countries was at 8.22%. In Australia it had slumped to 6.15%, with declines in both education and R&D. Unlike some other OECD economies, including those of the USA and the UK, Australia invests considerably more in physical plant and dwellings than it invests in knowledge, and this gap between "old economy" and "new economy"'investment has increased over time.

In 1998, Australia invested 5.46% of GDP in education, just below the OECD country average of 5.66%. However public investment—once above OECD average levels—was at 4.34% of GDP, which was 21st out of 28 OECD countries (the OECD average was 5.00%). Private investment in education at 1.11% was the 6th highest in the OECD. In a nutshell, in the neoliberal era, Australia has successfully shifted investment from the public side to the private side. However, private investment mostly takes the form of fee payment by students and families. Fees are relatively high in Australia, especially at university level, though the impact is modified by the system of deferred payment through the tax system (the Higher Education Contribution Scheme). Thus while high private investment provides fiscal relief for government, it has failed to generate a knowledge economy relationship between education and industry. Industry investment in both research and training falls well short of OECD norms. Correspondingly, the production of public goods has been weakened. The public sector is the main provider, especially at the tertiary level; and all three public systems—schools, universities, and training—are in unprecedented financial difficulties. Given the decline in public goods, it is not surprising that there is also a growing and evident bifurcation between educational haves and educational have-nots.

The pattern of public neglect and bifurcation begins early. Australia spends only 0.1% of GDP on preschool education, and participation of four-year-olds is at one-third compared to an OECD average of 60%. In the school years, one-third of students are located in the private sector. Private schools, which on the whole are attended by more affluent families, are largely funded by the federal government; while the public schools are dependent on more fiscally constrained state governments. The private schools have been favored by recent funding allocations. Tertiary participation is above average, but the rate of early school leaving is also above the OECD average; and retention till the end of school has fallen from 77% in 1992 to 72% in 1999. Between 1995 and 1999 tertiary funding fell in Australia, one of very few OECD countries where this happened. Tertiary enrollment rates increased by an average of 23% in the OECD but only 6% in Australia. University enrollments have now stopped growing altogether, except for fee-paying foreign students. These issues will keep higher education on the political agenda for some time to come.

■

Ethical Practices in the Korean Academic Profession

Sungho H. Lee

Sungho H. Lee is dean of the Graduate School, Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea. Address: The Graduate School, Yonsei University, 134 Sinchon-dong, Soeaemoon-ku, Seoul 120-749, Korea. E-mail: <leesh@yonsei.ac.kr>.

The belief is now widespread in Korea that we are in the midst of a wave of moral collapse and ethical confusion. A lack of moral leadership is apparent not only in the government but in industry, the media, and elsewhere. College and university professors have been actively involved in the veritable explosion of interest in the relevance of ethical considerations throughout most sectors and social classes. For example, professors have asked political leaders to consider whether their decisions are taken to benefit their own political interests or those of the people. Business and industry leaders have also been asked by professors to discuss whether environmental pollution is a necessary cost of maximizing profits.

Given the spirited discussions initiated by them, it is indeed ironic that college and university professors have until recently been relatively silent on the subject of ethical questions concerning their own principles, policies, and practices. While they have been critical of other professions, they have deflected criticisms of themselves by raising the mantle of academic freedom.

Traditionally, it has been expected in Korea as in other countries that colleges and universities be founded and operated according to relatively high standards of moral and ethical obligations and principles and codes of behavior. Institutions have never tolerated plagiarism, academic sabotage, or falsification of research data. They have never allowed gross abridgements of academic freedom, incidents of sexual harassment, the selling of grades, or the use of physical violence as a means of settling disputes and conflicts on campus.

The time has come for serious scrutiny of the ethical posture and behavior of the academic profession itself.

However, the time has come for serious scrutiny of the ethical posture and behavior of the academic profession itself. Indeed, there are few aspects of contemporary Korean higher education that do not exhibit signs of ethical confusion. On topics as disparate as admissions and graduation, curriculum development and research, faculty recruitment and grade inflation, or external consulting and administration, there are some thorny ethical issues that colleges and universities need to confront.

Perhaps the area in which Korean higher education is particularly vulnerable to charges of ethical abuse relates to the research mission of professors. For example, some professors are cheating their institutions and the students by pushing for lighter teaching loads so as to devote more time to writing research papers—destined for journals created solely as vehicles for these otherwise unpublishable articles. Many professors are currently grappling with the problems associated with government or private-sector funding of research that arise when a given sponsor imposes a demand for secrecy concerning scientific inquiries. That is a situation completely inimical to the tradition of open investigation and the sharing of research findings so crucial to the discovery of new knowledge.

In July the Opposition Labor Party issued An Agenda for the Knowledge Nation, a broad set of policies covering all forms of education and research.

The faculty recruitment practices at some colleges and universities are another troubling area in need of ethical review. These practices may include the hiring of faculty who are in no way qualified but who are selected because of social connections, monetary contributions, or even academic and social class backgrounds. Another less than totally ethical practice is the failure of some institutions to provide truly open competition for academic positions. Sometimes the department decides on a new faculty member even before the vacant position has been placed on the open market for an official competition.

A third important area of ethical responsibility has to do with extrainstitutional service. In Korean higher education, two out of three academics now engage in some form of paid or unpaid consulting during the year. And consulting constitutes the primary or secondary source of supplementary income. Although a significant segment of the professoriate engages in paid consulting, most professors try to balance consulting with their teaching, research, and other institutional obligations. However, when consulting activity becomes a top priority for faculty members, they are less dedicated and involved in their teaching, research, and other institutional responsibilities.

The current preoccupation with ethics in the conduct of the academic profession is probably a result of the increased complexity and magnitude of the higher education enterprise. It would be nice to view the concerns as an illuminating exercise, one that will lend support to the collective determination of Korean higher education institutions to pay attention to ethical standards, particularly at a point in Korean history when fears are being raised of a moral collapse in society.In conclusion, the credibility of Korean higher education rests on the ethical standards of professoriate. Korean higher education must take the initiative in addressing such charges now to avoid future repercussions. Failing to deal with the problems now will only exacerbate them and bring on external regulation and sanctions. The most positive course of action would be to raise such issues openly and aggressively and to promote decision making enlightened by ethical reflection. In practical terms, two basic steps are required. The first of these is to change the criteria by which faculty performance is evaluated. All forms of evaluation—including government evaluation for financial support and institutional faculty evaluation for promotion and tenure—must go beyond merely calculating faculty-student ratios, counting the number of articles and books published, and tallying faculty workload and instead pay more attention to the ethics, values, and integrity of faculty performance in teaching, research, and service. The other necessary step is development of a code of ethics. At present, few Korean institutions of higher education have developed their own code of ethics, including enforcement provisions, for their members.

■

The Knowledge Context in African Universities: The Neglected Link

Damtew Teferra

Damtew Teferra is codirector and lead researcher of the African Higher Education Project at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College. Address: 207 Campion Hall, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA. E-mail:<teferra@bc.edu>.

The West continues to dominate in the production, organization, and dissemination of the world's knowledge and information. The Third World, and Africa in particular, relies heavily on this knowledge and information.

Scholarly knowledge is conveyed in a variety of ways—including journals, conferences, the Internet, on-line databases, and CD-ROM. Scholarly journals remain the most important channels of communication in the knowledge distribution network. Even in this high-tech era, they continue to be vital and the most reliable avenues of knowledge delivery.

In a recent survey-based study by this author, 80 percent of the nearly 100 respondents reported having access to international journals. But close to 40 percent of the responses were qualified as "limited," "incomplete," "partial," "very few," "very old," and "unreliable access." The inadequate access to current scientific knowledge remains one of the widely