route would offer programs that are already cheap to teach but priced higher by traditional comprehensive universities cross-subsidizing their own more expensive academic programs. The proliferation of business programs in private-sector institutions, for example, can be seen through this lens. These programs require no special tools or laboratory equipment, and the subject matter is well-established and accessible to nonspecialists. By itself, business is a low-cost program. But many traditional universities use revenue generated by business and other similar low-cost programs, in order to make higher-cost programs more affordable. Simply by not diverting this excess revenue to offset unprofitable programs, the private sector institutions' owners can earn a healthy return on their investments without reducing quality.

A third strategy that avoids the quality-profit connection is to reduce “frills” elsewhere at the university, thus grabbing profit from not having to support elaborate and expensive extracurricular activities. In the United States, the for-profit sector mostly avoids the typical amenities found on traditional campuses—such as athletic facilities, social organizations, and campus housing. Anything outside of the primary instructional mission can be eliminated, leaving all of the focus on the provision of a quality-academic program. Revenue that would go to support nonacademic features can then be converted directly to profit, and the integrity and quality of the program remain inviolate.

In these routes to profit, only in the first case should potential concerns about academic quality come into contention, and even then only if traditional curriculum delivery practices are determined to be essential to quality provision. The other profit strategies are taking advantage of the

pricing strategies common throughout higher education. The quality does not have to suffer, nor do educational expenditures have to be less, in order for excess revenue to be generated. They can provide essentially the same instructional product as the public sector, while earning profit by reducing expenditures for extraneous activities.

#### QUALITY AND STANDARDS

A key question remains, however. Which aspects of a university education are extraneous and which are intertwined with a quality academic program? For example, to help poorly prepared students to be successful, any institution would need to spend money on nonclassroom activities like academic services, support, advising, extra tutoring, and others. Teaching may be cheap, but the student body is often quite expensive.

To be clear, a robust regulatory regime can still serve a quality-assurance function. As the US case shows, specifically targeting for-profit higher education for regulatory attention may be necessary to arrest egregious violations of academic integrity in the name of profitability. Some activities are certainly illegitimate and should be prohibited. The aim of quality assurance, though, can be more than just the enforcement of minimum standards. It should be possible to discuss “good and better” without disparaging all but “the top.” The profit status of the institution may be one element considered in evaluating educational quality, but it should not be the decisive factor. ■

---

## International Student Mobility in the United States

CHRISTINE A. FARRUGIA AND ASHLEY VILLARREAL

*Christine A. Farrugia is senior research officer, Institute of International Education, New York. E-mail: cfarrugia@iie.org. Ashley Villarreal is research coordinator at the Institute of International Education. E-mail: avillarreal@iie.org.*

The number of globally mobile students has nearly doubled over the past 10 years, from 2.1 million in 2001 to 4.1 million in 2011. According to *Open Doors 2012: Report on International Educational Exchange*, the United States hosted 764,795 international students in 2011/12, an increase of 3.7 percent from the previous year. International students in the United States now make up 19 percent of the world's



globally mobile students, and as university campus enrollments grow, so does the proportion of students enrolling in them from abroad. The number of US students studying abroad reached 273,996 in 2010/11, an increase of 1.3 percent over the prior year and an increase of 78 percent over the past 10 years.

The data in this article are drawn from *Open Doors 2012*, a statistical survey that reports on international students studying in the United States in 2011/12 and on US students studying abroad in 2010/11.

#### GROWTH RATES OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

For the fourth year in a row, China is again the top place of origin of international students in the United States, with 194,029 students, and continues to grow at a high rate (23.1%). The number of Saudi students in the United States also continues to increase, growing 50.4 percent over 2010/11, to reach 34,139. The mobility of Saudi students is the result of large-scale scholarship programs for education abroad, provided by the Saudi government. In the coming

---

**International students in the United States now make up 19 percent of the world's globally mobile students.**

---

years the number of Brazilian students in the United States is expected to increase as a result of the Brazil Scientific Mobility Program, which was launched in 2011. Students in this program began entering the United States in January 2012 and will be reflected in the *Open Doors 2013 Report*.

In contrast to government-driven reasons for large increases in students from countries like Saudi Arabia, growth from some countries is largely driven by student demand. One example is Iran, which in recent years, has shown a steady and significant growth in the number of students studying in the United States, despite the obstacles faced by Iranian students in studying abroad. Such restrictions include difficulties obtaining visas and transferring funds out of Iran for tuition and living expenses and US government restrictions on studying in certain scientific and technical fields. In 2011/12, there were 6,982 Iranian students in the United States, a 24 percent increase over the prior year and an increase of 150 percent over the past five years. From 1974/75 through 1982/83, Iran was the top sender of students to the United States, reaching a high of 51,310 students in 1979/80, but dropping to a low of 1,660 in 1998/99.

In 2011/12, modest declines were seen in students from several top places of origin. The number of students from India decreased for the second year in a row. In 2011/12, the number of Indian students decreased by 3.5 percent, following a decrease of 1.0 percent in 2010/11. The decline in the number of Indian students is likely due to the expansion of India's domestic higher education sector, a growing Indian economy that provides job opportunities for graduates, and a significant devaluation of the Indian Rupee. Other declines were seen in numbers of students from Taiwan (6.3%), Japan (6.2%), Canada (2.6%), and South Korea (1.4%).

#### INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' ACADEMIC LEVELS

This year's *Open Doors* data reflect some notable shifts in enrollment patterns of international students by academic level. For the first time since 2000/01, the number of undergraduate students surpassed graduate enrollments, driven by large increases in undergraduates from China. The number of Chinese undergraduates in the United States reached 74,516 in 2011/12, a 30.8 percent increase over the previous year. A striking increase in nondegree study was seen in the number of students from Saudi Arabia, which increased by 95 percent over the previous year, reaching 13,214 students. The majority of these students were enrolled in Intensive English Programs, which portends continued growth in Saudi degree-seeking students, as some current nondegree students are likely to remain in the United States for undergraduate study.

#### US STUDENTS ABROAD

In 2010/11, 273,996 US students studied abroad for academic credit. The rate of growth of US students studying abroad slowed in 2010/11, increasing 1.3 percent, compared to a 3.9 percent growth reported in the prior year. Events in several host countries resulted in many study-abroad programs being cancelled, contributing to declines in certain key destinations. The tsunami in Japan in March 2011 contributed to a 33 percent decrease in US students, while a US State Department warning on travel to Mexico resulted in a 42 percent drop of US students studying there. The Arab Spring in 2011 likely impacted study abroad to North Africa, most notably Egypt, which experienced a 43 percent decline in US study-abroad students. During the same period, other countries in Asia and Latin America experienced large increases, including Costa Rica (15.5%), Brazil (12.5%), and South Korea (16.4%).

Over the past 20 years there has been increasing diversification in study-abroad destinations. In 1989/90, 76.7 percent of students studied abroad in Europe, while in 2010/11 just over half of students (54.6%) selected European destinations. English-speaking countries received just 21

percent of US students studying abroad in 2010/11, while many non-Anglophone countries experienced increases in US students studying abroad, including China (4.9% increase), India (11.9% increase), and Israel (9.4% increase). These trends suggest that US students are increasingly seeking destinations that offer linguistic and cultural diversity.

#### GLOBAL STUDENT MOBILITY

The growth of international students in the United States results from both push and pull factors that entice students to select that country as their preferred study destination.

---

**In contrast to government-driven reasons for large increases in students from countries like Saudi Arabia, growth from some countries is largely driven by student demand.**

---

The quality, variety, capacity, and accessibility of American universities are compelling factors that make the United States an attractive destination for international students. This is certainly the case with students from China who, as the result of increasing family incomes and growing demands for higher education, are becoming more and more globally mobile. Likewise, students from Iran are increasingly enrolling in US institutions, despite the visa restrictions and financial barriers they face.

However, market-based explanations for international student flows do not entirely tell what is driving the growth of student mobility into the United States. Government initiatives to send students abroad to strengthen academic skills and expand cultural knowledge can have a significant impact on the flow of international students, as evidenced by the rise in Saudi students—which was precipitated by the launch of the King Abdullah Scholarship Program in 2005.

US study abroad is likewise impacted by a combination of market forces and government initiatives. While the growth in US students selecting nontraditional destinations is in part student driven, the increasing diversity of study destinations is also impacted by US government initiatives—like the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship, which encourages students to select nontraditional destinations, and the “100,000 Strong” Initiative for China, which promotes education abroad in China.

Increasing student demand for education abroad means that international student mobility will continue to

grow, but the impact of recent government programs demonstrates that policy initiatives can also be powerful tools to increase international mobility and to steer students toward countries of interest.

---

*Authors' note:* The Institute of International Education has published *Open Doors*, an annual statistical survey of student mobility into and out of the United States since 1919, and has received support from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the US Department of State since the early 1970s. The opinions expressed in this article are entirely those of the authors. More information on *Open Doors* is available at <http://www.iie.org/open-doors>. ■

---

## China's Confucius Institutes—More Academic and Integrative

QIANG ZHA

*Qiang Zha is an associate professor at the Faculty of Education, York University, Toronto, Canada. E-mail: qzha@edu.yorku.ca.*

Ever since the first Confucius Institute was launched in 2004 in Uzbekistan, this initiative has been seen as an arm of Chinese government for expanding China's soft power. The past 15 years witnessed a phenomenal growth of the Confucius Institutes around the world. By the end of 2011, 358 Confucius Institutes and 500 Confucius Classrooms were established in 108 countries—with 21 percent Confucius Institutes and 60 percent Confucius Classrooms located in a single country, the United States—though they remain controversial in many democratic societies. After all, the organization behind these Confucius Institutes and Classrooms, the Confucius Institute Headquarters or *Hanban*, is affiliated to China's Ministry of Education and operates with government funds. Notably, in 2011 alone, *Hanban* spent US\$164.1 million directly on all kinds of projects and activities in Confucius Institutes across the world. This figure is expected to grow significantly in the years to come. At the recent Global Confucius Institute Conference in Beijing, *Hanban* announced three new major programs applicable to Confucius Institutes worldwide. They include the Confucius China Study Plan—focusing on research aspects of Confucius Institutes, appointments of permanent academic staff at all Confucius Institutes, and the “Chinese

Day” program connecting Confucius Institutes to their local communities.

Apparently, these new programs aim to transform Confucius Institutes into an academic unit and an integrative part in their host universities as well as the local communities. The Confucius China Study Plan will champion research function of Confucius Institutes. It sponsors visiting scholars associating with Confucius Institutes to undertake research projects in China for a period of 2 weeks to 10 months, provides doctoral scholarships, and supports conferences and publications on China Studies related topics. The scheme for appointing the Core Teachers aims to create permanent academic positions at those Confucius Institutes that have operated for more than two years. The Core Teacher is supposed to be hired and compensated at the level of lecturer or assistant professor by Western standards, with *Hanban* covering their salaries and benefits in the first five years and 50 percent in the second five years, and the rest to be paid by the Confucius Institutes where they teach. Finally, the Chinese Day program designs to promote the Chinese language and culture as well as the Confucius Institutes in their local communities, through conducting thematic activities on a regular basis.

---

**By the end of 2011, 358 Confucius Institutes and 500 Confucius Classrooms were established in 108 countries.**

---

#### TRANSFORMATION REQUIRES RESEARCH SUPPORT

While it remains to be seen if these initiatives may work to upgrade Confucius Institutes around the world, they will certainly bring a lot of visibility (and possibly more controversies) to them and might open up a new research agenda. Between the goals and objectives spelled out by these new initiatives and the reality in which Confucius Institutes operate, there are a number of roadblocks. First and foremost, Confucius Institutes are largely operating at the margin on their host campuses, hardly making a part of the mainstream functions—i.e., research, teaching and service. In many cases, they are somehow competing with the existing structure of China Studies and Chinese-language teaching—i.e., the preexistent programs, centers and institutes that house China-related content. The Confucius Institutes’ outreach activities often appear to be disconnected with the host universities’ community engagement strategies and schemes. In this context, the goal for integration is nothing short of a challenge and requires research support for the sake of figuring out appropriate strategy and action plan.

In order to be integrative, Confucius Institutes need to transform themselves, and such questions may stand in their way of fulfilling such a transformation: How can Confucius Institutes contribute to the host university’s research function/agenda? In this regard, Confucius Institutes need to generate synergies with the existing research structure

---

**While it remains to be seen if these initiatives may work to upgrade Confucius Institutes around the world, they will certainly bring a lot of visibility.**

---

and agenda in their host institutions, rather than competing with them or creating a new structure. How can Confucius Institutes contribute to the host university’s teaching and learning (pedagogical betterment) in general? Apart from offering Chinese-language learning programs and courses, Confucius Institutes may maneuver to showcase the humanistic aspects of the Confucian education tradition and make them available and supportive to pedagogical reference and progress in their host institutions. Finally, how can Confucius Institutes connect to the host university’s community engagement efforts? How can they contribute to branding of the host university? The aforementioned questions may help upgrade and substantiate a research agenda surrounding Confucius Institutes, yet a meaningful research on them cannot afford losing grip in the difference or even contrast with respect to university culture.

In all cases, Confucius Institutes involve a partnership between a Chinese university and a non-Chinese one, which inevitably brings together different university cultures and sometimes could lead to a “clash” of university cultures. For instance, *Hanban* now requires all Confucius Institutes to work up their strategic planning, which often needs to take the form of three- or five-year plans. The Chinese universities are quite familiar with and used to this kind of practice. However, many Western partner universities may not necessarily be able to cope with such a requirement, as the long-term planning is not a part of their culture. In this circumstance, how could the Confucius Institutes’ planning survive the culture that traditionally de-emphasizes planning? Even if more and more Western universities now adapt to the planning culture, there needs to be a careful effort to connect the Confucius Institute planning, to that of the host university as a whole.

### AWARENESS OF DIFFERENCES IN UNIVERSITY CULTURE

More importantly, the partnership denotes the difference in decision-making patterns. Chinese universities tend to feature a bureaucracy (and sometimes a political system) model of decision making, characterized with a top-down approach and short-time horizon. Western universities, by contrast, are more likely to demonstrate the collegial model in decision making, and sometimes even characterize an “organized anarchy.” Decisions come often out of consensus, which requires a great deal of communications, consultations, and discussions. It is crucial to raise awareness toward this kind of difference in university culture and carefully nurture the partnership as a “unity with diversity”—a Confucian concept itself. All in all, the transformation of Confucius Institutes, as an academic effort or an integrative one, requires not only resource support but also—and more importantly—a thrifty handle of the difference in university culture, in order to form a shared “intersubjective meaning.” As a pressing step, *Hanban* needs to convince the world that, with these new programs, it is not taking advantage of the lack of funding for sinology and social sciences in Western universities, and trying to muscle in and control the teaching of the Chinese language and Chinese history through the funds it supplies to those strapped institutions. Perhaps, it is important for China to proceed slowly and gain trust. ■

## Finally, an Internationalization Policy for Canada

ROOPA DESAI TRILOKEKAR AND GLEN A. JONES

*Roopa Desai Trilokekar is assistant professor in the Faculty of Education, York University, Toronto, Canada. E-mail: roopat@edu.yorku.ca. Glen A. Jones is Ontario Research Chair in Postsecondary Education Policy and Measurement and professor of Higher Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. E-mail: gjones@oise.utoronto.ca.*

Canada does not have a national ministry of education, a national higher education policy, or a national strategy for international education. Previous attempts to develop an international education strategy for Canada have failed, under a federal arrangement where provincial governments closely guard their constitutional responsibility for education—while the federal government has responsibility for international relations. Given this context, the Canadian federal government’s 2011 announcement—to allocate Can

\$10 million over two years for the development and launching of Canada’s first international education strategy—was a bold step toward bringing the various stakeholders together to establish a common pathway.

### THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL STRATEGY

A strategic approach to international education is crucial to achieving national prosperity in a globally competitive knowledge economy. International education is now intrinsically linked not only with a nation’s foreign policy but with other national policies—such as trade, economic development, labor, immigration, innovation, and research. Thus, the absence of a national policy in Canada has led to a piece meal and largely uncoordinated approach, and Can-

---

**Canada does not have a national ministry of education, a national higher education policy, or a national strategy for international education.**

---

ada has only a small share of the global market for higher education. Canada attracts 5 percent of all tertiary students who study abroad, much lower than other major destination countries, including the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, Germany, and France.

### A NEW APPROACH

The ministers of International Trade and Finance jointly announced the formation of a six-member expert advisory panel, to make recommendations on how to develop and implement an international education strategy. The panel submitted its report to the government, on August 14, 2012, after a three-pronged extensive consultative process with multiple stakeholder groups. *International Education: A Key Driver of Canada’s Future Prosperity* is a comprehensive and expansive report, offering a total of 14 recommendations under five core themes: targets for success; policy coordination and ensuring sustainable quality; promotion of education in Canada; investments, infrastructure, and support.

One of the most-striking features of this report is that it largely defines international education as student mobility, and it emphatically sends a message that student mobility is not to be a one-way street. A central focus of the strategy is to both attract top talent, by recruiting the best and brightest international undergraduate and graduate students, and encourage Canadian students to go abroad to develop their global perspective. The advisory committee obviously listened to a range of stakeholder organizations

that have advocated for a balanced approach, and it recommends that Canada should send 50,000 students abroad each year—through an international mobility program co-funded by the federal and provincial governments and academic institutions.

The majority of the report, however, is focused on the recruitment and retention of international students, an emphasis that comes as little surprise given the potential revenue associated with expanding the Canadian market. The report recommends that Canada doubles its intake of full-time international students from 239,131 in 2011 to more than 450,000 by 2022, representing a 10 percent annual increase. Under this plan, international students would represent 17.3 percent of the total postsecondary enrollment in Canada, by 2020. This target seems modest and achievable, given the growth in international enrollment over the last decade, with minimal government support or coordination. The economic impact of recruiting international students is emphasized throughout the report. International education is valued as trade, but it is also viewed as an important

---

**One of the most-striking features of this report is that it largely defines international education as student mobility, and it emphatically sends a message that student mobility is not to be a one-way street.**

---

“pipeline” to the needs of the Canadian labor market. Given Canada’s low birthrates, future economic development depends on immigration, and today’s international students may well be tomorrow’s well-educated citizens.

#### CHANGING POLICY CONTEXTS

While the report is in sync with global trends, it is striking to note the change in Canada’s position in terms of soft power relations. Canada once distinguished itself as a non-colonial, middle power—having established international development assistance as a core component of its foreign policy. Through the establishment of the Canadian International Development Agency, Canada was once among the more generous donors of the industrialized countries. Today, the proposed national strategy identifies the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, as the national leader for the new strategy, while making only a passing reference to that agency. This is indeed indicative of changed policy contexts. Canada now views internation-

al education as an economic and trade benefit. Further, it seeks to position itself competitively with other nations and vies for a leadership position to attract top talent to Canada. The report recommends a massive new investment in competitive scholarships for undergraduate and graduate international students, a positive step toward attracting the best and brightest. However, it is an approach that has little in common with earlier Canadian scholarship programs for students from developing countries.

#### THE FUTURE OF THE STRATEGY?

Given Canada’s federal arrangements, the issue of coordination is key in any attempt to implement a national approach, and this is a major shortcoming of the report. While the report devotes considerable attention to coordination, the task force attempts to address this issue through the creation of a Council on International Education and Research to provide policy advice to the different federal ministries. The new council would include a chair, 3 deputy ministers from federal government departments, and 2 deputy ministers as provincial government representatives. The structure affirms the importance of federal government leadership in this policy area, but it is difficult to imagine the provinces agreeing to participate in any arrangement that would not include representatives of all 10 provincial ministers of education, several of which already have provincial strategies. Canada does have a “window of opportunity” to raise its stakes in international education. However, its future is dependent on the federal government’s approach to fostering meaningful partnerships with the provinces and securing their commitment to a coordinated national strategy. Will the federal government and the provinces have a strong enough commitment to work against the inherent jurisdictional tensions in Canada’s highly decentralized system? Currently, there has been no official government response to the advisory report. ■

---



In addition to our Web site and Facebook page, we are now tweeting. We hope you will consider “following” us on Twitter!



# Branch Campuses Weigh Start-up Options

DAVID A. STANFIELD

*David A. Stanfield is a research assistant at the Boston College Center for International Higher Education and doctoral student in Boston College's Higher Education Administration program. E-mail: david.stanfield@bc.edu.*

IHE dedicates an article in each issue to a contribution from the Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT), headquartered at the State University of New York, at Albany. More information about C-BERT can be found at [www.globalhighered.org](http://www.globalhighered.org). Follow us on Twitter at @Cross-BorderHE.

Higher education institutions face a variety of strategic decisions, in establishing branch campuses overseas. A decade ago, there was little guide for their decision making. Now, experience gained from watching early efforts have provided some help as the next generation of universities considers the available options. This article outlines three sets of decisions that can influence success.

## FIRST-MOVER VS. ESTABLISHED MARKET

The early bird gets the worm, as they say—but the second mouse gets the cheese. The first foreign university to enter a country or region can benefit simply initially. This is known as the first-mover advantage, a concept familiar to the business world—whereby a company establishes a dominant position through early entry into a particular market. Though these “first-in” international branch campuses must still compete with local postsecondary institutions and the attractions of traditional study abroad, they often have some advantage over other, later arrivals.

By building a positive reputation in the local community prior to the arrival of other institutions, first-in institutions are able to gain a lasting momentum to significantly help with student recruitment in subsequent years. The University of Wollongong—not an especially well-recognized institution outside of Australia—was the first branch campus to open in Dubai, United Arab Emirates. Wollongong quickly built up and continues to maintain a significant enrollment, despite the 20-plus branch campuses that have since come onto the scene.

Some institutions, however, have opted to join a market, where other branch campuses have already been established. In this case, more certainty exists, regarding the demand for and acceptability of foreign educational provision. Nevertheless, sound research and planning should

inform and guide the decision. For instance, institutions must gauge demand for their proposed degree program(s), evaluate institutional reputation among the target student population, and consider whether the terms of the host country or organization align with their own long-term vision. Furthermore, when entering an established market such as Dubai or Singapore, administrators must determine whether the location has reached a saturation point, which may differ based on institutional type, degree focus, or method of delivery.

## COMPREHENSIVE VS. NARROW FOCUS

A small number of foreign education providers have developed comprehensive branch campuses that provide a diverse assortment of academic programs and course offerings, robust administrative structures, and substantial physical infrastructure. In addition, these comprehensive campuses tend to offer a broader range of campus services and extracurricular programming. Providers generally hope this will contribute to a campus ethos and student experience similar to the home campus. With a wider range of courses, comprehensive branch campuses also make an attractive study-abroad destination for home campus students.

---

**The first foreign university to enter a country or region can benefit simply initially. This is known as the first-mover advantage.**

---

Comprehensive institutions, such as New York University in Abu Dhabi and the University of Nottingham's campus in China, rely heavily on global brand recognition to attract students; less prestigious institutions may struggle to recruit sufficient enrollment numbers under this model. Creating a comprehensive campus is an expensive and complex undertaking, usually requiring many years of advanced planning and an extended start-up phase. If something goes wrong, institutions could face reputational damage and financial loss—affecting not just the branch, but the home campus as well.

Other international branch campuses may pursue a more narrow focus, offering a limited number of programs, sometimes just a master of business administration or a degree in hospitality. They tend to offer degrees underserved by (or unavailable at) local institutions, programs that are perceived to be more prestigious or of higher quality than those available locally, and/or those that are in high demand

by the local population. From a strategic perspective, measuring demand for a small number of degrees is less complicated than the comprehensive approach. Furthermore, with lower start-up costs and fewer staffing requirements, the process is faster and reduces risk. If additional programs are warranted, they are added after establishing the viability of initial offerings.

#### **COLLABORATIVE VS. AUTONOMOUS**

Dubai, Malaysia, Qatar, Singapore, South Korea, and others are developing education hubs, with a concentration of international branch campuses. Some hubs provide an opportunity for collaboration between institutions. Joining a hub may help branch campuses save money, reduce start-up time, and minimize hassle by sharing facilities and student

---

**Comprehensive institutions, such as New York University in Abu Dhabi and the University of Nottingham's campus in China, rely heavily on global brand recognition to attract students.**

---

services—such as, residence halls, food courts, libraries, and medical offices, to name a few (though the level of cooperation varies among hubs). Nevertheless, collaboration may allow for less control and require compromising on certain standards and expectations. Institutions hoping to maintain strict-quality control, or attempting to reproduce particular elements from their home campus, may prefer a more autonomous approach. The degree to which an institution is collaborative or autonomous is further influenced by physical proximity to other institutions and by the formal and informal expectations of the host country or local partner.

The six American universities in Qatar's hub, Education City, permit students to cross-register for classes between institutions—allowing for a much wider range of options than any single institution could provide. Facilitating cross-registration could especially benefit those institutions offering bachelor-level programs with significant general education and elective requirements, which are difficult to maintain with small student populations. Establishing a branch campus in an education hub can also result in heightened publicity opportunities through joint branding and recruitment efforts.

Drawbacks to close collaboration include the obvious threat of competition over student applicants and other

resources. Furthermore, establishing collaborative agreements such as cross-registration or shared student services are complex and often require years of negotiation, followed by constant tweaking. For example, during the start-up phase of Education City in Qatar, the local sponsor constructed a liberal arts and sciences building, based on an assumption that branch campus students could jointly enroll in shared general education courses. As universities joined the project, it became clear that each institution had unique general education requirements, making the idea impractical, if not impossible to achieve.

#### **CONCLUSION**

As branch campuses evolve, learned experience and historical perspective increase new entrants' chance of success. Consideration of the issues outlined above will aid universities in not having to reinvent the wheel. However, each situation is unique; thus, institutions must recall that these strategic decisions, like all others, should stem from their unique goals and host country environment. Decisions void of nuanced, contextual considerations risk failure. There will also be instances when institutions have little or no say over one or more of these categories. For example, some decisions may be dictated entirely by local regulations or partnership terms. In reality, establishing a branch campus is not an exact science; but thoughtful and informed strategic decisions can have a significant impact on both short- and long-term success. ■

---

## **New Dynamics of Latin American Higher Education**

**JOSÉ JOAQUÍN BRUNNER**

*José Joaquín Brunner is professor at the Universidad Diego Portales in Santiago, Chile, where he is the UNESCO Chair in Comparative Higher Education Policies. E-mail: josejoaquin.brunner@gmail.com.*

**I**n 1950, there were only 75 higher education institutions in Latin America, mainly universities, with 266,000 students. Today there are about 3,900 universities and around 10,500 nonuniversity higher education institutions with an enrollment of 20 million students. In addition, while in the 1950s less than 2 percent of the age cohort (18–24) was enrolled in tertiary education, in 2010 it was 37 percent. In other words, Latin American higher education has been massified, leaving behind its minority and exclusive elitism; more—in Argentina, Chile, Cuba, Uruguay, and Ven-

ezuella—the gross-participation rate has passed 50 percent of the cohort. This dramatic transformation is changing our societies and bringing urgent educational, social, and public-policy challenges.

#### MAIN FEATURES OF MASS HIGHER EDUCATION

The landscape is chaotic, and national systems appear disordered and disorganized. Diversity is the dominant reality. There are institutions with different missions, dissimilar sizes, and diverse coverage of disciplinary areas; student bodies with distinct socioeconomic compositions and cultural capital; staff with varied professional profiles, labor regimes, training styles, and teaching modes; varied academic divisions of labor; distinct forms of institutional governance and management, funding sources, and functional arrangements; and relations to society, the state, and stakeholders. The systems have all the features of a postmodern landscape—hybrid institutions, the synchronism of high and low culture, the coexistence of elite and the mass learning, fluid knowledge, the dominance of the short term, the potency of the market, the lack of grand narratives, and so on.

In fact, the rapid massification of Latin America's higher education is inseparable from the tidal wave of a global capitalism characterized by multiple networks and the intensification of knowledge in all economic, social, and cultural sectors. From a labor force with little education, Latin America's economically active population has an average of complete secondary education and above. Soon, some countries will have between a third to a half of employed young people with tertiary education.

#### PRINCIPLES OF ORDER

Is our higher education as chaotic as it seems? Is it due to a lack of order, coordination, and leadership? I do not believe so. Rather, looking beyond appearances, one can discern structures that order these systems and certain patterns (not fully designed, different from command and control) of both coordination and leadership.

Three diverse categories have been organized but following internationally recognized rules of property, control, and funding. These are, first, public/state higher education institutions; second, private higher education institutions whose ownership, control, and funding is in the hands of private persons or entities and do not receive direct state subsidies. Third, between these two types are private institutions, partially or completely supported from national taxes but with a private governance structure. Order has evolved through the distribution of enrollment and by the proportion of funding from public or private sources. These two parameters define the political economy of the systems.

Today, more than half of Latin America's higher education enrollment is provided by private institutions—most without direct, regular state, or public subsidies; around 35 percent of total higher education expenditure comes from private sources. Both private enrollment and funding in Brazil, Chile, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Paraguay, and Peru are above the regional average, in some cases accounting for 50 percent in both categories. The combined forces of state and private agents are producing the massification of higher education. Latin America today is the region with the highest proportion of enrollment in private higher education institutions and the greatest proportion of funding from private sources—particularly households and student indebtedness.

---

**The landscape is chaotic, and national systems appear disordered and disorganized. Diversity is the dominant reality.**

---

Consistent with mixed political economies, the leadership and coordination of national systems are grounded in market competition, state regulation, and the institutions' strategic behavior—itsself produced by competition and regulation. Guidance, if any, is at arms length, with governments participating through regulations, incentives, and information; while the institutions themselves compete for students, academic staff, resources, and prestige based on their position in the institutional hierarchy of a given system. In brief, the apparent disarray of Latin America's tertiary education is the result of market conditions, with competition between suppliers, weak or nonintrusive state framework, at best providing orientation with regulations, evaluations, and incentives (backed by subsidies), rather than control.

#### CHALLENGES

Given these circumstances prevailing in Latin America, the first responsibility of governments (states) should be to guide market forces toward social welfare objectives and align the system's development to the general interest. The government, with other stakeholders, should establish a framework for priorities, benchmarks, and methods. Among the components agreement should be based on rules of the game and a commitment to a level playing field; institutions capable of regulating and controlling the system and agents' behavior; clear and accountable reporting requirements; guidelines and information about the

volume and modes of state funding for this sector with a medium-term-time horizon.

An essential role for public authorities is to ensure quality. In Latin America some think, erroneously, that such activities reduce the market's coordination function and that quality is best represented by rankings of higher education institutions that then act as proxies for quality. Confronted with sharp information asymmetries, public authorities need to acknowledge that under conditions of intense competition, higher education markets often produce a kind of "arms race" that encourages a continuous cost spiral, with increasing pressure on both public finances and household/student incomes. The allocation of subsidies by the government—both to suppliers (institutions) and for demand (students)—should be made with clear objectives and social priorities, by using a sophisticated and broad set of resource allocation instruments—competitive funds, performance agreements, formulas—which promote internal and external efficiency and act as stimuli for innovation and quality improvement.

---

**More than half of Latin America's higher education enrollment is provided by private institutions—most without direct, regular state, or public subsidies.**

---

Turning to higher education systems and institutions, the main challenge is human-capacity building involving many issues—for example, access to higher education; admission rules and how different institutions are selected; grades and titles; ideas and organization of curricula; teaching modes and pedagogic methods; the academic body and teaching personnel; and the transition from higher education to work and follow up of graduates in the labor market. Each of these dimensions should take account of supply diversity, from universities or nonuniversity institutions, whether academic-disciplinary or technical-vocational; whether they are elite or institutions with little or no selectivity, etc. The challenges are myriad, and the following paragraphs identify only a few salient features.

For access, the key issue is to take stock of the consequences of massive entrance. In particular, that for a period, an increasing number of students will come from households (in the lower three-income quintiles) with reduced economic, social, and cultural capital. The Program for International Student Assessment tests show that a high proportion of these young people have not developed, in secondary school, the minimum skills required to under-

stand texts, manage numbers, and set out arguments based on scientific principles and the use of evidence. They often lack the capacity to learn on their own, a basic requirement for success in higher education. The institutions will have to compensate for these deficits, just as public authorities help students with economic support (scholarships, student loans, etc.). If this does not occur, then dropout rates will continue at an estimated 50 percent in the region, which by any measure is a dramatic waste of talents and a serious squandering of public and private resources.

---

**The first responsibility of governments (states) should be to guide market forces toward social welfare objectives and align the system's development to the general interest.**

---

Facing massive training requirements, higher education institutions (encouraged by government policies) should revise curricula (widely regarded as rigid and mediocre) and premature specialization, in order to cultivate the socioemotional skills required by the new ways of organizing work and communication. These new arrangements will incorporate digital learning and continuous education and thus impact faculty training and instruction modes.

Further, higher education institutions and governments need to emphasize employability as part of education, without discarding other crucial aspects of learning, such as citizens' rights and responsibilities, individual career management, pluralism, and the appreciation of cultural diversity, etc.

To summarize, Latin American higher education has entered a new stage and needs to develop innovative concepts, and instruments to face the challenges of massification and universalization. Further, these challenges take place within mixed economic systems where governments, markets, and institutions interact and discover fresh arrangements to respond to social demands and ambitions, which aspire to leave poverty, authoritarianism, violence, and inequalities behind. ■

---

# The Public University in Argentina: Both Inefficient and Ineffective?

MARCELO RABOSI

*Marcelo Rabosi is assistant professor at the School of Government, Torcuato Di Tella University, Buenos Aires, Argentina. E-mail: mrabosi@utdt.edu.*

During the presidency of Juan Domingo Perón (1946–1955), Argentina implemented an open-admissions policy for all public universities. All aspirants holding a secondary degree were admitted. In addition, tuition was totally free. As a result of this free-for-all education, an enrollment explosion followed. Although both measures were suspended from time to time, particularly when a new Military Junta took power, the model was finally consolidated in 1984—determining the current dynamics of student flows today. Unsurprisingly, this open policy has had its dark side. Alarming attrition rates and a low number of graduates portray a public university that is both inefficient and ineffective.

## AN EASY-TO-ENTER MECHANISM

Today, 54 national universities enroll almost 1.4 million students (79.5% of total enrollment, by 2010); each university is free to determine its own admissions process. With different types of remedial courses shaped by the characteristics and needs of each institution, basically all aspirants carrying a secondary school diploma are admitted. In addition, tuition remains totally free at the undergraduate level. Thus, with this logic, candidates are not challenged to make their best effort, neither intellectually nor financially, to get place at the most prestigious national institutions. In other words, regardless of their academic performance candidates may enter any public institution and enroll in almost any desired field of study. However, this permissive admissions policy has serious consequences.

The heavy load of an open-admission model must be taken into account, since Argentina lacks a standard and common final examination for high school graduates to control for quality. This situation puts an extra pressure onto the system, particularly when the average high school student lacks the basic skills to succeed in higher education. According to the last Program for International Student Assessment, in 2009 Argentina ranked 58 among 65 countries, confirming that the gap in performance between the higher and lower achievers is one of the largest among participating nations. So it is not surprising that only a

small portion of students are able to complete their university education.

## AN INEFFICIENT AND INEFFECTIVE UNIVERSITY

On average, only 22 percent of all students at national institutions complete their degrees. In comparison, the private sector shows more efficient graduation rates (35%). Higher out-of-pocket and opportunity costs and better-organized program of studies in the private sector encourage students to complete their degrees within a shorter time. In the public sector, however, it is likely that violation of internal rules also contributes to the problem. Although the Higher Education Law of 1995 mandates that all students must complete at least two courses per year to maintain their enrollment status, in reality it is likely that 27 percent of the student body does not complete a single course during the academic year. This increases to 41 percent, based on those who took fewer than 2 courses during the period. Unsurprisingly, this “permissive university” allows Argentina to have the highest, gross-enrollment university rate in Latin America. On the other hand, the country graduates only 2.4 students per 1,000 inhabitants, well below more efficient systems in the region.

Although some public universities’ graduation rates are more comparable by international standards (where around 50% of freshmen complete their university education), others present alarmingly low-graduation rates. In effect, in more than one-third of all publics, drop-out rates are above 80 percent. In part, this uneven performance is most likely due to the fact that some institutions are more selective in the admission of students to more demanding careers. By distributing lower-achievers to less academically demanding programs, some universities have been able to reduce the number of dropouts. Also, some remedial courses have proven as efficient, especially in smaller classes, where a student has more contact with a tutor. Additionally, some public institutions are expanding the number of shorter programs, to increase the number of graduates. In this sense, they tend to behave as nonuniversity institutions in order to address the dropout dilemma.

## THE EFFICIENT NONUNIVERSITY AS PART OF THE SOLUTION

By contrast, a rising proportion of students now enroll in nonuniversity institutions, a phenomenon that has decreased the national drama of low graduation rates. These institutes offer two- and three-year programs in areas such as Web technology and technical education. Also, they are responsible for graduating more than 70 percent of all primary and secondary teachers. They have also proven to be more efficient than the national university.

These *institutos terciarios* (tertiary institutes) enroll 691,000 students, or 30 percent of all postsecondary en-



rollees, but produce almost the same number of graduates as the universities. When factoring in these institutions, Argentina is actually more effective in the production of human capital. The tertiary institutes effectively bring graduation in the Argentine higher education system up to par with neighboring countries.

The higher efficiency rate of the tertiary institutes rests on both academic and organizational factors. First, academic programs are shorter and require less previous academic preparation. Second, by offering smaller classes than universities, these institutes allow a closer interaction between students and professors. Also, tertiary institutions were conceived as an extension of secondary schools. In this sense, they offer a “friendlier environment,” and require fewer adjustments in order to succeed.

---

**Although the national university in Argentina prides itself on socially equitable admissions, it has also proven to be both inefficient (judged by high-attrition rates) and ineffective.**

---

#### CONCLUSION

Although the national university in Argentina prides itself on socially equitable admissions, it has also proven to be both inefficient (judged by high-attrition rates) and ineffective (low proportion of graduates in comparison to other countries in the region) in the production of human capital. Even without admissions requirements or tuition, there is in fact strong selectivity evident in the progression from first to subsequent years of most degree programs. If Argentina wants to truly achieve its objective of a postsecondary system that is socially just and equitable, higher education policy must be redefined. Beyond the urgent need for reform at the secondary level to better prepare students for postsecondary study, tertiary institutes and universities must act as complementary entities. The objective must be to achieve a better articulation between both types of institutions (currently almost nonexistent), helping less prepared students to make a smooth transition from secondary to tertiary education with more options. ■

---

## Central America: The Value of International Academic Cooperation

NANETTE SVENSON

*Nanette Svenson is an adjunct professor at Tulane University's Payson Center for International Development, New Orleans, Louisiana. E-mail: nanette.svenson@gmail.com.*

Central America, like many small developing regions, contributes little to worldwide research efforts. It accounts for less than 0.05 percent of global research and development and only 0.07 percent of all Science Citation Index publications. While this would seem to make Central American scientific and technological advances unworthy of study, quite the opposite is true as progress on this front will likely determine the extent of the region's development over the next decades.

Seven countries comprise this subcontinent lying between Mexico and Colombia: Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama. Each is different in many ways, but all fall into the “middle-income” World Bank category of developing countries. So, despite a 40 percent poverty rate, Central America is not poor enough to qualify for most donor aid. Neither is it large or rich enough to generate internally the scientific growth, required for propelling development. Interestingly, more than half of the world's economies fall into the same middling category—almost double the number in either the higher- or lower-income classifications. Thus, the circumstances facing Central America, particularly for participation in global scientific exploration, are not unique. International academic cooperation offers a powerful means of addressing this concern and bridging some of the existing gaps.

#### OBSTACLES

Central America faces numerous challenges to developing research capacity. Higher education enrollment has increased in recent years—thanks to a proliferation of private universities and various labor-market financial incentives—and now averages around 25 percent of the age cohort; however, completion rates are estimated at well below half of that. With the exception of Costa Rica, quality is also questionable. No Central American university appears in the international rankings; public investment in education is under the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's average 5 percent of gross domestic product; few professors hold advanced degrees; quality-assurance mechanisms are emerging but still underdeveloped;

and curricula are generally outdated, overly theoretical, and inapplicable to productive sector work.

Additionally, the region invests little in scientific research. Contrary to its industrialized counterparts, 70 percent of the investment is public, with little to no private support. This represents a considerable limitation, as governments struggle to budget for fundamental health and educational expenses—much less scientific and technological activity. Consequently, research is seen as a luxury, most policymakers are unformed about its potential returns, and Central America has among the lowest research and development investment rates worldwide. Institutionalization efforts are also lacking, which hinders scientific programming sustainability. Finally, the region operates principally in Spanish. This facilitates cooperation within Latin America, but impedes collaboration with North America, Europe, Oceania, and Asia, where the bulk of scientific exploration and publishing is happening.

---

**The region invests little in scientific research. Contrary to its industrialized counterparts, 70 percent of the investment is public, with little to no private support.**

---

Even with these obstacles, Central America does have something to offer the global scientific community. Its natural resources, indigenous tradition, and historical migratory importance—among other characteristics—make it a region to study. Its proximity to North America, relative political-economic stability, and literate human capital base also contribute to providing an operational platform. Leveraging these assets to bring education to the point of developing significant scientific capacity is the next step.

#### PROMISING INITIATIVES

International academic cooperation can do much to augment scientific research budgets and build capacity. In fact, international funding currently accounts for nearly 20 percent of Central America's scientific spending. One of the most promising areas in this regard is that of cross-border university- and research institute-led programs. A number of these have been established over the past several decades and are beginning to yield important dividends. This is especially true where collective synergies have been developed, around areas of common regional interest—such as, agriculture, environmental management, and health.

The Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education Center (CATIE) in Costa Rica is one such example. Established over 60 years ago through the Inter-American Institute of Cooperation on Agriculture and now supported by the World Bank and other international donors, CATIE is a regional research and education center, focused on agriculture and natural-resource management. It has graduated more than 2,000 students, operates over 100 research projects, employs professors and researchers from 25 countries, and publishes widely in Spanish and English.

Other examples, similar to CATIE, include the US Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute in Panama; the United Nations University for Peace in Costa Rica; the Pan-American Health Organization Institute of Nutrition for Central America and Panama in Guatemala; and the Latin American School of Social Sciences, supported by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, with programs throughout the region—including Costa Rica, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Panama. All of these initiatives create regional hubs for specialized knowledge generation, education, research, and innovation in areas critical to Central American development. To the extent they can draw on international scientific research capacity and funding, as well as incorporate regional actors and students, they will continue to advance opportunities for knowledge transfer.

---

**International academic cooperation can do much to augment scientific research budgets and build capacity.**

---

#### MOVING FORWARD

Central American governments, at both regional and national levels, must contribute to these efforts more consistently and effectively. Fortifying the national entities responsible for scientific innovation is essential, as is improving monitoring and evaluation methods for producing data on ongoing scientific activity. Costa Rica is farthest ahead with this, followed by Panama and Guatemala, but much remains to be done in all countries. More strategic targeting of specific scientific and technological capacities to be developed and the linking of development aims with scientific capacity building are important, too, for better identifying priorities and allocating resources.

Central American universities must also do more to further this process. Even with their limited resources,

alignment of graduate studies curricula with research methods that are more reflective of the Frascati principles, used elsewhere as the global benchmark, would represent a solid first step in this direction. Strengthening English-language skills would complement this effort. Both of these initiatives would better prepare faculty and students to seek out and participate in international research partnerships. Instigating more of the types of international academic cooperation programs, described above, would not only stimulate academic learning in the region but also give universities an added leverage with national governments for increasing research budgets.

Developing Central American scientific and technological capacity is a daunting task. Nevertheless, resources and models are available, and progress is being made in isolated areas. These advances should be nurtured and expanded. Better utilizing international scientific and technological capacity, to further regional development objectives, stands to benefit greatly the countries of Central America. It could also inspire middle-income countries facing similar challenges in other developing regions to do the same.

■

## Enrollment Competition, Accreditation, and the Private-Public Market in Mexico

JUAN CARLOS SILAS CASILLAS

*Juan Carlos Silas Casillas is a professor at ITESO, the Guadalajara Jesuit University, Mexico. E-mail: silasjc@iteso.mx.*

*IHE* publishes occasional articles from PROPHE, the Program for Research on Private Higher Education, headquartered at the University at Albany. See <http://www.albany.edu/>.

After decades in which Mexico experienced strong private growth and institutional diversification, the new century has brought even greater complexity. Changing patterns between and within the private and public higher education sectors have brought, among other things, intense market competitiveness in student recruitment.

Accreditation has assumed a rising role as a signal of institutional legitimacy, since it is carried out by independent agencies that highlight the cohesiveness of the programs or the solidness of the academic structure based on

preset processes. Accreditation is assumed as a synonym of quality.

The battle for market-share with its corresponding accreditation role, is being waged over a major range of the system—public and mid-profile private institutions. These institutions must fight for their enrollment applications under great pressure. This leaves mostly aside the elite institutions, which are always in great demand, attract the most privileged candidates, and have little need to further legitimize themselves. Also, “demand-absorbing” institutions, which simply depend on demand, continue to exceed good higher education supply; these institutions thus require little effort to recruit relative students. But the public and mid-profile private institutions that do have to fight for enrollment constitute the main part of the system. This enrollment comes mostly from the lower middle class, often first- or second-generation students, almost always with desires to join the job market at a high level. Both the private and public institutions are fighting mostly for this same pool of students.

This rather unexpected situation of intense competition seems to have resulted from two principal causes. One is the expanded quality-assurance effort by the Ministry of Education. As in other countries, concern has increased for decades about meeting minimum academic standards, amid sharply growing enrollment and both institutional and program proliferation. The government realizes that the market dynamics it favors require regulation. The other cause lies in the growth of customer-driven expectations. College goers and their families increasingly realize that they cannot simply depend on all institutions, providing learning experiences and degrees that work in the increasingly competitive job market. Accreditation is a logical response to the pressures from both government and prospective students.

### A BEWILDERING PANORAMA OF PROGRAMS

The rising consumer anxiety is exacerbated by a bewildering proliferation of programs. It is not just the number of programs but the impossibility of judging among so many that go under essentially similar names. A look at the data on enrollment and programs offered in many *licenciatura* (first-degree university) fields shows that the bulk of public and private institutions, in spite of the obvious differences in their funding and infrastructure, have similarities in their curriculum and recruitment. These programs tend to target the service sector of the economy with its pressing demand for university-trained graduates.

It may seem counterintuitive that public universities would fight for market share and make recruitment pitches on a jobs basis. After all, the traditional Mexican and Latin American notion was that public institutions would train

professionals in diverse areas of knowledge and, therefore, meet the needs of society and national development. Competition and advertising were not central to that conception. Why should public institutions waste their time creating attractive new names for traditional offerings and strive to showcase their programs as innovative in content and delivery mode? Much of the response stems from the intense challenge from the mid-profile private institutions. Public universities do not feature relaxed recipients of an unquestioning and eager pool of students. Established public institutions—such as, ITSON in the state of Sonora—place

---

**It may seem counterintuitive that public universities would fight for market share and make recruitment pitches on a jobs basis.**

---

newspaper ads; and the large state university in Jalisco—Universidad de Guadalajara—sets up information booths in shopping malls or “plazas.” It is not just private entrepreneurial institutions that give away “trinkets” at recruitment fairs or stands in shopping malls.

#### ACCREDITATION AND THE MARKET

Such program offerings and advertisements are overwhelming for many students and families. The avalanche of information is confusing for those who eagerly seek a rational basis for their choices. In this setting, families make decisions based on three elements (other than just location): (1) market image, brochures, media presence, and other marketing manifestations; (2) pricing, including schemes for special deals in monthly peso payments; and

(3) the use of accreditations as a sign of quality and an element of legitimation.

This third element seems crucial in the confusing scenario since the Ministry of Education has modified its role—from a provider of access to an evaluator who condemns low performance and rewards higher performance. The ministry has been targeting quality as its main goal and accreditation as the authentic way to prove quality has been achieved (or at least that the institution is striving for it). Public and mid-profile private institutions are understandably engaged in this “accreditation competition”—public universities in order to prove their continuing worth and private institutions to showcase themselves as reliable option. Elite institutions, focused on privileged students, also seek accreditation but not mainly for marketing strategies; demand-absorbing institutions do not (or cannot) make accreditation a major pursuit.

The role of accreditation seems to be crucial in the public and mid-profile private institutions—not only to achieve higher levels of performance but also showcasing themselves as legitimated by an external authority. But the accreditation process does not involve one clear route. Both institutions and programs can seek accreditation, from among many grantors: US accreditation agencies, the national federation of private institutions, the national association of universities, or a host of professional associations. They can seek it through different mixes of basic quality or salesmanship and persuasion, through copying accredited programs or innovation. What these institutions cannot do is to ignore the increased pressures in order to sell themselves in an increasingly competitive private-public marketplace. ■

---

### CRITICAL INTERNATIONAL NEWS AT A GLANCE ON FACEBOOK AND TWITTER

---

Do you have time to read more than 20 electronic bulletins weekly in order to stay up to date with international initiatives and trends? We thought not! So, as a service, the CIHE research team posts items from a broad range of international media to our Facebook and Twitter page.

You will find news items from the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Inside Higher Education*, *University World News*, *Times Higher Education*, the *Guardian Higher Education network UK*, the *Times of India*, the *Korea Times*, just to name a few. We also include pertinent items from blogs and other online resources. We will also announce international and comparative reports and relevant new publications.

Unlike most Facebook and Twitter sites, our pages are not about us, but rather “newsfeeds” updated daily with notic-

es most relevant to international educators and practitioners, policymakers, and decision makers. Think “news marquis” in Times Square in New York City. Here, at a glance, you can take in the information and perspective you need in a few minutes every morning.

To follow the news, press “Like” on our Facebook page at: <http://www.facebook.com/pages/Center-for-International-Higher-Education-CIHE/197777476903716>. “Follow” us on Twitter at: [https://twitter.com/#!/BC\\_CIHE](https://twitter.com/#!/BC_CIHE).

We hope you’ll also consider clicking “Like” on Facebook items you find most useful to help boost our presence in this arena. Please post your comments to encourage online discussion.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS

Adamson, Bob, Jon Nixon, and Feng Su, eds. *The Reorientation of Higher Education: Challenging the East-West Dichotomy*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Center, Univ. of Hong Kong, 2012. 324 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-988-1785-27-5. Web site: [www.fe.hku.hk/cerc](http://www.fe.hku.hk/cerc).

A potpourri of essays on aspects of higher education developments in a global context, this volume seeks to tie international trends to regional and local challenges. Among the themes discussed are the drivers of reform in higher education, dilemmas of reform in India, regional and global issues in the Hong Kong context, cultural aspects of Chinese higher education development, partnerships in Central Asia, and others.

Agarwal, Pawan, ed. *A Half-Century of Indian Higher Education: Essays by Philip G. Altbach*. New Delhi: Sage, 2012. 636 pp. INR995 (hb). ISBN 978-81-321-1048-4. Web site: [www.sagepublications.com](http://www.sagepublications.com).

This book includes a discussion of key issues in Indian higher education reflecting on the past half-century of developments. Among the themes discussed are student political activism, higher education reform, the politics of universities, the academic profession, language and higher education, knowledge distribution in the South Asian context, and others.

Albornoz, Orlando. *Competitividad y solidaridad: Las tendencias de la universidad contemporánea*. Caracas, Venezuela: Universidad Católica Cecilio Acosta, 560 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-980-405-001-5.

This publication—consisting of six chapters, a preface, a prologue, and an epilogue—provides a critical review of Venezuela's "Bolivarian revolution" and its conception of the role of higher education in society. The author criticizes, among other characteristics of contemporary higher education in Venezuela, the "academic populism" (an expression that Albornoz coined in 2005), which inspires many of the decisions that affect the system. He claims that despite the fact that Venezuela's Bolivarian (now Socialist) revolution tries to present

the concepts of competitiveness and solidarity as antagonistic, other socialist societies (i.e., China, which he examines in one of the chapters) have succeeded at harmonizing these two concepts to a significant extent. In this book, Albornoz offers a sociological overview of such topics as the future of Venezuelan higher education, the role of education, ideology, and religion in the political conflict; the possibilities and limits of higher education systems to effect change; and whether Venezuela can and should try to build a world-class university. (Iván F. Pacheco)

Altbach, Philip G., Gregory Androushchak, Yaroslav Kuzminov, Maria Yudkevich, and Liz Reisberg, eds. *The Global Future of Higher Education and the Academic Profession: The BRICs and the United States*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2013. 206 pp. \$85 (hb). ISBN: 978-0-230-36978-8. Web site: [www.palgrave.com](http://www.palgrave.com).

The book focuses mainly on the academic profession in the BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, China) countries and the United States. Careers paths, salaries, and the role of the academic in the broader higher education system are discussed. An introductory chapter compares the BRIC countries and comments on specific strengths and weaknesses among them.

Anderson, Melissa S., and Nicholas H. Steineck, eds. *International Research Collaborations: Much to be Gained, Many Ways to Get in Trouble*. New York: Routledge, 2011. 296 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-415-53032-3. Web site: [www.routledge.com](http://www.routledge.com).

This book provides a collection of thoughtful essays relating to the possibilities and, especially, the problems of international research collaboration. Among the topics considered are national variations in the organization of scientific research, research integrity in an international context, the impact of US law on international research projects, differences in doctoral education, and related themes.

Arkoudis, Sophie, Chi Baik, and Sara Richardson. *English Language Standards in High-*

*er Education*. Camberwell, Vic., Australia: ACER Press, 2012. 186 pp. \$44.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-74286-064-0. Web site: [www.aceroress.cin.au](http://www.aceroress.cin.au).

Recognizing that English is the key international language of higher education, this book provides a practical guide to the use of English in varied global academic environments. Among the themes discussed are models for English-language programs, curriculum design and assessment of English programs, English proficiency and workplace readiness, and others.

Ashcroft, Kate, and Philip Rayner. *Higher Education in Development: Lessons from Sub-Saharan Africa*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishers, 2011. 286 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-41735-541-7. Web site: [www.infoagepub.com](http://www.infoagepub.com).

The focus of this volume is how to improve universities in the sub-Saharan African region. The higher education context in Africa is discussed. Additional chapters consider curriculum development, quality and standards, teaching and learning, research, student services, and other themes. Short case studies relating to these themes illustrate the broader points.

Bastedo, Michael N., ed. *The Organization of Higher Education: Managing Colleges for New Era*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2012. 366 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-1-4214-0448-6. Web site: [www.press.jhu.edu](http://www.press.jhu.edu).

A collection of essays that focuses broadly on the organization of higher education, this volume mainly concerns the United States. The book analyzes the trends in research on higher education organization and discusses such themes as diversity, rankings, social movements and the university, institutional strategy, agency theory and organization, and others.

Cooper, David. *The University in Development: Case Studies of Use-Oriented Research*. Cape Town: Human Sciences Press, 2011. 390 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-7969-2347-9. Web site: [www.hsrcpress.ac.za](http://www.hsrcpress.ac.za).

The first part of this book discusses the international patterns of research for de-



velopment and university-industry collaboration. The second part focuses on South Africa and provides case studies of several universities and laboratories, to illustrate how universities participate in the development process. A careful analysis of problems is provided.

Deardorf, Darla, Hans de Wit, John D. Heyl, and Tony Adams, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education*. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2012. 536 pp. (hb). \$125. Web site: [www.sagepub.com](http://www.sagepub.com).

This prominent volume serves as a critical international higher education resource for scholars, administrators, policy-makers, and students. The handbook offers comprehensive coverage of this expansive and evergrowing field, including an historic overview, current trends and approaches to student and scholar mobility, innovative approaches to cross-border engagement and partnerships, and efforts to internationalize teaching and learning. Leading experts from around the world offer insights into internationalization trends within the US higher education context and across the globe. This volume provides a valuable conceptual background, practical guidance for building strategic responses, and a glimpse into what is next for international higher education. (David A. Stanfield and Yukiko Shimmi)

Fegel, Daniel Mark, and Elizabeth Mlson-Huddle, eds. *Precipice or Crossroads? Where America's Great Public Universities Stand and Where They are Going*. Albany, NY: State Univ. of New York Press, 2012. 318 pp. \$24.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4384-4492-5. Web site: [www.sunypress.edu](http://www.sunypress.edu).

Marking the 200th anniversary of the Morrill Act, the law that created the Land Grant universities in the United States, this volume reflects on the current challenges and future prospects of America's public universities. Among the themes discussed in the chapters are the land-grant heritage and its meaning today, enhancing the public purpose and outcomes of public higher education, public funding and tuition costs, statewide university systems and the land

grant idea, and the future promise of public research universities. Among the authors are presidents of key public research universities.

Kelly, Andrew P., and Mark Schneider, eds. *Getting to Graduation: The Completion Agenda in Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2012. 335 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-1-4214-0622-0. Web site: [www.press.jhu.edu](http://www.press.jhu.edu).

Degree completion is one of the most controversial themes in American higher education. This volume discusses that broad topic from a range of perspectives. Among the foci are challenges for increasing degree attainment, financial aid and degree attainment, apprenticeships and degree completion, the role of community colleges, certificate programs, remediation and degree completion, and others. This volume is perhaps the most comprehensive overview of this topic.

Koscielniak, Cezary, and Jaroslaw Makowski, eds. *Freedom, Equality, University*. Warsaw, Poland: Civil Institute, 2012. 296 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-83-933794-4-6.

Focusing on key challenges facing European universities, this volume features several chapters broadly considering access issues, student activism and civil disobedience, the market and democracy, and several others. These chapters are accompanied by national cases focusing largely on policy change in Russia, England, Finland, Germany, and Italy.

Kwiek, Marek. *Knowledge Production in European Universities: States, Markets, and Academic Entrepreneurialism*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang, 2013. 486 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-3-631-62403-6. Web site: [www.peterlang.de](http://www.peterlang.de).

An analysis of the interrelationships between the state and higher education in a variety of European contexts, this volume features discussions of the expanding private sector, changing ideas of the social contract and higher education in European countries, the university and the welfare state, knowledge exchange, and aspects of

academic entrepreneurialism.

Kwiek, Marek, and Peter Maassen, eds. *National Higher Education Reforms in a European Context: Comparative Reflections on Poland and Norway*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang, 2012. 242 pp. (hb). ISBN 978-3-631-63808-8. Web site: [www.peterlang.de](http://www.peterlang.de).

The focus of this book is on developments in what the editors call the "European periphery," in this case Poland and Norway. These two countries are situated in the broader European context by the book's editors. Other chapters examine public-private dynamics in Poland, qualifications frameworks in both countries, Europeanization in the two countries, and others.

Lane, Jason E., and D. Bruce Johnstone, eds. *Universities and Colleges as Economic Drivers: Measuring Higher Education's Role in Economic Development*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2012. 316 pp. \$24.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-4384-4500-7. Web site: [www.sunypress.edu](http://www.sunypress.edu).

Focusing mainly on the role of American higher education in economic development, this volume discusses higher education and economic competitiveness, problems in assessing higher education's economic contribution, and similar themes. Attention is paid to higher education and the labor market and the role of community colleges, in economic development.

Levin, John S., and Susan T. Kater, eds. *Understanding Community Colleges*. New York: Routledge, 2013. 263 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-415-88127-2. Web site: [www.routledge.com](http://www.routledge.com).

A multifaceted discussion of key themes concerning American community colleges, this volume focuses on such topics as the history of community colleges, adult student development, teaching academic underprepared students, management and leadership in community colleges, economic and workforce development, state fiscal support, and others.

Mack, Arien, ed. *The Future of Higher Education*. Theme issue of *Social Research* 79 (Fall, 2012): 551-784. \$18 (pb). ISBN 978-1-

93348130-2.

This collection of essays focuses on the global future of higher education, including themes on road-mapping university development and restructuring research universities. Among the topics of specific essays are the financial future of research universities, future prospects for China's universities, outcomes and testing, trends in Europe and Latin America, and several others.

O'Hara, Sabine, ed. *Higher Education in Africa: Equity, Access, Opportunity*. New York: Institute of International Education, 2010. 162 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-87206-34-1. Web site: [www.iiebooks.org](http://www.iiebooks.org).

This book provides a selection of essays on themes relating to African higher education, topics include improving access in Africa, making higher education a public and social good, private financing, gender inequalities, and several chapters in disabilities as they relate to higher education.

Palmer, John D., Amy Roberts, Young Ha Cho, and Gregory S. Ching, eds. *The Internationalization of East Asian Higher Education*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2011. 230 pp. \$85 (hb). ISBN 978-0-23010-932-2. Web site: [www.palgrave.com](http://www.palgrave.com).

The broad theme of internationalization in an East Asian context is considered in this volume. Contributions consider a comparison of higher education hubs in Hong Kong and Singapore, internationalization and Americanization in a Korean context, issues in internationalization of a Chinese regional university, English and internationalization in Japan and Korea, and others.

St. John, Edward P., Nathan Daun-Barnett, and Karen M. Moronski-Chapman. *Public Policy and Higher Education: Reframing Strategies for Preparation, Access, and College Success*. New York: Routledge, 2013. 321 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-415-89356-5. Web site: [www.routledge.com](http://www.routledge.com).

A volume in a new book series on "Core concepts in higher education" aimed at providing overview volumes for use in higher education courses in the United States; this

text-oriented volume features case studies and learning exercises. It discusses specific aspects of the American policy debate related to access and college success rather than a broad array of policy issues. The national policy discourse is featured as well as case studies focusing on state-level experiences.

Shattock, Michael. *Making Policy in British Higher Education, 1945–2011*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press, 2012. 280 pp. £37.99 (pb). ISBN 978-0-335-24186-6. Web site: [www.open.co.uk](http://www.open.co.uk).

This book is a classic account of the development of British higher education policy over more than a half-century of changing perspectives and the advent of mass higher education that permanently changed the nature of postsecondary education. Structures, financial issues, politics, the move to accountability, and the changing political winds in the United Kingdom are interwoven in this sophisticated analysis.

Tight, Malcolm. *Researching Higher Education* (Second edition). Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press, 2012. 278 pp. (pb). ISBN 978-0-33524183-9. Web site: [www.open.co.uk](http://www.open.co.uk).

This is a comprehensive guide to researching higher education issues with a largely British focus. This volume discusses the current literature on the field including the most important books and journals available, key issues for research (such as student experience, quality, system development, academic work, and others), and the process of doing research including various methodological approaches.

Trower, Cathy Ann. *Success on the Tenure Track: Five Keys to Faculty Job Satisfaction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2012. 270 pp. \$45 (hb). ISBN 978-1-4214-0597-1. Web site: [www.press.jhu.edu](http://www.press.jhu.edu).

Based on data collected by the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education, a project based at Harvard University and including a range of American universities, this volume reports on quantitative and qualitative research relating to early career development. Among the themes discussed

are the challenges of tenure, work-life integration, support for teaching and research, collegiality and campus community, and others.

Vande Berg, Michael, R. Michael Paige, and Kris Hemming Lou, eds. *Student Learning Abroad: What Our Students are Learning, What They're Not, and What We Can Do About It*. Herndon, VA: Stylus, 2012. 454 pp. \$39.95 (pb). ISBN 978-1-57922-714-2. Web site: [www.Styluspub.com](http://www.Styluspub.com).

Focusing mainly on American students who study abroad, this volume discusses a range of themes relating to study abroad, with a special interest in student learning abroad. Among the themes discussed are maximizing the study-abroad experience for students, cross-cultural learning, creating communities, teaching and learning in the study-abroad context, intercultural communications, and other.

Wang, Qi, Ying Cheng, and Nian Cai Liu, eds. *Building World-Class Universities: Different Approaches to a Shared Goal*. Rotterdam, Netherlands, 2012. 216 pp. \$49 (pb). ISBN 978-9462-09-032-3. Web site: [www.sense-publishers.com](http://www.sense-publishers.com).

Stemming from the 4th World Class Universities conference in Shanghai in 2011, the chapters in this book focus on a range of perspectives relating to the development of research universities and the broader theme of world-class status. Among the topics considered are different roads to world-class status, rankings and classifications, Asia's top-tier researchers, the role of the Web in world-class status, and others. Case studies from Russia, Saudi Arabia, Taiwan, and the Netherlands are included.

## NEWS OF THE CENTER

The most recent product of the Center's ongoing collaboration with the Laboratory of Institutional Analysis, at the National Research University-Higher School of Economics in Moscow, was published in February—Philip G. Altbach, Gregory Androushchak, Yaroslav Kuzminov, Maria Yudkevich, and Liz Reisberg, eds., *The Global Future of Higher Education and the Academic Profession: The BRICs and the United States* (New York: Palgrave-Macmillan 2013). English and Russian editions will be available. *American Higher Education in the 21st Century*, coedited by Philip G. Altbach, Robert O. Berdahl, and Patricia J. Gumpert, has been published in a Spanish language edition by the University of Palermo in Argentina. *Paying the Professoriate*, coedited by Philip G. Altbach, Liz Reisberg, Maria Yudkevich, Gregory Androushchak, and Iván F. Pacheco, has been published in a Russian-language edition by the National Research University-Higher School of Economics in Moscow, and will soon appear in Chinese from the Shanghai Jiao Tong University Press. *Leadership for World-Class Universities*, edited by Philip G. Altbach, has been published in Chinese by the Renmin University Press, Beijing. A Spanish edition will be published, in August, by the University of Palermo in Argentina.

The Center, with the cosponsorship of the Graduate School of Education at the Shanghai Jiao Tong University and the support of the Innovation, Higher Education and Research for Development program of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, is organizing an invitational conference of the directors of selected centers for higher education around the world in Shanghai in November 2013—to take place at the time of the World Class University (WCU-5) conference in Shanghai.

The Center is collaborating with Reisberg & Associates on an innovative leadership seminar for Princess Nora bint Abdul Rahman University in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, the largest women's university in the world. The seminar will take place in Riyadh in April. A group of six women, higher education leaders from the United States will work with counterparts in Riyadh.

Center director Philip G. Altbach and former research associate Liz Reisberg continue to serve on the planning committee of the annual Riyadh higher education conference. Philip G. Altbach travels to Moscow in May to participate in a meeting of the International Advisory Committee of the National Research University-Higher School of Economics. He will also participate in a leadership training seminar at the University of Hong Kong. Center associate director Laura E. Rumbley has been appointed to the publications committee of the European Association for International Education. She recently presented at the annual conference of the Association for International Higher Education in New Orleans.

The third installment in the *International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders* series, which the Center is coproducing with the American Council on Education (ACE), will be released in April. This new edition is titled "India: The Next Frontier." A complementary webinar will be hosted by ACE on April 25, 2013, with information to be available here: <http://bit.ly/QOYVaL>.

Join the American Council on Education (ACE) and CIHE for an upcoming webinar:

*India: The Next Frontier*  
Thursday, April 25, 2013  
2:00–3:30 pm EDT

Expert panelists will discuss the Indian higher education system, and opportunities for US institutions to establish partnerships and work effectively with Indian counterparts. Participants will receive a printed brief featuring 12 related

articles prior to the webinar, and will have the opportunity to pose questions to the panelists.

This webinar and *Brief* are part of the "International Briefs for Higher Education Leaders" series co-sponsored by ACE and CIHE.

Contact the American Council on Education's Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement for more information about webinar registration: [cige@acenet.edu](mailto:cige@acenet.edu).



Center for International Higher Education  
Boston College  
Campion Hall  
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467-3813  
USA

PRESORTED  
FIRST-CLASS MAIL  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
N. READING MA  
PERMIT 258

### 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](mailto:arnoldk@bc.edu)) or visit our Web site: <http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/>.

**OPINIONS EXPRESSED HERE DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEWS OF THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION.**

### EDITOR

Philip G. Altbach

### PUBLICATIONS EDITOR

Edith S. Hoshino

### EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

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](mailto: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](mailto:highered@bc.edu), including your position (graduate student, professor, administrator, policymaker, etc.), and area of interest or expertise. There is no charge for a subscription.*

ISSN: 1084-0613  
©Center for International  
Higher Education