

programs *because* they cannot attract sufficient numbers of students with provision delivered in the domestic language.

FOCUS ON POSTGRADUATE STUDIES

English-medium education is very predominantly offered at the master's level, with a share of almost four-fifths of all programs. In some countries, such as Germany, Sweden, and Switzerland, the postgraduate share even exceeds 90 percent. Since 2002, when the postgraduate proportion stood at 68 percent, the trend toward the second cycle has thus been further strengthened.

English-medium education in Europe is still an early-stage phenomenon since a fast growth rate is under way.

Across Europe, the subject area in which English-taught programs are most frequently offered is engineering and technology (27 percent), followed by business and management studies (24 percent) and the social sciences (21 percent). Together, these three subject area groups make up 72 percent of the total program offer. The subject-area distribution has changed remarkably since 2002, when business and management led the second-ranked subject area, engineering, by more than double, and the social sciences were only in fourth place.

English-medium education in Europe is still an early-stage phenomenon since a fast growth rate is under way. The majority of the programs identified (51%) were created in the four years prior to the surveys. More than a quarter even came into being in the last two years. Only about one-fifth of all programs were set up before 2000.

Students enrolled in English-taught programs are, in the majority, foreigners in their country of study. Their share is almost two-thirds (65%), up from 60 percent in the 2002 surveys. Domestic students, with an overall share of 35 percent, tend to concentrate in bachelor's programs, where they make up more than half of all students. The largest group of international students is made up of Europeans (36%), closely followed by Asians (34%). The largest single nationality group across Europe consists of Chinese, with close to 10 percent, but the regional origin of students differs considerably between receiving countries.

More than two-thirds of all programs (70%) charge tuition fees, a level considerably up from 2002. Only northern Europe (Finland, Sweden, and Norway) is still almost "fee free." On a European average, the annual fee for domestic students and those from European Union countries is about 3,400 euros. The fee for international students from outside the EU is roughly 6,300 euros. Programs in Denmark were most expensive, at 11,000 euros on average.

THE LANGUAGE DEBATE: NORMALCY, AT LAST

Especially in the early years, provision of education in English led to a heated—not to say, ideological—debate. Critics of English-medium teaching and learning maintained that this approach would inevitably lead to a loss of quality, due to the deficiencies in the command of English among both the teachers and the students. The new trend is also seen as a threat that will ultimately lead to the extinction of many a small language as a medium of scientific expression. Defenders admitted that while problems existed, they were not nearly as serious as the critics believed.

The findings of the 2002 surveys already seemed to support the defenders—as does the present study, even more clearly. Only 16 percent of respondents identified an insufficient command of English among international students. And only 9 percent found the mastery of English among domestic students inadequate. Perhaps surprisingly, the most frequently stated linguistic problem concerns the (lack of) mastery of the domestic language by international students. While the problem has not changed, Europe's higher education institutions have become accustomed to the communication situation in the international classroom. What once created frustrations is today viewed as a normal condition. ■

The Humanities and Social Sciences in Asia: Endangered Species?

PHILIP G. ALTBACH

Philip G. Altbach is Monan University Professor and director of the Center for International Higher Education at Boston College.

Most observers agree that the humanities and social sciences—the soft sciences—are an integral part of any university, indeed that a real university must have strength in these areas. These disciplines are important in their own right, and are a central core for any general education program. The humanities and to a lesser extent the social sciences are in crisis in many East Asian universities. Few students are choosing to focus their studies on the humanities—fields such as philosophy, history, and cultural studies. Linguistics and language studies, other than practical English programs, are also in decline. The social sciences, particularly such disciplines as economics and a few others that relate to management or policy studies, fare somewhat better. A conference held recently at Harvard University and sponsored by the Harvard-Yenching Institute brought together leaders of key East Asian universi-

ties and Harvard scholars to examine the “crisis of the humanities and social sciences” in East Asia.

A “PERFECT STORM” OF PROBLEMS FOR THE SOFT SCIENCES

Many universities, in a rush to become “world class” by emphasizing the hard sciences and other easy to quantify disciplines, have let the soft sciences languish. As governments and universities worldwide have emphasized the “private good” aspects of higher education more than the “public good,” universities and public funders generally support fields that will yield income or that are in student demand. The traditional public good roles of universities—providing education in all branches of knowledge, cultural analysis and critique, the integration of science and culture, and the preservation of knowledge—have been largely pushed aside. Students find that the sciences and especially professional fields such as management and law provide more secure and remunerative careers, causing enrollments in the humanities and some of the social sciences to plummet. Jobs outside academe are easier to obtain and more remunerative with training in professional fields and the sciences; even within academe, salaries are higher in these fields. The rise of private universities—the fastest-growing sector in higher education worldwide and the dominant force in such East Asian countries as Korea, Japan, Taiwan, and the Philippines—has meant in some cases an emphasis on fields that are in high student demand.

Mass higher education brought immense pressures on higher education systems everywhere and has been particularly damaging for the soft sciences. First generation university students typically choose fields that will yield easy employment after graduation—seldom the soft sciences. Budgetary pressures caused by massification meant reduced funding for fields not in high demand.

THE SOFT SCIENCES AND GENERAL EDUCATION

Most East Asian universities, as is common worldwide, provide a specialized curriculum with a vocational or disciplinary focus, and students must enroll in specific faculties. General education is, by and large, absent, although exceptions do exist—such as the University of Tokyo, which requires a year of general education. A reconsideration of this specialized professional curriculum has recently begun, with critics arguing that it stifles creativity and forces students to confine the focus of their studies. Moreover, the specialized curriculum may be irrelevant for the more fluid job market of the 21st century.

As the idea of general education and an interdisciplinary approach to the curriculum strengthens, the role of the humanities and social sciences becomes more central. General education never provides an exclusively science-based curriculum, and in most cases the soft sciences are at least as significant as the hard sciences and professional subjects. With declining strength in the soft sciences, the development of innovative and effective general education programs will be difficult if not impossible.

A related concern in many East Asian universities is the development of critical thinking skills as part of the academic curriculum. As with general education, any innovative effort in this direction must involve the humanities and social sciences.

CURRENT REALITIES

With enrollments down and funding cuts, humanities programs have been reduced or even eliminated. In countries such as Japan and Korea, private universities that traditionally stressed the soft sciences are in jeopardy because of enrollment declines in a difficult demographic environment. Fewer doctorates are being produced in most of these disciplines, reflecting student preferences; fewer academic positions are available; and salaries have not kept up with other fields. The professoriate is aging and often not being replaced.

At the same time, a new recognition that the soft sciences are needed to support academic programs exists—as well as a growing concern to ensure critical thinking for first-degree students and in fledgling general education courses.

Mass higher education brought immense pressures on higher education systems everywhere and has been particularly damaging for the soft sciences.

CHALLENGES

Ensuring appropriate strength in the humanities and social sciences is complex. Both academic institutions and government must recognize that the soft sciences are important for the university—and funding made available. Some academic departments of high quality that can produce top humanities and social science scholars are a basic necessity. Not every university needs to have the capacity to produce doctorates, but the system must. Unlike some fields in the hard sciences, where it does not matter where a scientist is trained, advanced education in the humanities and some social sciences fields at home is in most cases valuable because the national context is important and expertise is unlikely to exist abroad. In such fields as national and local history, national culture and language, and related subjects, local expertise as well as sources and documentation is often quite good at home. In academic systems that value foreign degrees, this may place the humanities at a disadvantage.

The humanities particularly are often relegated to a distant and low prestige part of the university. The soft sciences must regain their places at the center of academic life. These fields must themselves reintegrate into the mainstream of the university by emphasizing interdisciplinary work, their contributions to general education, and their importance to understanding contemporary society. New fields such as bioethics and environmental science, if they are to be effective, need significant expertise from the humanities and social sciences.

Business programs require a strong element of the social sciences and the best ones include a consideration of ethics. Too often, humanities scholars are content to stick to their narrow disciplines—they must convince others of the relevance of their expertise. If general education and creative thinking are to become part of the curriculum, expertise in the humanities and social sciences is absolutely necessary.

Several key challenges are evident: to improve the image of the soft sciences at every university; to provide capacity in a country to educate scholars at a high level in the various soft science disciplines (all universities of course need not offer a full range of specialties); to integrate the humanities and social sciences into interdisciplinary programs in professional and other fields; and to have capacity in these fields to contribute to general education.

The humanities and social sciences are not only an essential part of the idea of the university; they are at the core of understanding contemporary society. History, sociology, philosophy, and other disciplines interpret today's key challenges. The university, as the central institution providing careful analysis and interpretation of society, requires the soft sciences as never before. ■

Exploring Academic Salaries in a Comparative Context

IVÁN PACHECO AND LAURA E. RUMBLEY

Iván Pacheco is a graduate research assistant and doctoral student in higher education administration at Boston College. Laura E. Rumbley is a research associate at the Boston College Center for International Higher Education. E-mails: pacheciv@bc.edu; rumbley@bc.edu.

Surveying the range of faculty salaries around the world feels like checking out apples and oranges . . . and bananas, strawberries, kiwis, cherries, and plums. Finding complete, current, and parallel sets of data across countries often represents an extraordinarily difficult task. It becomes even more daunting to compare the data in various countries against one another, given the unique cultural, economic, and professional circumstances in which academics live and work across the globe.

Examining faculty compensation around the world can reveal the value individual societies attribute to the academic enterprise and those who carry it forward. This work can highlight the factors that affect how academic staff are compensated in different countries. And, it may also add much-needed insight into the phenomena of brain drain and brain gain.

A small number of studies have attempted to compare fac-

ulty salaries internationally, but only a few have cast a wide geographic net and included countries of varied levels of national and economic development. In 2007, the Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) launched an exploratory project attempting to do just that—collecting and comparing salary data (in World Bank PPP dollars) from 15 countries and one territory, including Argentina, Australia, Canada, China, Colombia, France, Germany, India, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Palestine.

In terms of salary progressions over the course of a career, our data show that faculty in wealthier, more developed countries tend to enjoy greater potential for salary growth.

SALARY COMPARISONS AND NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The CIHE study found that overall average monthly salaries ranged from \$1,182 in China to \$6,038 in Canada. These findings produced an international average of \$4,856 per month, with Canadian academics earning on average 5.1 times more on a monthly basis than their Chinese counterparts.

To put some of this information in context, it is important to consider how faculty salaries compare to some benchmark data. Here, we looked at target countries' relative positions on the Human Development Index (HDI) of the United Nations Development Program for comparative analysis. Not surprisingly, the countries of less advanced "human development" exhibited lower average salaries than those considered to have higher levels of human development.

There were several interesting exceptions to this rule, however. For example, Saudi Arabia, ranked no. 61 on the HDI, consistently outpaced average salary levels in Australia (no. 3), the United Kingdom (no. 16), Japan (no. 8), Germany (no. 22), and France (no. 10). South Africa also bucked this trend to some degree. With an HDI ranking of 121, South Africa registered a higher entry-level salary average than Malaysia (no. 63), Colombia (no. 75), and China (no. 81). Even more notable, in a comparison of top-level salary averages, South Africa showed higher levels of compensation than 10 of the 15 countries studied—including Australia, the United Kingdom, Japan, Germany, and France. Meanwhile, the Chinese higher education system consistently came in dead last in the international comparison of salary averages.

EARNINGS POTENTIAL OVER TIME

In terms of salary progressions over the course of a career, our data show that faculty in wealthier, more developed countries tend to enjoy greater potential for salary growth. However, here again notable exceptions occurred to this trend. South Africa