HIGHER EDUCATION AND EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY: A SURVEY OF RECENT CROSS-NATIONAL RESEARCH

Fred A. Lazin
Center for Israel Studies,
American University, Washington, DC
Professor Emeritus, Ben Gurion
University of the Negev Beer Shera

Pregledni rad
Primljeno: listopad 2011.

Summary Rising costs of education at the start of the 21st century seem to indicate a stark shift in education policies, which raises several important questions. The author shows that from the United States to East Asia and Australia – seemingly everywhere – higher education policy is headed in the same direction. The movement to broaden access to public universities, the dominant strategy during the 1970s and 1980s, has largely shifted to enable the marketplace, rather than the government, to shape the contours of higher education. Government funding is being reduced, affirmative action and other programs designed to insure broader access are in decline, and personal fulfilment is replacing a public good designed to insure greater equality of opportunity. The author describes how this sea of change in higher education has played out in economically developed and developing countries. In trying to provide the answer to the above-mentioned development, the author raises the question related to the consequences of a market-driven higher education for student access, teaching and scholarship.*

Keywords higher education policy, market-driven reforms in education policy, government funding of higher education

---

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the conference "Developing policy in different cultural contexts: learning from study, learning from experience", Centre for Advanced Academic Studies, Dubrovnik, Croatia, 10-12 June 2011. The conference was sponsored by the International Political Science Association (IPSA) Research Committee on Public Policy and Public Administration in conjunction with the Croatian Political Science Association, the Institute of Public Administration, the IPSA Research Committee on Comparative Studies on Local Government and Politics, The Faculty of Political Science of the University of Zagreb, the University of Zagreb, and the Research Committee on Public Policy of the Russian Association for Political Science.

Public higher education systems in the United States, Europe and Asia have fostered greater access to a wide range of citizens, providing opportunities that had previously been denied by exclusive elite universities. This was particularly true of American land grant colleges and several public urban institutions which, in the late 19th and 20th century, provided opportunities for citizens – including immigrant populations – to obtain necessary academic credentials and training to advance in the economy and labor force. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act (GI Bill) following World War II allowed many working and lower-middle class veterans to pursue educational degrees at the more prestigious American universities. The 1970s and 1980s saw a further commitment to equality of opportunity for minorities in higher education via affirmative action programs.

The rising costs of education at the start of the 21st century seem to indicate a stark shift in education policies, which raises several important questions: Has the American academic experience changed in recent decades with greater reliance on the private sector and market forces? Are European and Asian universities doing the same? Are newer immigrant groups and emerging minorities being given access to higher education?

In his 2005 bestseller *The World Is Flat*, *New York Times* columnist Thomas Friedman celebrated the fact that globalization was fast leveling the economic playing field. The world of higher education is surely not flat – country-specific cultural norms, and economic calculations and political constraints continue to play a major role – but it is flattening. To what end?

From Asia to Europe, Africa to Australia – seemingly everywhere, higher education policy is headed in the same direction. The movement to broaden access to public universities, the dominant strategy during the 1970s and 1980s, has largely shifted to enable the marketplace, rather than the government, to shape the contours of higher education. Government funding is being reduced, affirmative action and other programs designed to insure broader access are in decline, and personal fulfillment is replacing a public good designed to insure greater equality of opportunity.

This paper describes how this sea of change in higher education has played out in economically developed and developing countries. It is based on several country reports presented at the "Hurst Seminar on Higher Education and Equality of Opportunity: Cross-National Perspectives" at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev (BGU) (Israel) in June 2008. All of the country reports cited here appear in the book *Higher Education and Equality of Opportunity: Cross-National Perspectives* (Lazin *et al*., 2010).

A common set of questions guides these accounts: What are the consequences of a market-driven higher education for student access, teaching and scholarship? What is the impact on the role of the university as an equalizer of opportunity? Is the dominance of marketplace norms and forms inexorable or might governments reclaim some of the authority they have tacitly surrendered?

The value of this paper lies in its coverage of current cross-national dilemmas in higher education. It presents case studies focussing on higher education systems within a particular country or countries on several continents.

The research reported on here provides an interesting contrast of the diversity and uniqueness of higher education in the United States, France, Australia, India, Ghana and several other countries, while at the same time revealing surprising commonalities despite the countries' cultural and ethnic differences. In many countries across five continents, it is evident that there are world-wide trends in higher education including an expanding role for private markets, a cutback in government financing, a narrowing of access, and a receding of affirmative action. Thus, the paper explores universal phenomena in higher education through the individual experiences of different national systems.

This paper also adds to the literature on higher education during the age of globalization. The studies are recent and provide important information about the current situation in higher education in several important countries around the world. The authors, who include some of the most influential scholars in the field as well as younger researchers, are from the United States, Europe, Africa, and Asia. The authors also represent several disciplines in both the social sciences and humanities which contribute to an interdisciplinary analysis.

Hopefully, this paper will be of interest to students of higher education, higher education policy, development, equity and globalization. There is also material here which will interest students of public policy of the United States, European Union countries, India, Far East, Oceania, and Africa.

In his chapter, *The Earth is Flattening: The Globalization of Higher Education and its Implications for Equal Opportunity*, David Kirp presents a theoretical framework for the other chapters presented here and in the book. He argues that the dominant strategy in higher education in the 1970s and 1980s to broaden access to public universities "has largely been supplanted by reliance on the marketplace, not the government, to shape the contours of higher education" (*ibid.*: 11). While the United States has led in reforming higher education over the past half century, first with the access revolution and then with the market revolution, other countries have followed. From Taiwan to Great Britain, Ghana to Australia – seemingly everywhere, higher education policy is headed in the same direction. The movement to broaden access to public universities, the dominant strategy during the 1970s and 1980s, has largely been supplanted by reliance on the marketplace, not the government, to shape the contours of higher education. As the United States has shifted from an opportunity-driven approach toward a market-driven strategy, other countries have followed suit.

In the US, he cites the changes in the University of California system where government funding has been reduced, tuition tripled, private funding is perceived as the solution and the system is seen less as serving the broader community/public interest (*ibid.*: 13).

Many universities now respond to rankings and place a priority on serving the needs and preferences of customers (students). The curriculum reflects what sells and attracts. They build posh dorms and sport centers at the expense of libraries and research facilities. Scholarships are now given more on merit than need. Since the 1970s, affirmative action which had given new opportunities to minority students has been under siege and on the decline. There is clearly

a bias in favor of the elite and better off population at the expense of the poor. Kirp argues (2008) that "smart poor kids go to college at the same rate as stupid rich kids".

In the past, Americans believed that higher education was an engine of mobility, as evidenced by the 1867 land grants policy for public universities and the 1944 GI Bill. Today higher education is seen less and less as a public good and a social benefit whose costs should be mostly borne by taxpayers. Most view it "as private good whose cost should mainly be the responsibility of the individuals who will reap most benefits" (Lazin *et al*., 2010: 15).

Kirp argues that until the 1970s, most other higher education systems in the world were more elitist and centralized. Globalization and the knowledge economy contributed to change and the demise of the older higher education systems by making knowledge instantly and ubiquitously accessible. Nevertheless, over the past few decades, governments have been cutting support for public education and market forces have become the driving force of higher education worldwide. The result is a remarkable convergence – a "flattening" of the higher education universe – among developed and developing nations alike.

Two papers report on open admissions at Hunter College of the City University of New York (CUNY), the third largest university system in the United States. They both address issues of access and excellence in CUNY's admission policies.

CUNY instituted an open admissions policy in 1970, in which many of its senior colleges, including Hunter, went from an exclusive to an all-inclusive system (*ibid*.: 70). The open admissions policy gave high school students with 80 or above or in the top 50 percent of their class entry into any of the CUNY Senior colleges.

In *From Open-Admissions to Honors College: Equal Opportunities at the City University of New York*, Judith Naomi Friedlander focuses on the debate over CUNY's admission policies and the effectiveness of the Hunter College's honors program. In 1970, CUNY's Board of Trustees embraced the ideals of affirmative action, proclaiming that every high school graduate in New York City would henceforth be admitted to CUNY. By the late 1990s, the pendulum began swinging back in the opposite direction. Severe pressure from Mayor Giuliani's office and elsewhere persuaded the Trustees in 1999 to put an end to open admissions and to close down remedial programs at the four-year senior colleges, including Hunter College.

Friedlander cites conflicting evidence about the Open Admissions Program. On the one hand, some researchers show that the program was an important positive experience in the life of many of the participants. On the other hand, she cites evidence that many of the participants were not prepared and lacked skills necessary for college. Many did not graduate within 4-8 years (*ibid*.: 73). Overall, she believes that academic standards fell dramatically at a former elite public institution which had been the only academic institution in the world to produce two female Nobel Prize winners.

Politically active members of CUNY, long identified with the Civil Rights Movement, argued that ending affirmative action would have a negative impact on the diversity and size of Hunter's stu-

dent body. These predictions, however, have proved wrong. Since 1999 enrollment has actually grown by ten percent and the ethnic and racial distribution of students continues to reflect the diversity of New York City. Nevertheless, as Tien argues below, the African-American student population at Hunter College declined.

Friedlander also discusses the success of Hunter's honors program which fosters academic careers for many of its minority students. As the door was being closed to minority students that were poorly prepared for college, academic leaders at Hunter College committed to continue a previous tradition of providing academic opportunities in the sciences for elite minority students. In 2001, CUNY Chancellor Goldstein opened an Honors College within 7 of the 11 senior colleges. Tuition was waived for participants. By 2007-2008, Hunter's undergraduate population of 16,000 had 323 Honors Students, the largest number of any CUNY campus (*ibid*.: 76). The Hunter Program at the same time obtained massive federal funding to train minority students in the sciences. Ironically, the ending of open admissions and the subsequent drop in enrollments of African-American students could lead to Hunter loosing its eligibility to apply to federal funds for science education at "minority institutions" of higher education.

In *The Changing American College Experience: A View from the City University of New York, Hunter College*, Charles Tien analyzes the way in which policy changes in access and market approaches have affected minority enrollment at Hunter, especially for African-American and Asian-American students. His analysis focuses on data for CUNY's special admission program SEEK (Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge) and data on graduation rates. He also utilizes data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth to compare minority students' college experiences with that of white students.

Tien focuses on the SEEK program, established in the fall of 1966 and designed to serve underrepresented minorities at CUNY. Later it would be open to all races of open admissions students. In 1966, the minority population of CUNY stood at 4 percent.

In 1988, at Hunter College over 65 percent were minority students (22.9 percent African-American, 20.6 percent Hispanic, and 11.4 percent Asian). In 2003, the white student body stood at 35.2 percent.

In respect of graduation rates for open admission students at Hunter College in the 1980s, less than 4 percent graduated in 4 years, while 34.7 percent graduated in five years (*ibid*.: 93). Tien points out that the national average for graduation in 5 years was 54.3 percent. Looking at the SEEK program, the six year graduation rate at Hunter was very low at 13.9 percent, while for other students the rate was 28.9 percent. In trying to explain the results, Tien emphasizes that 25 percent of open admissions students worked full or part time, 30 percent are or have been married and many are raising children, and about half the freshmen are foreign born.

The 1990s brought about changes to SEEK both before and after the end of open admissions. The number of whites in SEEK increased from 1996 to 2007 from 6 to 10.51 percent, with most of the whites being students from the re-

cent immigrant communities from the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The African-American student population plummeted. In 1988, 38.9 percent of the SEEK students at Hunter were black, in 1996 – 30 percent, and in 2007 – 10.7 percent. The Hispanic population has remained above 30 percent going from a high 45.21 in 1988 to 38.08 percent in 2002. In respect of Asian students, first time SEEK freshmen in 2007 were 42.2 percent Asian.

The figures suggest a significant decline in African-American students and an even greater increase in Asian-American students. As already noted, the decline of African-American students may create a dilemma for Hunter College, which receives massive federal funding for its science programs as an institution serving a minority student body. Regardless, it would seem that Tien's findings support Friedlander's conclusion that open admissions admitted minority students, too many of whom lacked the skills and support to succeed in higher education.

Ka Ho Mok and John Hawkins's *The Quest for World Class Status: Globalization and Higher Education in East Asia* presents an in-depth study of reforms in higher education policies throughout East Asia. To become globally competitive, governments and universities in these countries began searching for new methods to improve university governance. Not satisfied with the conventional model of state-oriented, highly centralized higher education, coupled with the pressures to improve the efficiency of university governance, many Asian governments have introduced corporatization and privatization measures to run their state/national universities. These moves are designed to make national universities more flexible and responsive to rapid socio-economic changes. Instead of being closely directed by the Ministry of Education or equivalent government administrative bodies, state universities in Asia are now required to become more proactive and dynamic in obtaining their own financial resources.

In order to survive, universities have become customer-focused business enterprises (*ibid*.: 127). They act in market-like ways which result in changes in funding, management and function. These pressures often lead to strengthened partnerships with industry and business. As Kirp argues, the Chinese universities are privatizing and being driven by a market which makes them responsive to demands of students for a specific curriculum.

Hong Kong, for example, adopted this model for governance of its universities. Moreover, the Hong Kong University Grant Committee now favors much more extensive collaboration between academic institutions.

In Singapore, Singapore Management University (SMU) and the Ministry of Education have altered governance models of state universities, University of Singapore and Nanyang Technical University. Each has become an independent entity via corporatization. Similarly, in Malaysia public universities are now being run as corporations.

Mok and Hawkins conclude that decentralization efforts as well as marketization and corporatization strategies have not really liberated universities or empowered academics. This has rather led to a re-regulation and re-centralization through various kinds of accountability measures and performance checks.

Accountability relationships are often at the expense of democratic values and academic freedom. In Hong Kong, recent economic setbacks have resulted in universities focusing their research on commercial products.

They also discuss the trend in several Asian countries and universities to strive for "world-class" university status. This often involves, the authors argue, negative consequences for the universities, faculty, students and the public at large.

Hong Kong, for example, aims to become a world academic hub. It pressures its universities to get involved in international research by putting more weight on research performance and research-performance-led funding. There is pressure to publish in English, which often results in neglecting "local" language publications.

Taiwan and China have similar policies. For example, China's "211 project" focuses on developing 100 universities and departments to compete in the world system. Its "985 scheme" wants to transform Beijing University and Tsinghua University to be world-class.

Similarly, Japan has launched a "Flagship Universities" project to identify a few universities to become world--class. Singapore has the same strategy. It has invited major foreign universities to open branches in Singapore.

The emphasis on developing world--class universities, they argue, furthers the gap between these and other universities in their respective countries. Well--established universities clearly have advantages over the newer institutions. Moreover, government pressure to perform leads many institutions to neglect teaching and research, and to focus on economic and social development via entrepreneurial activities. They cite Phillip Altbach's claim that globalization reinforces regional inequalities and hurts the poorer countries and their institutes of higher learning which cannot compete (*ibid.*: 136). Finally, they suggest that the push for world-class universities is perceived by some scholars as a form of cultural imperialism dominated by the United States and Western Europe.

In *The Korean Passage to Tertiary Education for All: Over-Privatization*, Ki Seok Kim and Hwambo Park examine the privatization of tertiary education in Korea. In some respects, the particular experiences of higher education in Korea are unique. Nevertheless, the trends in Korean higher education coincide in many ways with the trends experienced by the United States and other countries in the Far East as described by Mok and Hawkins.

The main driving force behind the rapid expansion of higher education was not a concerted central planning effort by the government, but rather the parents' zeal and willingness to financially support their children's studies. The Korean tradition of parental involvement began during the Japanese occupation when, in response to Japanese policies favoring technical education, the parents funded general academic education (*ibid.*: 149). The current system is characterized by extreme over-privatization, with more than 80 percent of students at private universities and colleges. Moreover, Korea has achieved an unprecedented simultaneous transition to universal access to secondary and tertiary education. Korea has one of the highest rates of tertiary education in the world, surpassing the United States. The idea of "tertiary education for all" is closer to

reality in Korea than in any other country. At the same time, it was one of the first countries to achieve almost universal completion of secondary education. The phenomenon of achieving both simultaneously is unprecedented. The Korean case provides valuable insights for tertiary education policies in other countries.

But the privatization and the lack of government coordination result in many problems. The fact that so much is dependent on private funding leads to the widely held belief that higher education is not a public good. Moreover, there is no unified, coordinated and functional system of higher educational in the country. A more functional system would assign tasks to particular universities and sectors (public/private). Most universities have no special mission or function; all strive to be comprehensive flagship institutions. Many tertiary institutions provide both academic and non-academic studies (*ibid*.: 153). Some universities offer PhD programs without having the necessary resources. At the same time, the higher education system does not meet the human resources needs of Korea's rapidly growing knowledge-intensive industries.

The authors call for a system of governance over higher education. This is essential to the establishment and implementation of a revised coherent system of tertiary education which provides diversity of higher education opportunities. There is a need to differentiate between research universities, teaching universities and vocational colleges. Finally, they also praise the efforts by Seoul National University and Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology to become world-class competitive research universities.

In *Disparities in Access to Higher Education in India: Persistent Issues and the Changing Context*, Narayana Jayaram focuses on recent changes in the issues of unequal access to higher education in India. He argues that the concern with access to higher education is not new; it has been addressed by policy-makers repeatedly since the program of planned development began in India in the early 1950s. However, the context in which the issue was addressed has not remained the same. During the first four decades (1950s through the 1980s), the key strategy was steady expansion of the tertiary sector of education under state patronage. The achievements were impressive. The system expanded from 20 universities and 496 colleges with 241,000 students in 1947 to 437 universities and 16,009 colleges with 11.8 million students in 2005 (*ibid*.: 162). Nevertheless, in 2007 only 7-10 percent of those between the ages of 18 and 34 study at colleges and universities.

At the same time, serious regional, gender, caste and tribal imbalances characterize the higher education system. Some regions have large numbers of students and others far fewer. Moreover, almost all universities and colleges are urban, while there are few in rural areas. Women are underrepresented. They made up about 10 percent of the students in 1951, and about 40 percent in 2004. They remain a minority. Some states have been proactive in helping women to study, while others neglect the issue.

In respect of caste, tribal and religious affiliation, there have been affirmative action programs since 1961. For example, 15 percent of all places for funded higher education for castes, and 7.5 percent for tribes. In some areas,

states reserve even more places for them. By 2004, scheduled castes made up 10.7 percent and scheduled tribes 3.78 percent of the student body. The percentage of Muslim students reflects their percentage in society.

With the adoption of the structural adjustment program and the policy of liberalization (since the early 1990s), the state is gradually withdrawing from the sphere of higher education. The void created by this policy is being filled by private initiatives and innovations. This shift from state patronage to laissez--faireism in the sphere of higher education has thrown up new issues concerning access and development. There is no longer an effort to tie the educational system to the needs of the economy. As a result, many academic grads remain unemployed. The liberal arts are neglected as students choose to study more practical subjects. There is a rise of professional and allied courses, and other schools now compete with universities.

The new policy has forced universities to find alternative funding. Some have twinned programs with foreign universities. In the face of a freeze on new institutions of higher education, some foreign universities have opened branches in India. Jayaram believes that privatization will reinforce the existing inequalities between regions, genders, castes and tribes.

In *The Development of Corporate and Private Universities in Ghana: Effects on Curriculum, Faculty, Access and Equity*, Josiah Cobbah examines Ghana's rapid surge in private universities. In the past, government funding allowed for the expansion of the higher education system. The student body grew from 9,997 students in 1990 to 63,576 in 2004. Government funding however could not keep up with the demand (*ibid*.: 234-236). Moreover, in recent years government funding has been cut from $2360 per pupil in 1991 to $566 in 2000 (*ibid*.: 237). Private colleges and universities have filled the gap. Since the latter charge a higher tuition, there is less access for poorer students. There are also significant regional imbalances; nearly 70 percent of all students at the top 5 universities are from three southern regions.

Cobbah argues that privatization and corporatization may be doing more harm than good to Ghanaian higher education. The emphasis on marketing is increasingly changing the nature of the university and the commitment of academic staff to the university. Students are demanding more business courses, and the private sector is providing them. At universities which operate on a tight budget, few faculty are given tenure, salaries are low so as to allow higher payment to the few better known academics, and there is little incentive for and/or interest in research. The universities are controlled by external interests, and even religious bodies are now exerting influence. Clearly, as in other countries, higher education is perceived more as a private good than a public good for the benefit of society.

In *Access to Higher Education in France: Between Equality of Rights and Meritocracy: A Long Walk to Equalities of Opportunity?*, Gaele Goastellec provides a broad picture of the French higher education system. She explains the organization of access to higher education in France and analyses the difficulties faced in conceiving and implementing the equality of opportunity policies. She focuses on the conflict between meri-

tocracy and equality of rights. She explains that the principles regulating access to higher education in France echo a dual higher education system of the elite *Grandes Ecoles* and the more inclusive universities in a national and legal framework that claims equality as its basic value.

On the one hand, the sector composed of the so-called *Grandes Ecoles* is highly selective and, though based on "pure" academic merit, it largely favors the offspring of the elite. Between 1960 and 1990, working class children were 23 times less probable to get accepted than those from the upper class. On the other hand, universities offer open access to all secondary education graduates, following the principle of equality of rights. Since 1969, all high school students have the right of access to the university of their choice (*ibid.*: 255). But, behind this formal equality that led to the tremendous expansion of the university sector, local cooling-outs are organized, and the social distribution of students testifies of a high degree of inequalities. In practice, many universities find ways to reject applicants. Thus access to higher education remains linked to social background. For example, more children of the elite study medicine, law and health sciences at universities.

She notes a new experiment begun at the Parisian Institute of Political Science (one of the *Grandes Ecoles*), which began to accept a small number of students from the less qualified, socially poorer sectors of society. This involves seeking out potential students and preparatory programs at the high school level. Together with a policy of fee reductions and scholarships favoring low-income students, this altered in a *minor way* the student body at the *Grandes Ecoles*.

She concludes (*ibid.*: 267) that massification of higher education allows for a greater number of students to access higher education. However, massification tends to reproduce inequalities instead of promoting social justice.

In *Altruism and Avarice: The Place of Foreign Students in Australian Universities*, Don Stewart reviews the place of foreign students in the Australian higher education system over the last fifty years. The research ranges from an earlier period, when the foreign students' presence in the universities reflected the 'goodwill' of the Australian Government and the Australian universities towards less wealthy neighboring countries, to the present time, when they are now the largest source of non-government income for those universities. In 2006-2007, for example, Australia issued 228,000 student visas (up to 19 percent in one year). In 2000, foreign student paid tuition generated 3.7B Australian dollars, and they composed 17.3 percent of university students at Australia's forty (38 public and 2 private) universities (*ibid.*: 35, 36).

The number of Australian college students grew from 31,753 in 1949 to 695,000 in 2000. Fees were abolished in 1972. In 1988, the government introduced a system of repayment after graduation for university education (Higher Education Contribution Scheme [HECS]) for Australian students. In contrast, foreign students had to pay full fees and direct costs including a capital component (for depreciation of costs of the capital, buildings, libraries and equipment) paid for by the Australian taxpayers.

When full tuition was introduced, foreign students stood at 5 percent and

they quickly grew to 18 percent. At the same time, government funding for tertiary education decreased by 7 percent (in the 1995-2003 period). Having few avenues to raise funds, the universities saw foreign student tuition (which they received directly, and not via the government) as a major source of funding. For example, it made up 16 percent of the annual budget at Melbourne University.

Ironically, this led to the demand that Australian students pay full fees. In practice some were charged for graduate studies. The 2007 Labor government planned to phase out the Higher Education Contribution Scheme.

This case study shows how changing attitudes towards equality of opportunity for Australian students have been reflected in attitudes towards foreign students and, perhaps paradoxically, how attitudes towards foreign students have been reflected back on the provision (or lack of it) of opportunities for tertiary education for less affluent Australian students.

Conclusions

Clearly the trends in the United States of a cutback in public funding for higher education and a system driven by the private market seem to be occurring also in countries around the world. Of course, the conclusions here are limited to the few case studies. The answer to the question of 'how representative are the trends presented here in the various case studies?' lies beyond the scope of this paper.

The effect of privatization and reliance on the market and parents (as in Korea and elsewhere) is to make higher education a private good and the responsibility of the recipient (the student) and his/her family. In this century, in many countries including the United States, Ghana, Korea, and India, higher education is no longer considered a public good, a service which is for the benefit of all to better themselves and to raise the level of society. Consequently, in many countries, higher education today is much less a means for social mobility.

With regard to the United States, the change is drastic. For the past century, public education in public universities allowed many "have nots", including new immigrants, to better themselves and improve. After World War II, massive financing via the GI Bill allowed millions of veterans to gain education at private and public universities. Later affirmative action programs enhanced opportunities for qualified students to enter higher education and advance. These gates of opportunity are closing.

The case of open admissions at Hunter College suggests that many of the participants were not qualified. In time they were excluded, and then replaced by Asian-American students who had the skills and benefited from a relatively inexpensive and accessible higher education system.

A market-driven higher education system in the United States and elsewhere might also lead to the passing of traditional research universities, both public and private. For example, tuition has increased, tenure is being abolished or limited, research is becoming more applied and often contracted with private companies, and professional training replaces the pursuit of knowledge. Is this change/passing of the traditional research university a bad thing?

The last question raises a philosophic debate concerning the parable about "who knows best whether the shoe fits?

The cobbler or the wearer of the shoe?" Many scholars bemoan the potential passing of the traditional universities. On the other hand, many people are learning what they want to learn, and systems might become more efficient and cost-effective. With a market-driven system, universities and other institutions strive to meet the needs/demands and/or interests of potential students. Many prefer more applied subjects, especially in business and finance, often to the detriment of the liberal arts. The market dictates efficiency and a balanced budget, which results in lower faculty salaries (often without tenure) and higher tuition.

Finally, several of the country studies reported here indicate pursuit of world--class universities. Having a world-class research university is important for many countries because it allows one or more of its institutions to become part of the first tier international educational and research network. Participation could lead to significant economic developments in the future. It also contributes to national prestige.

But only the wealthiest of countries can compete and only a few of their universities. Consequently, a few institutions (and faculty and students) receive a larger proportion of public resources allocated to higher education at the expense of the overwhelming majority of institutions (faculty and students). Thus inequality in higher education between countries and within countries may increase. Some see this effort as another form of cultural imperialism or globalization in higher education, led by the American universities in which most participants, regardless of country, speak, read, teach and do research in English.

REFERENCES

Friedman, Thomas (2005) *The World Is Flat*. NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Kirp, David (2008) "College for the Few". *The American Prospect*, December 9.

Lazin, Fred, Evans, Matt, and Jayaram, N. (eds.) (2010) *Higher Education and Equality of Opportunity: Cross-National Perspectives*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Visoko obrazovanje i jednakost mogućnosti: pregled najnovijih usporednih nacionalnih istraživanja

SAŽETAK Čini se da su sve veći troškovi obrazovanja na početku 21. stoljeća označili oštar zaokret u obrazovnim politikama, koji otvara niz značajnih pitanja. Autor pokazuje da se politika visokog obrazovanja praktično svugdje, od Sjedinjenih Država preko Istočne Azije do Australije, kreće zapravo u istom smjeru. Naime pokret za proširenjem dostupnosti obrazovanja na javnim sveučilištima, dominantna strategija koja je bila na djelu 1970-ih i

1980-ih godina, uglavnom je promijenjen kako bi se snagama tržišta, a ne vladi, dopustilo da oblikuju konture visokog obrazovanja. Autor opisuje na koji se način niz promjena u visokom obrazovanju odvijao u ekonomski razvijenim, za razliku od nerazvijenih zemalja. U nastojanju da pruži odgovor na prethodno spomenute procese autor postavlja niz pitanja vezanih uz posljedice trendova u visokom obrazovanju prouzročene djelovanjem tržišnih snaga, poput pitanja dostupnosti visokog obrazovanja, odvijanja nastave i stipendiranja studenata.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI politika visokog obrazovanja, tržišno orijentirane reforme u obrazovnoj politici, državno financiranje visokog obrazovanja