

INTRODUCTION

Peter T. Manicas and Jaishree K. Odin

THE PRESENT VOLUME had its genesis in a conference entitled “Globalization and Higher Education,” held in Honolulu in February 2002 and sponsored by the Globalization Research Center at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. There were a number of novelties to this conference that bear on the contents of the volume. We think that these novelties make this a very different and important book. Of course, readers will determine how different and how important.

First, there was a very deliberate effort to bring together for three intense days people who could offer very different perspectives on the nest of problems generated by joining the already complex ideas of globalization and higher education. The authors of the essays in the present volume do indeed come from very different places, both in terms of geographical location (Australia, Britain, China, Costa Rica, Germany, Hong Kong, Kashmir, Pakistan, and the United States) and in terms of their institutional positions in higher education, as either active players or as scholars or both. Thus, we invited not only academics from several disciplines, but entrepreneurs, those who had served as deans in several very different kinds of institutions of higher education, and a past president of a prominent eastern university. (See List of Contributors.) These many different voices give this volume an inclusiveness and comprehensiveness not attempted before.

The second novelty was that the conference would be “dialogic.” With the particular angle of vision of each participant in mind, the organizer asked the participants to speak from their position to issues that had been the primary area of concern and expertise, but not to present a paper. Instead, they would offer the group their reflections on how they saw things. This would be followed by moderated conversation—a dialogue. This gave us ample opportunity to explore issues, to

raise questions, to offer dissent, to learn. It was not long before we had congealed a kind of a community. Given the chance to understand one another, we were forced to rethink things, perhaps even to change our minds. This gives the volume an integrity that, given the very different orientations of the participants, would not otherwise have been possible.

There was also a danger in this process: it wasn't easy to stay on track. We knew at the outset that the problems were interconnected, but did not appreciate how profoundly interconnected they were. Indeed, not only are both the leading concepts, globalization and higher education, complex, but trying to identify the causes and connections between them was forbidding, contestable, and conjectural. The essays in this volume give ample evidence of this.

We also decided that after we had all dispersed across the globe to our home bases, we would keep the conversation going asynchronously. A web site was established for electronic conferencing. Not everyone was equally comfortable with this mode of conversation. That was to be expected. But even our Danforth Award teacher and powerful defender of face-to-face teaching and learning made his appearance!

Despite differing perspectives, we found a common discourse. Indeed, gradually, there emerged considerable consensus on a number of key ideas. To be sure, there were some very wide disagreements, especially as regards *explaining* what we could agree to, and partly as a consequence of these differing views, there were disagreements about alternative versions of the future of higher education.

For convenience, we offer some of the consensus ideas, beginning with some hard lessons learned during the course of our conversation (but not always noticed by standard accounts).

We had no trouble agreeing that postsecondary education is now a massive globalizing industry and it is perhaps impossible to overestimate its potential. Asia alone offers fantastic possibilities. It is projected that by 2010 there will be 100 million people in the world, all fully qualified to proceed from secondary to tertiary education, but there will be no room left on any campus. A recent study by Merrill Lynch reported that the higher education market outside the United States is worth \$111 billion annually, with perhaps 32 million potential students (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 28, 2002). To be sure, this raises more questions than it answers, especially regarding the possible consequences for the future of higher education.

The presence of participants from so many different locations forced us to see that there is a huge risk of overgeneralization when we speak of higher education. First, even if one restricts one's sight to higher education in the United States, it is an error to think of higher education in terms of the University of Michigan or Ohio Wesleyan. This overlooks the huge differences in the character and goals of the institutions of higher education: public/private, research I universities/liberal arts colleges, four-year colleges/community colleges, non-profit/for-profit, proprietary schools (which offer training in trades and regulated industries, e.g., auto-mechanics, tourism), online universities, corporate universities (e.g., Sun Microsystems University, the University of Toyota) and finally, "diploma mills," digital and otherwise (see Ruch, Thomas, Delanty, Wagner).

Worse, it is easy to slip into the assumption—not always noticed, even by participants in a conference on globalization—that arrangements in higher education globally are largely the same as arrangements found in the United States. This is anything but the case. Differences in the histories and political economies of the nations of the world have resulted in differences in the situation of higher education across the globe. (See especially essays by Wagner, Currie, Inayatullah, Su Hao, Garnier, and Delanty.) This regards not only questions of access, funding, organization, programs, and institutional variety, but questions of needs and goals as well.

To take but one important example, globally there are remarkable disparities in the sources of funding for institutions of higher education. Although the situation is made especially complex by differences in institutions and recent figures are difficult to come by, European institutions of higher education still get the majority of support, as much as 90 percent, from public funds (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997). In the United States, state support peaked in 1979 at 62 percent and has declined steadily ever since. At the beginning of its most recent spiral, in 1991, it was 40 percent. "We used to be state-supported, then we became state-assisted, and now we are state-located." Other chief executive officers talk about leading "privately financed public universities." Currently, in the United States, both private and public institutions draw the majority of their support from nonstate sources, including tuitions, research grants, and gifts (Duderstadt, 2000). On the other hand, there is evidence that the trends clearly visible in the United

States toward privatization are visible elsewhere as well. Thus Garnier (below) argues that in 1930, private universities accounted for only 3 percent of enrollment in Latin America; today, they might account for almost half. As he notes, this is particularly troubling given the explosion of “garage universities,” charging high tariffs and offering very low-quality programs.

But given differences in the situations of American, European, Latin American, Australian, and Asian colleges and universities (with differences among these as well), the public university is currently the dominant form of higher education globally. With nearly one-quarter of its institutions of higher education private, the United States is nearly unique. (Only Japan compares.) Nonetheless, in the United States, public institutions enroll some two-thirds of all college students, or some 5.8 million, in four-year institutions. Two-year public colleges add 11.1 million students, or taken together with the four-year institutions, over 80 percent of the total (Duderstadt, 2000). But of course all this could easily change.

Similarly, while it is clear that globalization is a real phenomenon and is not to be taken lightly, it is easy to fail to acknowledge its complex and multidimensional character (Wagner, Currie, Delanty, and Inayatullah). Accordingly, globalization will have different consequences for different institutions of higher education within a nation. And because of differences in the histories and political economies of the nations of the world, the consequences of globalization will likely be very different between the world’s nations. This is brought out quite forcefully by comparing, for example, the accounts of Currie, Su Hao, and Garnier.

Although the evidence comes mainly from students in American institutions of higher education, student attitudes toward and expectations of postsecondary education are increasingly oriented toward career advancement and economic return. (See especially Ruch, Thomas.) This observation joins with another. While there is no doubt that higher education is changing rapidly, there is an unfortunate tendency to think nostalgically in terms of the “ideal” university as a place where students and faculty collaborate in face-to-face teaching/learning and where the goal is the emancipation of the human spirit. But not only was it the case that this ideal was rarely realized, but historically, it was the condition of only a privileged few. Moreover, there were always alternatives to the traditional college and university, sustained, as seems likely, by

responding to needs unmet by this model. Of course, this raises questions regarding the uses and relation of markets to institutions of higher education (Ruch, Karelis, Smith).

For reasons that are not entirely clear, perhaps an aspect of globalization and perhaps not, there has been the rapid and surprising growth in recent years of degree-granting, for-profit colleges and universities, not only but perhaps especially in the United States. In 1991, there was one for-profit, degree-granting, accredited institution listed on U.S. stock exchanges, DeVry, Inc. By 1999, there were forty (Ruch). Generating some \$16.5 billion in revenues, growth of for-profit revenues increased by 20 percent in 2001 over the previous year. (As Ruch points out, the essential difference between private nonprofits and for-profits is not that nonprofits do not seek “profit,” but that their tax liability differs both as a source of revenue and as a form of expenditure.) More generally, institutions of higher education are increasingly engaged in what Max Weber termed “rationalization”—“privatizing,” adopting business-like strategies, “managerialism” (Currie), with an eye toward cost-saving, for example, replacing retiring tenured faculty with adjuncts (who now comprise some 42 percent of teaching faculty), and marketing in a competitive search for students who are “consumers.” (See Margolis.)

Finally, with the use of Internet technologies, distance education has taken on new meaning as “the virtual university.” Thus, as of November 2002, Phoenix University Online had a staff of some 1,700 with some 7,000 faculty—mostly part-time, teaching some 49,400 students. Phoenix reported a net income of \$64.3 million for the year 2001 (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 1, 2002). Universitas 21, an international consortium of seventeen universities from Asia, Australia, Europe, and North America, will offer wholly online degrees, beginning with an MBA to be offered in Asia in 2003. Nevertheless, at least the majority of our participants would agree that the traditional university is not going to disappear even if it changes its character and/or becomes increasingly less important.

But the hard questions remain. What does it all mean? While not all of the following essays address all the hard questions, most have a view, be it implicit or explicit.

1. First is the question of capitalism, globally considered. Given differences in the understanding of global capitalism, all would grant

that it is a critical “mechanism” (or complex of mechanisms), but disagree as to what it explains. Do the processes of global capitalism fundamentally challenge the inherited forms of the university? Scholars fiercely debate the challenge of neo-liberalism, and whether the traditional university will become marginalized. (For some different views, see especially Currie, Margolis, Garnier, and Delanty.) Second, as part of this, there is disagreement regarding the role of the state, in terms of both its fiscal capacities and its direct and indirect roles in shaping the institutions of higher education, including its role in defining the tasks of higher education (Currie, Garnier, Hao, Wagner).

2. Related to the foregoing are questions of the use and nature of markets as regards higher education. While our participants would agree that the market/state polarity is at best an often misleading oversimplification, how should they be conceived and how are they related (Wagner, Smith, Ruch)? In what sense are students *not* consumers? In what sense, alternatively, can the university be transformer of value systems (Karelis, Thomas, Garnier, Delanty)?
3. The role of technology is unclear. Our contributors reject a technological determinism, but differ, sometimes subtly, regarding how technology figures, or should figure, in these outcomes. Odin notes that faculty are anything but enthusiastic about the use of the new technologies, even as supplements to their teaching, and our group acknowledged that a very solid case can be made for their appropriate use and that their capacities are by no means fully explored. But if it be granted that not all uses of the technologies are pedagogically sound, what is the appropriate pedagogy for the new technologies and what are its limits? For example, are there technological solutions to increasing access? How do we involve faculty in their use (Odin, Margolis, Delanty)?
4. A series of questions concerns the mission and goals of higher education, from an inherited ideal of *Bildung*, to the search for and dissemination of knowledge, to a concept emphasizing instrumental values, to its role in national and economic development, to a future-oriented idea of providing “institutional spaces where cognitive models for society to learn can emerge,” to a view that holds that higher education is and should be all of these. But if so, how is

- this to be accomplished? Who should determine this (Karelis, Abeles, Bowen-James, Inayatullah, Smith, Delanty)?
5. The foregoing raises deeper questions regarding the very idea of knowledge, including the provocative contrast between what Bowen-James and Abeles call “just-in-time” versus “just-in-case” knowledge, the distinction—increasingly difficult to draw—between “teaching” and “training,” the differences, overlapping with these, between knowing in the theoretical mode, knowing in the practical mode, and knowing as an essentially reflective process, and, finally, the view that there are alternative ways of knowing (Odin, Abeles, Delanty, Garnier, Inayatullah).
 6. Another series of problems regards questions of justice, including questions of access and inequality. Thus, if widening participation is an over-riding good, should this be conceived in terms of the realization of human capacities, of attaining employment skills, including credentials for personal success, or in terms of efficiently realizing national goals, including the development of managerial, scientific, and technical knowledge? Or perhaps these are not disconnected? What changes in our current institutional arrangements are necessary (Karelis, McDermott, Thomas, Su Hao, Bowen-James, Abeles, Garnier, Delanty)?

This volume aims to energize readers to rethink higher education. In what was the third main novelty of this book, the authors have tried to be provocative and plain-spoken—not an easy thing for persons socialized in the university. And consistent with our efforts to communicate, they have foregone the usual academic apparatus of footnoting references. A bibliography of works drawn on by our participants is appended following each essay, along with an end-of-book annotated bibliography of works pertinent to the themes of our volume.

REFERENCES

- Duderstadt, James J. (2000). *A University for the 21st Century*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Slaughter, Sheila, and Larry L. Leslie. (1997). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

