

11-1-2011

David Palfreyman and Ted Tapper. Structuring Mass Higher Education: The Role of Elite Institutions. New York: Routledge Press. 2009.

Ryan Guffey Ph.D.
Lindenwood University, rguffey@lindenwood.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/jigs>



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#), [Critical and Cultural Studies Commons](#), [Environmental Studies Commons](#), and the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Guffey, Ryan Ph.D. (2011) "David Palfreyman and Ted Tapper. Structuring Mass Higher Education: The Role of Elite Institutions. New York: Routledge Press. 2009.," *Journal of International and Global Studies*: Vol. 3 : No. 1 , Article 12.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/jigs/vol3/iss1/12>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of International and Global Studies by an authorized editor of Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. For more information, please contact phuffman@lindenwood.edu.

David Palfreyman and Ted Tapper. *Structuring Mass Higher Education: The Role of Elite Institutions*. New York: Routledge Press. 2009.

Part of the excellent Oxford International Studies in Higher Education Series, *Structuring Mass Higher Education: The Role of Elite Institutions* consists of an introduction followed by two parts: Structural Change in Systems of Higher Education (Chapters 2-11) and Elite Institutions in the Age of Mass Higher Education (Chapters 12-18). In each part, experts in international higher education aptly identify and address the history, nature, and cause of (1) country-specific educational “massification” issues and (2) the relationship between elite institutions and students, interest groups, and national governments. While one might assume that the brevity of a 265 page book, spread across 18 sections, could not adequately address or account for the complexity of the nature of higher education systems worldwide, this book does tackle both broad and granular issues in higher education and highlights the researchers’ perspectives on such issues. Specific cases in the United States (U.S.), the United Kingdom (U.K.), the Nordic region, Latin America, Germany, South Africa, China, Netherlands, Poland, France, Australia, and Japan are addressed.

Consistent throughout the sections, and across the globe, is the perception that national governments are continuing to ratchet up the “arms race” of educational exclusivity. As the value of a nation’s education system increasingly becomes a reflection of its governmental strength and commitment to its citizens, countries are consuming vast resources in an attempt to ensure that their educational systems ascend to or maintain their status in the top echelons of the “world-class” educational rankings. However, this growth of mass higher education has many universities reconsidering their roles within their domestic and international settings, and the proliferation of higher education institutions has invariably changed the higher education landscape and, to some degree, acceptable norms within the field. Traditional notions regarding the relationships between students and instructors, researchers and funding organizations, fundraisers and donors, lobbyist and policy makers, tax payers and the government, parents and the institutions, among others, have been challenged.

This book makes significant use of comparative methodology to explore the impact of mass education on national systems of higher education and the strategies “elite” universities have employed in order to retain their national and international status. Several significant research questions emerge from the manuscript, including whether there is a space for structuring higher education on a global level; whether there are particular bonds that tie various institutions and groupings of institutions together; whether domestic institutions and/or systems can adequately respond to the external pressures of globalization and internationalization in light of national norms, cultural heritage, and current events; what it means to have access and quality in a global context; what the role of research universities is within mass systems; and who and what the change agents or agencies are within systems of higher education.

In the introduction, *Structuring Mass Higher Education: Interpreting the Process of Change*, the two editors, David Palfreyman and Ted Tapper, illustrate the nature and scope of the higher-education “arms race,” particularly with respect to the range of worldwide agents and interests involved. Tapper and Palfreyman go on to argue that “we have been seduced by the implicit assumption that there is a universal trajectory” for all education systems despite the structural inability to facilitate this conception (2009, p.3). They elucidate the crux of the problem by referencing Trow’s (1973) evolutionary classification of the contemporary higher

education models: elite, mass, and universal. Tapper and Palfreyman argue that in many parts of the world, national governments attempt to achieve or maintain status within the framework of one of these three models, depending upon prevailing national and international perception of and public need for the countries' higher educational institutions. The authors illustrate how top-tier institutions typically receive the majority of government research grants and are thereby elevated or preserved within "world-class" rankings. To some degree, this international race for educational preeminence has brought "elite" institutions (and the governments that support them) into an environment in which they are susceptible to influences outside their control (i.e., market forces, on and off-campus historical and cultural norms, shifts in national and international education trends, political/governmental transitions, and more). These forces become the main discussion points for this volume.

James Fairweather, in chapter two, *U.S. Higher Education: Contemporary Challenges, Policy Options*, begins by framing the historical approach to comparative higher education. As Fairweather (2009) indicates, "Much of comparative higher education focuses on the differences between national systems, particularly the historical and cultural milieu unique to each country" (p.13). However, Fairweather believes this approach is dated, as higher education continues to become increasingly internationalized.

Every nation is trying to educate more of its citizens, not fewer of them. Every nation is trying to figure out how to pay for higher education, including how much it should cost and who should pay for it. Increasingly, national systems share the goal of preparing citizens for participation in a global economy, not just a local or regional one. How to cope with and incorporate technology in instruction, meet the needs of increasingly diverse students, and maintain quality while expanding access are also goals shared by many, perhaps most, nations. (p.13)

To facilitate a common understanding of higher education policy issues, Fairweather uses the case of the United States to establish a baseline among higher education systems worldwide. He explains many of the defining characteristics of the U.S. educational system, such as the U.S.'s lack of an autocratic Ministry of Education; the mixing of federal and state governing authority over educational institutions; the voluntary cooperation of schools with various accrediting agencies; the market responsiveness of educational institutions; the size and variety of educational institutions available to students; the shared academic structures (of credit hours and grade point averages) among U.S. educational institutions; the emerging national labor market for students; the faculties and staffs of educational institutions; the sharing of tuition payment between students, their parents, and universities (within work study programs, for example); and the historical blending of educational traditions from abroad (e.g., the liberal arts tradition from the U.K. and the research and graduate school tradition from Germany) that typifies the modern U.S. educational system. He goes on to identify several educational policy challenges within the U.S., including those that affect the affordability of and access to education, student diversity and changing demographics, and globalization and economic developments. However, his ultimately favorable assessment of the U.S. higher education system fundamentally rests on the notion that demand-driven adaptability has generated both (1) a proliferation of educational options for students (e.g. among institutions and institutional types)

and (2) strong state-wide educational systems—and that these are good things. These options, the author says, have facilitated an environment in which nearly every student can find a suitable educational experience.

In *Structural Changes in Higher Education: The Case of the United Kingdom*, the third chapter, Peter Scott examines the structural pressures for educational “massification” and how such pressures are formed. The term “massification,” like that of “globalization,” often engenders opposing (although not entirely conflicting) views on the location(s) that generate(s) the global power currents responsible for precipitating the phenomena. In this case, with respect to the “massification” of education, Scott believes that too much attention has been focused on “endogenous factors” within higher education and that not enough attention has been paid to the role of external dynamics (i.e., political change, shifts in economic and occupational compositions, and major cultural/societal transformations). “As a result,” he says, “structural changes in higher education have often been seen in isolation, as self-willed reforms, rather than as responses to the wider currents of individualization, new patterns of production and consumption and new knowledge structures” (p. 35). To reinforce his argument, Scott uses the case of the United Kingdom, where, based on tradition, there existed, until the mid-1960s, a resistance to permitting educational systems to respond to market-driven forces or social changes. Indeed, the well-established elite system of education in the U.K. and those who benefitted from it did not fancy it being made more “accessible.” The latter half of the twentieth century, however, forced the U.K.’s education system to respond to political and social change (including such issues as the rise and fall of the welfare state, the growth of individualism and erosion of class-based societal structures, changes in technology, and business and international competition). These external factors began to apply pressure to the U.K.’s once stagnated higher education model. Scott argues that these same external factors are also the current drivers of organizational change (such as the fall of “collegiality” and the rise of “managerialism”) within the education model in the U.K. at this time. He continues by explaining that, as with most systems transitioning from an elite system to a mass system, there has been a substantial increase in the number of eligible participants within higher education in the U.K. (In 1960, there were fewer than 250,000 students attending post-secondary institutions in the U.K.; today, there are over two million). Additionally, U.K. universities have significantly diversified the ways in which they address the needs of a new, broader student body (i.e. by offering scholarships and loans, designing non-traditional degree programs and formats, and creating new institutions, etc.), all the while trying to remain competitive on a global scale. All of these efforts have culminated in the United Kingdom becoming the largest producer of post-secondary graduates in Europe; (1.8 million students graduated from a U.K. university in 2009). This is a clear sign of the successful transformation of emergent philosophical prescription for the system of higher education in the British Isles.

In the fourth chapter, *Nordic Higher Education in Transition*, Agnete Vaco and Per Ølaf Aamodt focus on the national and regional structural changes in higher education caused by the internationalization of higher education, specifically in the Nordic setting. The chapter begins by reviewing the last 50 years’ worth of changes made to higher education in Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden and focuses on the growth and development of educational philosophies in these nations. As with most countries in the world, the Nordic nations have always had considerable intermeshing between the higher education systems and the state. This chapter explains how higher education employees in Nordic nations have traditionally been civil servants. As such, the authors focus on the ways in which the Nordic governments have used

higher education as a mechanism for both social and economic change. In the 1960s, the Nordic countries saw a rapid expansion of their universities. Consistent with the arguments made by other authors within the text, Vabo & Aamodt (2009) argue that this expansion came as a result of market-driven needs (particularly within the technology sector) that forced organized labor to become more educated/specialized. In addition, in the Nordic context, Vabo & Aamodt (2009) assert that the rise of the welfare state and the relative increase in the need for skilled labor in the public sector required universities to expand and adapt.

A position Trow (1973) puts forward is that massification requires an increase in educational options (i.e. numbers of universities, degree programs, and degree types) in order to accommodate the needs of a broadened student population and the corresponding demands those students place on the “market” (i.e. as a result of their wide range of academic abilities, personal interests, and financial resources). In the Nordic countries, this effort to increase and diversify educational options, in fact, caused an over-abundance of colleges and universities; in addition, in direct proportion to the increase in numbers of students was a decrease in the average university entrance examination scores. These conditions eventually resulted in the reorganization and merging of 98 colleges into 26 regionally organized state colleges (Vabo & Aamodt, 2009). At that time, some educational policy makers took the 1999 Bologna Declaration (which proposed that European students and graduates be permitted to move freely between countries, using prior qualifications in one country as acceptable entry requirements for further study in another) as an opportunity to restructure the old system of higher education and replace it with a system that was more appropriate for mass education. Indeed, it was an opportune time for restructuring Nordic education systems, as the pressures of competing for students with international institutions (as well as simultaneous efforts to partner with many such institutions) called for the streamlining of the Nordic system of higher education (i.e. by standardizing academic calendars, degree formats, types of degrees, etc.). These organizational changes put the Nordic system more in line with the modern western European systems and have cleared the way for new, more demanding objectives to be tackled. Trow explains, while

[t]he changes in Nordic higher education today incorporate market-oriented modes of governance, performance-based funding, more variety in funding sources, and public-private partnerships within research and research training, [these] new forms of management (systems of quality assurance and accreditation and funding based on results) force the higher education institutions to become more pro-active in terms of responding positively to such demands while ensuring their ability to sustain and strengthen their existing research capacity. (p. 66)

The goal of strengthening the capacity for research at Nordic universities, for example, has driven new policies in the hopes of creating elite research institutions. As funds are being disseminated relative to outcome-based initiatives, academic power is being gathered in the hands of the most productive institutions and research centers. According to Vaco and Aamodt, there is push to continue integrating Nordic colleges and universities in order to further consolidate research activities/programs and create a tier of elite Nordic universities that will be among the best in Europe.

Alma Maldonado-Maldonado, in the fifth chapter, *Latin American Higher Education: Hope in the Struggle?* presents the main challenges facing Latin American higher education systems since their expansion in the 1960s. In the last 30 years, Latin America has seen the spread of stable democratic systems. However, the economic systems among nations within the continent still vary greatly in their success rates and sustainability, and Latin American higher education institutions do not always receive the financial support they need. (During the 80s, transnational agencies such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Economic Commission of Latin America suggested and even imposed structural funding plans to reduce the amount of public funding to education systems in Latin America.) As a result, there are tensions in Latin American countries between the socio-political and economic needs of their citizens and the need for the advancement of their systems of higher education. In the race to join the transnational knowledge community, many Latin American higher education systems have created a “disconnect” between themselves (and their interest in seeking to gain a foothold within the realm of international higher education) and the interests of their own citizens, which may be significantly more basic at this time. This conflict notwithstanding, as a result of the extraordinary growth in the number of participants in Latin American higher education (7.5 million in 1994 to 13.8 million in 2003), the number of private and for-profit education institutions has sharply increased to meet growing student demand.

Problematically, while the number of participants in the Latin American higher education systems has grown, the volume of curricular options has not. In addition, economic disparity throughout the region has intensified long-standing debates on the purpose of education. For instance, while major players in the international knowledge community (e.g., the United States and Europe) have argued for research-oriented programs and institutions to be developed in the region, many Latin American countries have sought, instead, to increase the number of institutions or strengthen support for existing institutions that provide basic professional and/or vocational training for students, for the goal of many Latin American countries is simply to decrease the poverty gap within their populations by educating their citizens. In short, though steps have been taken to provide major funding for research opportunities in Latin American universities, there is still ample room for development in this region.

In *Higher Education in India: The Challenge of Change*, the sixth chapter, N. Jayaram discusses the “quiet crisis in higher education in India.” India is the third largest provider of higher education outside of the United States and China; it has some of the best institutions in the world (e.g. the Indian Institutes of Science and Technology), many of which boast enormous waiting lists (some of which imply a wait of several years, exceeding any wait a student might endure to enter, for example, the U.S.’s Harvard University). However, this was not always the case. During the British occupation, higher education in India resembled Britain’s own elitist system but with the added element of explicit class discrimination. The system was both narrow and exclusionary, perpetuating low student enrollment. In the year India achieved its independence, there were only 20 higher education institutions in the entire nation. Upon gaining independence, government directed initiatives sought to make higher education in India more accessible to its enormous population. By 2002, in response to such initiatives, there were 323 higher education institutions. Along with this massive expansion came the normative issues of curricular format and quality, the underfunding of facilities and academic programs, the eroding of necessary qualifications for teaching applicants, a reduced emphasis on research, the increase of market-driven enrollment initiatives, and the decline of state patronage. As a result of this

multitude of challenges, there has developed in India a burgeoning dependence on private higher education options for both quality and convenient education. Given its history of class division, the size of its population, and the pressures it faces to develop world class educational institutions, India's system of higher education has produced both great successes and great failures. With its broad and well-established educational foundation, however, India, remains poised to provide (if the myriad logistical issues can be addressed), one of the best educational systems in the world.

In the seventh chapter, *The German "Excellence Initiative" and Its Role in Restructuring the National Higher Education Landscape*, Barbara Kehm and Peer Pasternack present a history and critique of the 2004 German higher education "Excellence Initiative." The Excellence Initiative was fashioned in order to (a) enhance university research in an environment in which a majority of research efforts and funding were migrating toward institutes, think tanks, and centers outside of the university setting (e.g., Max-Planck Institute and Helmholtz centers), (b) increase the overall academic prowess of universities in Germany, and (c) enhance the visibility of German universities on a global scale. However, this change did not go over equally well among all affected constituents. Traditionally, basic funding of higher education institutions fell under the purview of the German state in which the institution was located. The state then shared the costs for building construction and research projects with the federal government. Under the Excellence Initiative, universities faced competition with one another to solicit funds from the federal government, which were available for institutions within three categories: (1) best graduate schools, (2) centers of excellence with the capacity to enhance or develop an international reputation, and (3) institutions seeking to become "elite" global universities. Despite the fact that the overall quantity of funding available for universities increased as a result of the Excellence Initiative, the competitively solicited monies also came with strict guidelines. Unfortunately, these earmarks were not always the priority of each institution. Thus, an informal tiered system of "excellence" was created between the least and most participatory universities. While some unintended side effects have arisen (e.g., funding criteria disputes and arguments of authoritative legitimacy), many of the "top" universities have seen tremendous developments within their own institutions. As Kehm and Pasternack state, "[t]ime will tell" if this initiative will truly herald the German system of higher education onto the global stage.

Andre Kraak, in chapter eight, *South Africa's Elite Universities in the Post-Apartheid Era, 1994-2007*, provides a historical educational analysis of South Africa's early colonial influences (1829-1948), racially segregated education system (1948-1982), "binary system" (1979-1994), and current movements toward a unified education system (1995-Present). From 1829 to 1948, South Africa saw a cultural and divisional split that fell along secular lines. For example, in the classroom and everyday life, the Dutch Calvinists spoke British English, and the English Anglicans spoke Afrikaans. These divisions caused the population to continue struggle with issues of racial and ethnic discrimination over the next century.

From 1948 to 1982, the Apartheid regime imposed a strict mandate of racial segregation. A high priority for the regime was to maintain separate systems of education; they created nine separate universities for Africans, "Coloureds," and "Indians." While university programs for White participants grew and were well-funded, programs for non-Whites were both sorely underfunded and under-populated, not least because of issues of access and affordability. As with all aspects of South African Apartheid society, the segregation of educational institutions heightened ethnic tensions for years to come. In the early 1960s, South Africa saw a growth in the national economy and began implementing policies to produce a modernized and globally

productive society. Toward that end, in 1974, the “binary system” was created, which formed two types of institutions: universities (exclusively attended by Whites) and polytechnics (technikons) (attended by non-Whites). As with most polytechnics, technikons focused on the manufacturing and service sectors. Although the binary system provided some increased opportunity for non-Whites in the education system, it nonetheless continued to reinforce racialized division of education within South African society.

The post-Apartheid government actively sought to reverse the damage of the Apartheid regime and dismantle their separatist education programs. One of the greatest successes of the post-Apartheid government was the deracialization of access to all levels and types of education institutions. However, the increase in Black participation in the education system appeared to “displace,” within the public education institutions, a number of Whites, who have, as a result, migrated almost exclusively to private universities, which comprise most of South Africa’s elite institutions. The increase in enrollment of Black students in public universities has created the perception of reverse access issues and unequal growth between the public and private universities. Today, South Africa is still feeling the strains its historical racial and religious discrimination, but it is seeking a more unified system of education (between public and private) to enhance South African citizenry and to increase the prominence of South African education in the global knowledge sphere.

In *The Legacy of Planning: Higher Education Development in China*, the ninth chapter, Kai-Ming Cheng, Yan Wang, and Su-Yan Pan explain that the growth and strengthening of China’s economy over the last ten years is reflected in the development of its higher education sector. From 1999 to 2006, the number undergraduate entrants went from 1,596,800 to 5,460,500. To challenge views that predicted similarly steady yet relatively conservative enrollment growth, the Chinese government initiated, in 1999, a dramatic and philosophically revolutionary expansion of the higher education system, which by 2007 had more than 25 million students, making the Chinese education system the largest in the world.

China’s recent educational history (1960s-1990s) supported the notion of manpower-planning, which paired higher education curricula with programs to specific state needs. Today, the emphasis is on creating an increasingly educated and globally productive work force. This has led to the creation of non-formal education options such as self-study distance learning and vocational training and has even led to the development of world class Chinese universities such as Peking University and Tsinghua University. However, these developments would not have been possible without major overhauls in the structure of ministerial institutions.

Under the socialist system, Chinese ministerial institutions were self-contained entities that independently controlled the education and training of their entire work force. In the 2000s, the ministries were required to relinquish authority of their institutions to either the provincial or national authorities, depending upon the regional or national impact of the institution. However, this transfer of authority did not preclude regional input. Instead, in return for admitting local students and a level of collective governance, regional authorities were expected to share in the financial responsibility of these institutions. The overall plan was to (a) “maintain a small number of quality institutions under direct control of the Ministry of Education,” (b) “gradually phase out the ministerial institutions,” (c) “increase the provincial participation and ownership of institutions,” and (d) encourage the “establishment of non-government institutions” (160). This set of objectives led to the creation of both more regional institutions (which specifically address provincial needs) and international world class universities. Such a two-pronged approach

suggests the government's willingness to look forward and not backward in terms of mass educational planning.

In the tenth chapter, *Excellence in Dutch Higher Education: Handle with Care*, Frans Kaiser and Hans Vossensteyn discuss the perceived absence of elite institutions in the Dutch education system and how internal and external pressures have forced the Dutch government to consider new ways of differentiating among Dutch education institutions in order to achieve an educational standard of excellence without undermining Dutch cultural values. Excellence in higher education is crucial for countries to be able to compete in a global economy. However, the pursuit of such excellence often requires a competitive individualism among institutions and a willingness to invest significant financial resources in an effort to outperform peer institutions. These prerequisites for competitive excellence have caused something of a handicap for the Dutch, who, due to the fundamentally egalitarian nature of their culture, have lagged somewhat behind other European nations in the development of an education system in which certain schools are perceived to be more academically "elite" than others. There are currently two types of public education in the Netherlands: the *hogescholen* and universities. The former are professionally oriented institutions, and the latter are academically oriented. All education opportunities are open to any applicant because the Dutch believe that all students deserve the same opportunity to pursue their desired interests. Both types of education are thus considered of equal educational value in spite of their different orientations, making it difficult to develop a culture of elite institutions in the Netherlands. Indeed, an arguably favorable cultural characteristic has had the ironic effect of at least partially precluding the development of a true "elite" tier of education institutions in the Netherlands; in short, despite any *actual* academic excellence the Netherlands has developed within its education system, it remains a nation that is loath to cultivate inequality (or the perception thereof). As such, the country finds itself closer to the back of the pack when it comes to global perceptions of competitive academic excellence.

Despite the Dutch emphasis on equality, the Dutch have begun to realize that developing elite institutions is crucial for producing better graduates to enter into the work force and for drawing more international applicants to their schools. As such, the government has taken a couple of different approaches to developing an elite sector of higher education. One approach has been to make a change to the legal framework of education, which includes relying less on a lottery to select students and more on individual students' motivation and merit. Schools now have minimum scores required for acceptance. The traditional four- and five-year programs have been replaced with a Bachelor-Master system, which includes the option of honors courses. Another approach consists of, on an experimental basis, the developing honors colleges and the careful selection of students by creating specific profiles to match students to programs. Though the results of these changes and experiments have yet to be determined, the idea of differentiation among education institutions and the notion of academic excellence (or elitism) within the Dutch system is still a sensitive subject, which is why the chapter is entitled "Handle with Care."

Ireneusz Bialecki and Malgorzata Dabrowa-Szeffler, in the eleventh chapter, *Polish Higher Education in Transition: Between Policy Making and Autonomy*, discuss the various developments in the Polish higher education system since the 1990's. Changes in the system are part of an ongoing process based on the growing education aspirations of Polish society, the free-market, European cooperation, and globalization. There have been two periods of change since the end of the communist regime: 1990 to 1999, characterized by adaptation to the free-market economy, and 2000-2006, characterized by international factors, such as the 1999 Bologna

Declaration and the 2000 Lisbon Strategy, which, nicely dovetailing the Bologna Declaration, aimed to make the EU “the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion.” These declarations increased desire for education and led to an increase in the number of students that enrolled in tertiary education. Increased demand for high quality education caused a boom in private higher education institutions, but the number of available instructors grew at a much slower rate, creating a burden for existing instructors and causing them to have to work in multiple institutions.

By chance, the surplus of students in Polish higher education institutions has decreased significantly over the past few years as the Polish population between 19-24 years of age has substantially decreased, alleviating the problem of instructor shortage. In addition, both public and private institutions have become more competitive in every aspect, from enrolling the very best students, to hiring the best teachers, to competing for government subsidies. This stiff competition has caused a gap in the quality of teaching among institutions and a difference in the autonomies of academic schools and vocational schools. Adding to the challenge of increased competition is the fact that education in Poland is woefully underfunded, and the funds that are given are unequally allocated. Part of the reason for this lies in the cultural norms that developed as a result of the communist period. The Polish have a general fear of top-down projects; they avoid anything that might require too much government involvement. As such, the government is not given enough power to make a difference in the higher education system, but the private sector has not been able to develop quickly enough either.

In *What is an ‘Elite’ or ‘Leading Global’ University?*, the twelfth chapter, David Palfreyman and Ted Tapper begin the second part of the volume by discussing how research universities have become the embodiment of “elite” among institutions in higher education. These elite, heavily research-oriented institutions share certain characteristics (be they perceived or actual) that typify them. Among these characteristics are the notions that these schools (1) are typically the oldest in the national systems of which they are a part, (2) boast both high-quality teaching and high scoring students—often from the upper and upper-middle classes, (3) have architecturally “European” style campuses (complete with churches and clock towers), and (4) are located in economically vibrant communities that are both culturally interesting and socially progressive. Schools such as these are usually found in wealthier nations. They are elite in terms of their academic requirements for admission and the impressive educational qualifications of their students, faculties, and research programs. Indeed, the implication is that elite research institutions are among the “elite of the elite.” The authors quote Altbach and Balan, saying that “all world-class universities are research universities, without exception, but not all research universities are world-class, nor should they be” (208).

The status of higher education institutions is often judged based on rankings found in magazines like *US News and World Report* and *Newsweek International*. These rankings have turned the higher education system into a national and international market. Pursuing prestige is now considered an investment and is often very risky. This investment comes with many challenges for elite institutions, such as those

of sustaining and increasing their income, of wrestling with pressures of privatization, of balancing pure research with commercial research... of maintaining autonomy while being accountable for their use of taxpayer monies, of functioning in the

ever-more global and competitive science environment, and of offering their academics both academic freedom and job security within a 'cosmopolitan academic environment.' (208-209)

Despite these very real challenges, a new entity within higher education has developed: the Emerging Global Model (EGM), which is described as "a super-research university at one end of a continuum of institutional types reflecting different missions and different emphases on research, teaching, application, and service to the area in which the institution is geographically located" (210). This type of institution is well-rounded, with research as the main focus; however the selectiveness and competitiveness that is associated with gaining admission to these "super schools" (and the perceived prestige associated with being admitted) has had the effect of decreasing the perceived excellence of some of the *other* models of education institutions.

In the thirteenth chapter, *Elite Higher Education in France: Tradition and Transition*, Cécile Deer discusses the institutional organization of higher education institutions with respect to social, educational, and financial aspects. Higher education in France has been in a race to evolve its education institutions ever since it fell behind in its perceived excellence in the 1980's, mostly due to the fact that higher education had begun to serve as an avenue for social mobility rather than as a form of elite education itself in and of itself. There are currently two different tracks for education in France: the university and the *grandes écoles*. The university system is much less advanced than that of the *grandes écoles*. By law, the universities are non-selective, meaning that all who apply are accepted. (The only requirement is that the students must have achieved the baccalaureate level of education in order to be admitted.) These schools are very inexpensive and almost anyone can get in, but the level of education there is not known to be high quality. On the other end of the spectrum are the *grandes écoles*, traditional, private institutions that are very selective and expensive. They require students to have received education not only at the baccalaureate level but also in *classes préparatoires* before being accepted. Not surprisingly, most of the students that attend these higher education institutions come from higher social backgrounds. According to Deer,

By the mid-1990's, the expansion of higher education that had taken place essentially in the non-selective sector of higher education (i.e. the universities) led to further reforms of this part of the system, as it was becoming obvious that the quantitative expansion in terms of the sheer numbers entering higher education had not been matched by a qualitative expansion in terms of an equalization of academic chances, which in France is particularly strongly correlated with employment opportunities, life chances and earnings. (225)

In so many words, increased participation in higher education does not have significant meaning for the advancement of the French education system because the system itself is still socially segregated. Education at the *grandes écoles* is crucial for students to be able to find good employment opportunities with decent pay, yet this kind of education is widely unavailable, leaving the best jobs open for those who are already rich and reducing any real opportunity for upward mobility among university students. Additionally, the best schools tend to be the engineering schools, followed closely by management schools. This fact has resulted in a gender

inequality as well, since it has historically been mostly men who attend engineering schools and mostly women who attend management or business schools.

In an attempt to improve some of these flaws and compete with other European nations' elite universities, France has entertained policies of regionalization, Europeanization, and internationalization. The purpose of such policies would be to help the *grandes écoles* branch out to other parts of the country and to increase their competitiveness with other higher education institutions in the EU and with other highly ranked schools in the world. The French system of higher education and the *grandes écoles* system is currently under evaluation in France. Only time will tell if the country will be sufficiently successful to compete internationally. Simon Marginson, in the fourteenth chapter, *The Elite Public Universities in Australia*, illustrates the public and private methods of funding higher education in Australia and how these methods affect the status of elite institutions and their research capabilities. There are a total of eight elite universities in Australia, known as the Group of Eight (Go8). Five were founded before World War I and are nicknamed the "sandstones" because of the material found in their buildings. These are the Universities of Sydney, Melbourne, Queensland, Adelaide, and Western Australia. The other three universities achieved elite status after World War II: the Australian National University, the University of New South Wales, and Monash University. In the 1960's, public spending on higher education increased fivefold, and these schools were able to catch up with the older ones in their science, medicine, and engineering programs. Eight more universities were later founded but were never able to become known as elite because public funding for schools stopped in 1976.

Because of the elimination of government funding, Australian schools suffered from a lack of resources and were unable to continue developing. As such, a reform began in 1985 under the federal Labor Minister of Education, John Dawkins, which lasted until 1992. In order to raise revenues, Dawkins introduced student charges, encouraged mergers and entrepreneurship with private enterprises, and abolished the distinction between universities and colleges. Dawkins also insisted that public funding be mixed with private funding, which was intended to make the education systems more egalitarian by preventing the unequal distribution of monies among institutions. As a result of these changes, the elite universities did feel some tightening of funds, ultimately restricting their research capacity; to counter this, class sizes were increased in order to bring in more revenue, and some resources were transferred from teaching (salaries) into research funding and the education of doctoral students, all of which had the ultimate effect of permitting most elite universities to maintain their statuses.

Part of the reason that the elite Australian universities were able to remain elite was because they were still viewed as such by students, the government, and professionals. Additionally, their ability to maintain research outputs sustained this perception. To make up for gaps in funding, elite universities began attracting international students and competing for private research funding, which now constitutes the highest proportion of these schools' income. The schools also utilize investments, donations, and full-fee paying students as sources of income. In short, Australian elite universities have bounced back from the lack of public funding through the use of creativity and hard work in order to maintain their status as elite. The main challenge that Australian universities now face is international competition. (The focus has been turned inward for so long that Australian elite higher education must now continue to internationally develop networks and make the transition into global entities, as only a select few of them have done.)

In *(Post-)Mass Higher Education and Japanese Elite Universities*, the fifteenth chapter, Fumi Kitagawa illustrates the development of the Japanese post-war higher education system and the challenges it faces. The original imperial universities, the first of which was the University of Tokyo, founded in 1877, were founded by the Meiji government. According to the Imperial University Ordinance of 1886, the priority of the imperial universities was “the teaching of, and fundamental research into, arts and sciences necessary for the state” (260). Nine universities were founded under this ordinance between 1877 and 1939. Additionally, ten private universities were officially recognized in 1919 and 1920. Development of education institutions was stagnant until after World War II, when a four-stage development began to take place. The stages of development were democratization, expansion, quality improvement, and a second expansion. One of the main challenges to the current Japanese higher education system is a double-edged sword: a declining birthrate in Japan has reduced the total number of primary and secondary school children, yet the proportion of secondary school graduates seeking *post*-secondary educations has *increased*, causing an increase in competition for admission to the best Japanese universities, leaving the less elite schools to compete for applicants in order to maintain enrollment. This particular dilemma has possibly contributed to a stalling of the intended “second expansion.”

There are three coexisting higher education systems in Japan: national universities, public universities, and private universities. These universities are part of a hierarchical structure that is protected by government funding, with national universities receiving the most money and private universities receiving the least. While unequal funding causes tensions, the official justification for such practices is that the different types of schools serve different purposes for the state. Regardless of this discrepancy, generally speaking, higher education institutions in Japan (across all university types) are not well funded compared to those in the rest of the world. The relatively minimal funding provided to Japanese universities has inspired the elite institutions in Japan to become very economically competitive, and many schools run their admissions processes like businesses. They have developed income resources to supplement federal grants, and, as of 2004, most universities are almost autonomous from the government. In addition, for purposes of income, many Japanese public/private/national universities enjoy commercial research relationships with industry, which is meant not only to sustain the universities, economically, but also to stimulate national economic growth. Each institution is responsible for its own innovation and implementation of strategies, which has increased inter-university competition and thus sparked major reforms at many of the elite institutions.

In the sixteenth chapter, *The Ivy League*, Roger Geiger discusses the history of the American “Ivy League,” issues specific to the Ivy League institutions, and present day challenges to Ivy League growth. The league originated from the “Intercollegiate Agreement,” an athletic agreement designed to level the playing field between the football teams of participating schools (originally only Harvard, Yale, and Princeton (HYP), later expanded to include Brown, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, and the University of Pennsylvania, institutions that wanted to share HYP’s elite reputations). Many of these Ivy League schools date back to the colonial times and have had centuries to develop into elite institutions. However, even the Ivy League schools have had to face challenges in order to continue developing and to maintain their elite status. The challenges facing these schools have come in three stages: (1) a focus on making selection processes more equitable (less nepotistic) in the 1920s, (2) a focus on instilling and maintaining an environment of genuine meritocracy in the 1950s, and (3) a focus on achieving racial diversity in the 1970s.

These three particular challenges, though they arose in different decades, were similarly inspired by demands for the Ivy League institutions to acknowledge and respond to social change. Historically, the Ivy League schools once maintained themselves by admitting, in great numbers, the sons of former alumni. These young men were practically guaranteed acceptance to the universities; less than stellar academic abilities were many times overlooked in the name of lineage and patronage. In conjunction with such nepotism was the discrimination against applicants (even academically excellent ones) from lower socio-economic classes and non-White backgrounds. Combined, this overlooking of academic qualifications among applicants in favor of “pedigree” and the refusal to admit lower class and non-White candidates eventually watered down academic standards at Ivy League institutions. At the same time, a growing trend toward making higher education available on a mass scale meant that the Ivy League universities, if they wanted to remain competitive in their attracting and admitting of students, had to reconsider their selection processes in order to stay competitive, which included becoming more meritocratic in their admissions practices and more ethnically and socio-economically diverse.

The early part of the 20th century saw a transformation in the way students were admitted to prestigious universities in the Ivy League, and the mid-century saw even more pronounced efforts on the parts of these universities to maintain systems of meritocracy among their students and faculties, an increase in academic research, and differential tuition pricing for students of different socio-economic backgrounds. Finally, by the mid-1970s, the post-Civil Rights era saw the increased admission of non-White and minority students to these prestigious U.S. education institutions.

Ted Tapper and David Palfreyman, in the seventeenth chapter, *Oxbridge: Sustaining the International reputation*, discuss the challenges that the U.K.’s Oxford University and Cambridge University currently face trying to maintain their traditionally elite reputations while staying at the forefront of modern higher education and entertaining state interests. The combined institutions of “Oxbridge” have been associated with three major themes or stages throughout their history: (1) They served as a network of interacting social interests; (2) they reproduced class interests and national culture; and (3) they are now on leading edge of the production of world class research. This last stage is enabling Oxford and Cambridge Universities to stay current and to remain academically elite while providing an economic resource for the nation. The universities have moved beyond acting as a domestic social force and are now a leading influence in international higher education. Part of this move is based on the decline in prestige that both institutions suffered over the last twenty years, which resulted in a need to further differentiate themselves from other universities. British colleges have since followed suit (often risking financial debt just to keep up with Oxford or Cambridge in the development of research programs). However, Oxbridge is part of the growing trend of elite universities around the world that are detaching themselves from the national higher education scene and forming a world class league of higher education, thus sacrificing some state interests in the name of global interests and participation in a global system of post-secondary education.

In *Converging Systems of higher Education?*, the eighteenth chapter, Ted Tapper and David Palfreyman conclude their volume by illustrating the relationship between mass higher education, elitism, and research with respect to regions and individual states. They compare various university responses to the challenges that face higher education worldwide, summarize the different structures that exist within higher education the world over, and explain the overlapping relationships among elite higher education institutions worldwide. The authors also argue that mass and elite education have a place alongside one another, claiming that elite

institutions can continue to flourish (without challenge to their status as elite) within a mass system. Last, they discuss the role of governance and government funding in higher education that has lately been serving to broaden the scope of higher education and make it more widely available to students of all origins. Such funding has also increased the opportunity for state intervention in the affairs of education institutions, which has led elite universities to opt to compete for private funding (to avoid government involvement with respect to how research dollars are spent) in order to continue to improve their research programs, which, in turn, has had the ultimate effect of creating an emerging league of world class universities. The authors categorize the institutions within this emerging world-class set of universities into three main models: (1) the U.S. public/private model, (2) the European model (which leaves a role for the centralized state), and (3) a mixture of these two models, which commonly appear in many other nations. Palfreyman and Tapper suggest that the next progressive step in the evolution of higher education might be a structural shift among the elite universities of the world that would both permit and encourage such entities to become more consciously involved in the deliberate construction of a world-wide network of elite post-secondary institutions (as opposed to remaining primarily focused on their competitive relationships with other, national institutions).

This text provides an exceptionally detailed historical account of the development of mass education in a variety of national settings. However, given the linguistic style and the nature of the subject matter, this work is clearly intended for researchers, industry experts, and policy makers rather than a general audience. For this reason, for specialists interested in 20th century national educational developments, competitive excellence programs, the arms race of educational exclusivity, and the implementation of massification ideologies in multiple country settings, this text will be a perennial reference. However, because the text is an anthology of edited works, each chapter, while adhering to an overarching theme, is essentially a standalone reading. Therefore, key sections (i.e. chapters on specific countries), will perhaps be of more significance to specialists than the entire manuscript.

Ryan Guffey, Ph.D.
Center for International and Global Studies
Lindenwood University
rguffey@lindenwood.edu