

poses. The international ranking “game” is another illustration of a preoccupation with international standings based on questionable and biased indicators. To what end does this competitiveness for international status serve? Is it to improve higher education's contribution to solving some of the global challenges? Or is it a sign of the market approach, where often position is more important than substance? Internationalization can be used as a strategy to enhance the international, global, and intercultural dimensions of teaching and learning, research and knowledge production, and service to society. It also has the potential to improve quality, but a preoccupation with status plus the emergence of rogue providers, diploma, and accreditation mills are overshadowing and jeopardizing the added value that internationalization can bring to higher education.

*More than 50 large transnational companies are publicly traded on stock exchanges and are active in providing international educational programs, degrees, and services on a for-profit basis.*

#### INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES

More institutions around the world are establishing a central office and an institutionwide policy for internationalization. This trend takes many forms but illustrates a gradual change from a reactive ad hoc approach to internationalization to a more proactive planned approach. Nevertheless, a strategic approach is still out of reach for most institutions. Considerations as to the obstacles with regard to internationalizing an institution have evolved. Previously, the key barriers were viewed as lack of senior-level commitment, finances, and policies. Currently, the major obstacles include lack of expertise in the international office and lack of faculty interest, involvement, and international/intercultural experience. Clearly, human resources are now a major challenge and in need of more attention.

The approach of a long list of inactive bilateral agreements has been shifted to participating in international or regional networks. In fact, networks are becoming important branding tools as institutions look for prestigious partners and funding sources. Networks are often formed to enhance student and professor exchanges, develop joint curriculum and degrees, undertake benchmarking exercises, or engage in collaborative research. In other cases, networks are oriented to cooperating for competitive purposes with regard to student recruitment, franchising programs, or applying for research grants. It is interesting to note that the recent worldwide survey by the International Association of Universities found that the three most important growth areas for internationalization include institutional agreements and networks as number one, fol-

lowed by outgoing student mobility and international research collaboration.

International student recruitment remains a top priority for traditional receiving countries like the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada; but new initiatives by several European and Asian countries are making them popular destination points. The efforts of Asian countries and several wealthy Gulf states are worth watching in the next few years as they compete for increased market share of international students.

#### RATIONALES, BENEFITS, AND RISKS

Many observers would claim that in the last decade they have witnessed a dramatic movement of internationalization rationales toward income production. While this trend may be true for a small group of countries, it is certainly not the case for the majority of institutions around the world. A more accurate description is an increased diversification of rationales driving internationalization at institutional and national levels. Current leading motivations still focus on enhancing the international knowledge and intercultural skills of students and professors, but other goals include the creation of an international profile or brand, improving quality, increasing national competitiveness, strengthening research capacity, developing human resources, and diversifying the source of faculty and students. In the past decade the importance and benefits of internationalization have been recognized, but at the same time, new risks have been widely acknowledged. The most important risks include commercialization, foreign degree mills, brain drain, and growing elitism.

All in all, we have seen a very dynamic evolution of internationalization in the past 10 years. It is critical that we continue to nurture positive results and remain vigilant to potentially negative and unexpected implications so that internationalization builds on strengthening individual, institutional, community, and national development in the more interdependent and interconnected world in which we live. ■

## Private Higher Education: Patterns and Trends

DANIEL C. LEVY

*Daniel C. Levy is Distinguished Professor at the University at Albany, State University of New York, and director of the Program for Research on Private Higher Education. E-mail: DLevy@uamail.albany.edu.*

In its 12 years, *International Higher Education* has published many articles on the continued growth of higher education,

as well as on related matters such as access policy. Within this powerful higher education growth, even more spectacular is the growth of *private* higher education. Today, best estimates indicate that about one in three students globally is in the private sector.

There is no magic year that marks the inception of accelerated private growth. Certainly the last two decades have been unprecedented in private growth, but each country has a different starting date or period in which private enrollment begins to soar. As recently as 1980, while much of the world already had private higher education, still many countries did not. Now virtually all the world's regions have private higher education in the large majority of their countries and pre-existing private sectors have grown strikingly

The private higher education surge mixes with a substantial degree of privatization in a range of other economic and social fields. However, neither primary nor secondary education has paralleled higher education for the proportional surge of private to total enrollment.

*The last two decades have been unprecedented in private growth, but each country has a different starting date or period in which private enrollment begin to soar.*

In some ways the most arresting private higher education growth has come in regions where two decades ago, even sometimes one decade ago, there was no such sector. In the Middle East, emergence is often basically a creature of the new century, otherwise of the 1990s. We are referring to such varied countries as Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Oman, Saudi Arabia, and Syria. With only scattered examples dating to the 1980s, private growth in Africa has more recently spread to country after country, including all the largest ones. Predictably, the private sector is larger in anglophone than francophone countries.

Latin America and Asia generally have longer continuous private higher education experience. But in the former it has recently grown to almost half (45%) of total enrollment and includes every country except Cuba. Elsewhere in the region some countries have gone from minority to majority private enrollment. Only with the 1989 fall of communism did private higher education emerge in modern eastern and central Europe and it spread like wild fire in the first half of the 1990s. That leaves only western Europe as the outlier region where the public sector remains almost unchallenged by private growth (though it itself is partially privatizing). In Asia several countries, most importantly China, have launched private sectors. Several older private sectors account for most of their countries' higher education enrollment (notably Japan, Indonesia, the Philippines, South Korea, and Taiwan).

So powerful is global private growth that almost no country

has seen a *decline* of the private share in the last decade or two. This is not to rule out that changing national conditions could lead to a decline. Those changed conditions could include an aging population (Japan, eastern Europe), partial privatization of public sectors, and the threat that populist regimes such as Venezuela's could curtail private institutions.

#### FOLLOW THE LEADERS

Two very common myths about private higher education are more false than true. One is that private-public differences are insignificant as both types pursue public purposes. The second is that each country is unique so we cannot intelligently generalize about private higher education. In fact, the private growth of the last decade or two is remarkable not only in weight but in replication of patterns long observed in other countries; among these patterns are prominent private-public differences.

Regarding patterns of growth, for example, we continue to see private emergence outside government plans (the Middle East excluded) and often taking officials and others by surprise. Private institutions continue to be considerably smaller than public ones on average. The basic causes of private expansion remain religion, social advantage, and absorption of the accelerated demand for higher education. As before, the causes of the growth now often shape the kind of ensuing private type that functions.

In finance, the great majority of private institutions (old and new) continue to be overwhelmingly financed privately, usually through tuition and fees. Philanthropy, corporate contributions, and alumni giving are still rare outside the United States, and elite private universities remain almost nonexistent outside the United States. In governance, private institutions continue to be more hierarchical than public counterparts, limiting faculty and student participation. The private places still concentrate on a few fields, mostly in commercial areas. They remain narrower than public institutions in this and other respects. Another common and enduring private-public distinction exists where the private institution represents a religious or ethnic group. And concerning the demand-absorbing institutions a crucial challenge yesterday and today is to be able to distinguish "garage" operations from serious operations. Even the serious institutions rarely pursue academic research or graduate education and rarely have ample full-time faculties, top students, and laboratories and libraries.

#### NEW PATHWAYS

But it would be wrong to say there is nothing new under the sun. We should identify several key fresh tendencies and hybrid forms or developments. One tendency is the increased role of foreign institutions. In many instances they construct partnerships with local institutions or government. Usually the partnerships involve collaboration between countries of more and less development. On both ends, the institutions may be private or public but probably a disproportionate share of the

involved local institutions are private. In other cases (e.g., Greece) local institutions engaged in partnership with foreign institutions get leeway outside national rules (and cannot offer national degrees).

Local-foreign partnerships increasingly have a for-profit side. The financial incentive for Australian, UK, or US universities is clear, even if their institutions are juridically public. It appears that an increasing proportion of the local actors are for-profit, in conjunction with “branch” campuses of foreign universities.

In other respects, the for-profit growth is yet more astonishing. Several for-profit businesses invest in higher education. The three most prominent internationally are Laureate (formerly Sylvan), Apollo (which owns the massive University of Phoenix in the United States), and Whitney International. Clearly these companies are in it for profit and do not claim otherwise. Alongside them is a growing list of domestic investment companies. In some cases lines between ownership and investment are fuzzy. Laureate has often bought up existing private nonprofit institutions and invested, yet the institutions remain legally nonprofit, as law in countries such as Chile and Mexico proscribes for-profit higher education. However, the line between nonprofit and for-profit is notoriously unclear. Many legally nonprofit institutions are functionally for-profit, simply not distributing financial gains to stockholders. Meanwhile, even truly nonprofit institutions are becoming more commercial. For-profit growth is one of the striking global tendencies within the United States.

*The great majority of private institutions (old and new) continue to be overwhelmingly financed privately, usually through tuition and fees.*

Even where the basic private types of yesterday are the private types of today, changed mixes emerge. There is a relative decline of religious focus. Whereas elite private higher education is rare outside the United States, exceptions arise (perhaps Turkey's Bilkent University) alongside longer-standing Japanese and Korean cases. A much more common phenomenon is the development of “semielite” private institutions. These may evolve out of some of the serious demand-absorbing institutions. Though their elite nature may be more about clientele than academics, some do achieve distinction, often in a niche field. The niche field is usually business related. Semielite universities can be markedly entrepreneurial. They could evolve into a competitive threat to public universities of the second tier.

In terms of sheer numbers the most important private development is the clear dominance of demand-absorbing institutions. In certain countries (e.g., Brazil, Philippines) such institutions have for many decades held the majority of

private enrollment, sometimes the majority of total enrollment. Now, however, the dominance in growth and enrollment numbers of these institutions spreads to more and more countries. Unsurprisingly, the proliferation, against a legacy of little regulation, has given rise to increased concern about quality assurance and to the establishment of public accrediting agencies in country after country. ■

## Graduate Education in Latin America: The Coming of Age

JORGE BALÁN

*Jorge Balán is a senior researcher of the Centro de Estudios de Estado y Sociedad in Buenos Aires and a visiting professor at the Ontario Institute for Studies of Education at the University of Toronto. E-mail: j.balan@cedes.org.*

A research-based, academically oriented graduate program had an early start in Latin America. In the 1950s and 1960s, many countries in the region established national councils for the support of scientific research and advanced training. During that period the leading public universities sought to build a niche for advanced training and research to expand and renovate the professoriate. Since the mid-1980s, the democratic regimes in the region have provided greater institutional legitimacy and more generous funding to improve the scale and scope of training and research. Within the public university, graduate education obtained a larger degree of academic and administrative autonomy.

Flying under the radar screen of university politics, graduate education is today perhaps the most dynamic and innovative sector of higher education. Its market is expanding and diversifying, responding to the manpower needs of higher education and other economic sectors and to the career needs of a growing number of graduates. Government plays a key role in stimulating demand through regulation, incentives schemes, and the provision of funds for research and development. This article examines academically oriented graduate programs (the MA and PhD degrees) in a few major countries in the region.

### LOCATION, SCALE, AND FUNDING

In 1985 Brazil developed a plan to send 10,000 students abroad for advanced training. However, during the 1990s the country gave priority to achieving greater domestic capacity for research and training in all areas of knowledge. Brazil is today the leader in the field of graduate education in the region, with an enrollment of over 100,000 graduate students in academic