2

DISTINCTIVE LOCAL CONTINUITIES AMIDST SIMILAR NEO-LIBERAL CHANGES: THE COMPARATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE PARTICULAR

GARY RHOADES

My first exposure to Maurice Kogan's work came in 1981, when I read a little book of his entitled, *The Politics of Education: Edward Boyle and Anthony Crosland in Conversation with Maurice Kogan* (1971). Within his interviews and commentary lay three key and enduring features of his scholarship. First, Kogan afforded the reader entrée into the complex interrelations between knowledge, governance, and values. The interviews, after all, were with the Minister of Education and the subsequent Secretary of the Department of Education and Science in the UK, who were prominent national leaders in different political parties. Second, Kogan attended to detail, and to the interesting continuities in government and higher education even in times of significant change. For all the differences in Boyle's and Crosland's values and styles, there were also some remarkable commonalities. Maurice was sensitive to both in his rendering of not just these ministers but the ministries with which they interacted and through which they tried to act. Third, Kogan walked the reader through a body of empirical evidence and inductively built theory on that foundation. Maurice is not one to grand theorise; what is more compelling to him, and comes from him, is an accumulation of solid empirical evidence. The detailed and compelling cases of his interviews with Boyle and Crosland reflect the focus and quality of Kogan's empirical work.

A recent example of Kogan's work also reflects these three features. Nearly a quarter century after I came to Maurice's work as a postdoctoral researcher in Burton Clark's Comparative Higher Education Research Group at UCLA, I continue to draw on it. In *Reforming Higher Education*, Kogan and Hanney (2000) analyse the shifting values and governance structures, and the significant continuities that define 20 years of policy changes in UK higher education. One of the key subheadings in the concluding chapter is "Exceptionalism, continuity, and change"; Kogan and Hanney identify four features of continuity amidst changes in the British higher education landscape. The in-depth understanding of the phenomena at hand is grounded in 300+ interviews. Kogan's comparative work is similarly situated in extensive

I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds.), Governing Knowledge, 11-28.
© 2005 *Springer. Printed in the Netherlands.*

local knowledge: this book is part of a three-country study, with teams of colleagues in Norway and Sweden utilising compatible research frames to develop their own accounts, and later a comparative volume (Kogan et al., 2000). Thus, Kogan provides insights into the particularities of national higher education systems, and the enduring values about knowledge that affect and are enacted in governance across systems. For him, the modus operandi and the goal are inductively derived understandings, which he distinguishes from the approach of Dutch higher education scholars:

In the social arena, the data emerge in topological rather than progressive arrangements. Whilst we can certainly look for juxtapositions and thematic comparisons, and attempt to find causal explanations, we will be strapping ourselves into an unnecessary bed of nails if we try to direct our research on the basis of prestructured hypotheses. … It is wrong to assume that without hypothesising there is no theorising. (Kogan & Hanney, 2000: 21)

Kogan draws on theory eclectically to inform and clarify the particular patterns that he observes. In doing so, he offers a profoundly important stance in comparative work.

The work that I present for this *festschrift* pays homage to Maurice in several regards. First, as Maurice's work has underscored the importance of the particular and the empirical in providing common comparisons within and across national settings, in this chapter I explore distinctive local continuities amidst similar neo-liberal changes that are unfolding globally. Shifts or translations between neo-liberal changes at the international, national, regional, and local levels are addressed. By neo-liberal changes I mean both formal policies and underlying conceptions that in education involve reducing public sectors, decreasing public subsidies, increasing evaluation, monitoring, and competition, and increasing tuition fees and privatisation. In the neo-liberal model, the private sector market is valorised and promoted. Managerial influence within organisations is enhanced. Students are framed as consumers, and as flows of human capital to be productively processed. Public sector entities are encouraged to more closely intersect with and model themselves on private sector enterprises. A narrow, economic role of revenue generation and contribution to the corporate economy is emphasised for educational institutions. And private models of education are promoted. As a scholar from the U.S., which has a strong private higher education sector, one of the themes I develop relates to conceptualisations and roles of public and private universities.

Second, as with Maurice's analytical focus, in this chapter I focus on values, conceptions of knowledge, and models of governance, applying these concerns to the substantive areas of U.S. and Mexican higher education, and featuring important neo-liberal developments in each. In the realm of values, I discuss how if histori-

cally universities in some countries were nation-building institutions, now they are increasingly nation-positioning institutions in a globally competitive marketplace. That role necessarily features, in neo-liberal style, the economic functions of universities, and thus of knowledge, although these may be differentially specified in different national contexts. In the realm of conceptions of knowledge, I discuss how, if historically universities in some countries have been seen as a source of significant national knowledge, now they are increasingly being evaluated according to the significance of their knowledge in the global economy. Part of the neo-liberal model is to encourage closer connections between higher education and the economy and to emphasise the value of knowledge that can potentially generate revenue in the private and global marketplace. This has tended to mean a reduced emphasis on basic relative to applied fields (and on the arts, humanities, and social sciences, which often are grounded in the particular cultures of countries, relative to the natural sciences), and an increased investment in fields like biotechnology and information sciences in which the boundaries between fundamental and applied research are relatively blurred. So I outline some of the choices that we find across countries in the local, national, and global applications to which universities orient their knowledge. Finally, in the realm of models of governance, I discuss how, if historically universities have been shaped by senior academics, now they are increasingly being shaped by academic managers and non-academic professionals, in ways that substantially vary cross-nationally. Again, my position as a scholar in the U.S. shapes my discussion. In examining governance issues I concentrate on the department and campus levels of analysis rather than on state and federal boards, systems and ministries. Thus in developing the theme of the contrast between public policy and discourse and private practice, I emphasise the inner lives of departments and contrast that to the public postures of universities.

In short, then, I feature significant commonalities and variations in the neo-liberal directions being pursued in higher education systems and institutions. And I speak to the above analytical foci in the context of three general research projects in which I have been involved. The first is a project supported by the National Science Foundation that focused on entrepreneurial activity at the department level of public research universities in the U.S. (Leslie, Oaxaca & Rhoades, 1999). The second is a set of doctoral dissertations I chaired focusing on neo-liberal policies stemming partly from the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in Mexican public universities in three different fields of study – business, engineering, and women's studies (Acosta, 1998; Bracamontes, 2003; Saunders, 2003). The third is a project that is in its initial stages; its aim is to focus on differences between public and private sectors in Mexico versus the U.S. Rather than seeking to provide a comparison of Mexico and the U.S. on key dimensions, my aim is to draw on material from these two national contexts to develop the themes. Notably, all three projects are

joint endeavours, as is so often the case with Maurice's comparative work. And this is a third way that I pay homage to Maurice's work, his emphasis on extensive empirical projects conducted with various colleagues.

I further try to pay homage to Maurice in a fourth way, stylistically. In introducing sections of the paper, I offer a quote from Maurice's writings to convey one of the three key analytical themes – the major features of Kogan's scholarship. In addition, I start each of the sections with a brief vignette to express the principal issues being addressed. Maurice is an excellent raconteur, and satirist, with all the attention to the details and ironies of life that go with that. Though I am unable to adequately replicate and mimic these qualities, I offer, by way of entrée to the cases, a concrete rendering of what Maurice has called the "inner life of institutions" (Kogan, 1984).

Finally, I close with some thoughts about patterns of neo-liberalism in higher education that in important regards take us beyond some of the boundaries that I believe are ingrained within Kogan's work. I do this in part because Maurice himself (Kogan, 1996) has called for the pursuit of new approaches in comparative higher education. I do it also because I know that for Maurice one of the greatest forms of flattery is not imitation but the effort to build on and modify the foundation he has established.

ENTREPRENEURIALISM AND DEPARTMENTS IN U.S. PUBLIC RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES

The inner life of institutions becomes more complex as they attempt to reconcile collegiality, managerialism, popularism, and many, often conflicting, forms of participation. (Kogan, 1984: 60)

Much has been written about entrepreneurial universities (Clark, 1998; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). But most of what has been written concentrates on research, on patents and technology transfer. Far less has attended to the internal realities of academic departments, probing the concrete realities of research and teaching in the context of a managerial push to connect more extensively with private industry and to generate more revenue. The general policy trends are clear and overwhelming, representing an extraordinary external stimulus. But what is less clear is what is happening internally at the level of the basic "production" unit. In this section I explore what Clark (1998) has referred to as the "academic heartland" of discipline based academic departments.

The narrative story-lines of two department heads capture some significant themes that emerged in an interview based study of 131 heads in science and engineering at public research universities (Leslie, Rhoades & Oaxaca, 1999). The first story-line speaks to a level of uncertainty amidst a broad range of demands that are

raining down on academic departments from within and outside the university. As one head of computer science indicated, he was unable to get any sense of priorities from central administrators. They just want faculty members to do more, with less; to get more federal grant monies and to obtain private sector support for their research; to publish more articles and to patent their work; to teach larger numbers of undergraduates, and to ensure that larger numbers graduate; to address different learning styles of students, and to use instructional technology in the classroom. And to reach out to the community. From his perspective, the inner life of the institution reflected a confusion or just an undifferentiated and, he felt, unrealistic demand for more.

A second department head's story-line offers another perspective. He was clearly angry and upset about a shift in federal and institutional priorities that did not serve his unit well. As he said, the Cold War had ended, and Department of Defense and National Science Foundation support for basic research in mathematics was declining. The institution wanted faculty to pursue private sector contracts, but there was little possibility of that, he felt, in the case of faculty members in his department. The one opportunity structure that existed was in the realm of mathematical education, which infuriated him. He complained vigorously about the "educationists" who, he felt, had at that point taken over the National Science Foundation and were emphasising grants that addressed mathematics and science education at the undergraduate and secondary school level. Although aware that the rules of the game had changed, this head was less interested in strategically moving to address new opportunities than he was in decrying the new directions.

Many department heads that were interviewed for this project had undertaken various entrepreneurial efforts to generate revenues for their unit. But the two that I describe above express key patterns and themes that emerged. First, the responses of heads to the changing fiscal realities of public universities were uneven, and in some sense almost unrelated to the pressures that were being applied by central academic managers (Rhoades, 2000). There was clearly a changed model of governance in these institutions. At the campus level, universities were adopting forms of incentive based budgeting (Leslie et al., 2002) and seeking in managerial style to more strategically focus their resources, leading departments to be more accountable for their productivity, and to compete with each other for institutional resources. These more managerially led resource allocation and strategic planning mechanisms were clearly, in the eyes of department heads, a response to state boards and legislatures that were demanding greater accountability from public enterprises, even as they were becoming less willing to provide public subsidy to universities that were not sufficiently attentive to productivity. Yet it was far from clear that the public discourse and policy of increased managerial pressure from multiple sources in central administration (provost, president, and various vice-presidents) (e.g., for research,

undergraduate affairs, and development) and in state government were generating a consistent, clear, and strategic response in the actual practices of department heads.

In some ways, many heads were involved in seeking to strategically position their units to obtain more resources, externally and from the central administration. The orientation of these efforts was largely one of national competition among similar departments, or competition on campus with related departments. Yet in contrast to what I note later with regard to Mexican universities, there was little sense at the departmental level of being part of an enterprise that had a significant national role.

In terms of conceptions of knowledge, two important themes emerged. First, with regard to research knowledge, although there was evidence of a shift towards research and knowledge that would intersect with and pay off in the private sector, there was little evidence of a significant shift to applied research, or research geared to private sector needs. Departments and their heads were very much connected to their disciplines and to the status structure of those disciplines. There continued to be a marked preference in review processes for federal grant money over support from the private sector, in part because the former was seen as a proxy measure of quality, because it was peer reviewed. However, within fields, there was a clear push not only publicly from the institution but also privately from department heads and professional peers, to generate more grant revenue, partly in order to supplement increasingly insufficient monies allocated from the state. Virtually all departments were being forced to support their basic activities with monies that they had generated on their own. Between fields, there was also clear evidence of a shift in the kinds of scientific knowledge being valued by the institution. With the end of the Cold War, the favoured status of physics and mathematics, with their massive subsidies from various federal agencies, was on the decline. And with the rise of the new economy, fields such as computer science and various biomedical and biotechnology fields, which were seen as having direct payoffs in the commercial sector, were the focus of institutional investment. The humanities, fine arts, and social sciences were not even part of this calculus.

A second theme had to do with education knowledge. In this realm, department heads and faculty seemed much more willing to explicitly orient the curriculum to considerations of the marketplace. That applied particularly to the development of new programmes and degrees to target particular student markets. Most telling here was the development of thesis free "professional masters" programmes, largely as a way of attracting more working students from the business world. In several ways, moving in this direction runs counter to traditional academic norms: the focus is on masters, not doctoral students; this particular graduate curriculum breaks with standard practice by relaxing requirements, such as that students must do a thesis; and the target population is part-time students. In each of these ways, the actual educational practices of discipline based departments were changing in ways that reflected

neo-liberal conceptions of knowledge and of students. Ironically, there were few institutional incentives, and some disincentives, for departments to move in this direction. Nevertheless, we found considerable evidence of educational or instructional entrepreneurialism. Thus, the local translation of entrepreneurial activity varied significantly by the realm of the work, a finding that is consistent with international research on this topic, which points to a diversity of forms of academic capitalism, and various sources of resistance (Ylijoki, 2003; Jansen, 2002).

However, at this point I must introduce another proviso pointing to the significance of local specification of macro patterns. My study of department heads focused on discipline based departments. Yet much of the entrepreneurial action lies outside these realms, in newly created academic and non-academic units. Indeed, the pattern of "academic capitalism and the new economy" (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004) is investment in the internal managerial capacity to develop and market various intellectual products. That generally means going outside the traditional academic units and constructing new sorts of units, bypassing traditional structures of academic governance. As Kogan suggests in the quote that opens this section, the complexity of the inner life of academic settings is such that it calls for in-depth specification of these larger patterns. At this point, my findings would not suggest that there has been a shift to, in Gibbons et al.'s words (1994), a "Mode 2" form of organisation. Instead, significant shifts have occurred within existing departments. It remains to be seen how far other organisational units further reflect these patterns, and take on the more stable character of traditional departments or the more flexible form of "Mode 2" knowledge production.

NEO-LIBERAL POLICIES IN MEXICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

There is perhaps no other zone of activity [as higher education] where the foci of concern are so public and the modes of operation so private (Kogan, 1984: 56)

Over the past fifteen years, several countries in Latin America have introduced a range of higher education policies that can be described as neo-liberal (Torres & Schugurensky, 2002). That has meant delimiting public expenditures on higher education, emphasising privatisation in various forms, including an increasingly close connection between universities and industry, demanding greater accountability for performance and quality, and treating higher education increasingly as a private good that should be paid for by the customer. Within the past five years I have worked with three doctoral students whose dissertations have focused on the ways in which such neo-liberal policy changes at the national level have translated into changes within universities, in business, engineering, and women's studies. In part, that work stemmed from my own experience in 1998 in giving an invited address to

the Faculty of Electrical and Mechanical Engineering at the Universidad Autonoma de Nueva Leon (UANL), one of the most important public research universities outside of the top public university in the country, Universidad Nacional Autonoma de México (UNAM), in Mexico City. The topic of the talk, and of the conference, was "International Trends in Higher Education". During the course of my brief visit I was struck by the significant disjuncture between the public discourse about globalisation and the university integrating into and preparing its students for the high tech, global, information economy, and the private realities that surrounded these efforts, as the ensuing vignette suggests.

Two disjunctures were particularly striking. One had to do with language. The other had to do with technology. My presentation at Nueva Leon was simultaneously translated, in a new university library facility that was both aesthetically stunning and extraordinarily high tech. Although part of the engineering faculty's public claim and aim to intersect with the global economy was that students and staff be conversant in English, it was clear in my private conversations with a range of people that most professors and students had very limited English skills. Remarkably, the faculty was proud of having just hired a young European professor, who also presented at the conference; he spoke no Spanish, and his heavily accented English was very difficult even for me to understand as a native speaker. When I asked about how students would understand this professor's lectures and teaching, I was told that it would be fine because they needed to be literate in English, and would follow his lectures in English texts. My sense of the disjuncture between publicly expressed and privately realised linguistic capacities was matched by a sense of technological disjuncture as well. The facility in which I spoke was fabulous. Yet, in working group discussions of engineering faculty members, one of the major topics of discussion and concern was the lack of access to computers and to the Internet. UANL is one of the leading public research universities in Mexico. But many professors in the faculty of mechanical and electrical engineering lacked basic technology.

Some European scholars, including Kogan, have underscored in their work the robustness of the academic community's norms and values, which in some sense buffers it against the interventions and effects of national public policy (Premfors, 1980). The case of neo-liberalism in Mexican higher education policy highlights two other important dimensions of this gap between public policy and private practice. The first is evident in the above vignette. The gap in Mexico between the public policy claims and efforts in regard to neo-liberalism and the on the ground realities of practice have to do in considerable part with the concrete material conditions that delimit various possibilities.

A second dimension contributing to the disjuncture between neo-liberal policy and practice has to do with the historical values and social role of universities in Mexico, and is evidenced in two of the dissertations I have chaired. Each point to

the significance of Mexican universities as national and nationalistic entities. Particularly among public universities, there endures a very real commitment to a role of enhancing Mexico politically and economically, something that is not found in the U.S., and was entirely lacking in the discourse and strategies of department heads there. That commitment colours and underlies (and in some cases undermines) the commitment of Mexican academics to an international orientation in curricular practices, to demonstrate that their students can compete with the best and that their institutions are high quality universities.

Two of the dissertations I have chaired focused on the playing out of neo-liberal policies on particular fields of Mexican higher education – engineering and business. The rationale and issues in the first case were, as engineering, and particularly civil engineering, have historically been the most prestigious fields of study in Mexican universities, how has the curriculum of engineering reflected the effects of globalisation and neo-liberalism (Saunders, 2003)? The rationale and issues in the case of business education were, similarly, how have the curricula of departments in this field, which is explicitly linked to the economy, been affected by globalisation (Acosta, 1998)?

Engineering professors and deans expressed what Saunders (2003) called a "muted nationalism". For them, dependence on U.S. texts and technology was a concrete reality, so taken for granted that it was not really a source of resistance or resentment. At the same time, Mexican academics articulated a commitment to their role in positioning their country in the regional and global economy that expressed a very real sense of nationalism. Universities have long been central cultural institutions in Mexico; indeed, they were a central institution in building the nation, as was true historically of many continental European and Scandinavian countries (Valimaa, 2001). Mexican academics in engineering also articulated their commitment to a broad social role in enhancing educational and economic opportunity within the country, a broad conception of knowledge and the social role of higher education not likely to be found among engineering professors in the U.S. Amidst this continuity with the past, however, was the current reality that Mexican universities were trying to intersect with multinational corporations. Underemployment among graduates was a major problem; the most elite programmes were those that had formed networks with multinationals and were preparing students for such employment. Thus, a much more narrowly economic conception and measure of good education was gaining significance.

A similar pattern was emerging in the case of business education, with the effect of heightened stratification among higher education institutions, particularly between publics and privates. In the process, conceptions of knowledge were changing, though at different rates in different sectors. In comparing four public and private university business departments, Acosta (1998) found that publics were less

aggressive in internationalising their curricula and emphasising the learning and use of English. Their orientation was to relieving financial stress and fostering economic development in the local and regional setting, though of course that economic stress was in part a function of Mexico's position in the global and regional economy. Yet, for faculty in these units the historical social role of Mexican universities continued to define their conceptions of what knowledge and functions were essential, making for considerable continuity amidst changes in the neo-liberal direction. By contrast, the curriculum of private university departments reflected much more the influence of international, and particularly U.S., topics and ideas. And the use of English was much more emphasised in these settings, as was employment in multinational corporations. Nationally, these universities have become increasingly important and powerful, changing the stratification between public and private higher education sectors, particularly in terms of undergraduate education.

In some sense, the ascendance of private universities is forcing publics to respond, and increasingly to emphasise connections with private industry. Historically, publics have been much more linked to the government and to public sector employment. That is beginning to change, slowly, particularly at the level of post-graduate education and research (Leyva, 2001).

Thus, for all the continuities in public universities, neo-liberal policies are having an effect on concrete practices, administratively and academically. A third dissertation that I have recently chaired focused on women's studies departments in Mexican universities (Bracamontes, 2003). One of the key findings of this work was that the so-called New Public Management in Mexican higher education has affected the ways in which faculty are evaluated and rewarded, with implications for the sort of academic work they do. Many of the feminist faculty interviewed for the study contrasted the work they had been able to do in the early years of their departments with what they felt was necessary more recently. With this new model of management had come an increased emphasis on productivity, on publishing in English language journals, and on getting external project funding, which had led them to redirect their energies in terms of academic curriculum and programmes, research, and their service. As a result, their work was increasingly moving away from local problems and populations to address topics that resonated more with international audiences in their field. For them, the private, inner life of the institution was being reshaped by public policy.

A final example here is helpful by way of further illustration and of providing a segue to the next section. Part of the public policy commitment to a more efficient model of management in Mexican higher education is a programme that allocates resources to universities to promote the professional development of their administrative (and professorial) staffs. That can effectively translate into financial support for staff to pursue certificates (diplomados) or advanced degrees, often in the form

of collective agreements with universities in the U.S., Canada, and Europe. Thus, my Center for the Study of Higher Education is forming partnerships with Mexican public universities to provide workshops and certificates, and to facilitate administrators and faculty in Mexican universities getting advanced degrees in Higher Education.

Ironically, the above sorts of arrangement can reflect a neo-liberal emphasis on managerial efficiency and a pattern of private sector, "free market" stratification that advantages the already advantaged. They involve transferring resources from Mexican higher education, which is relatively poor, to foreign universities and systems that are relatively wealthy. Thus, part of the aim of my Center's partnerships is to establish more mutually beneficial relations and exchanges not only between our Center and Mexican universities, but also among Mexican universities themselves. Our aim is to establish a different local pattern and effect of neo-liberalism.

PUBLIC/PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION SECTOR DISTINCTIONS IN MEXICO VS. THE U.S.

In conclusion, it has been the aim of this paper to demonstrate that the comparative method does not only consist of testing pre-established hypotheses. In addition, the comparative method can be used as "a mode of locating and exploring a phenomenon as yet insufficiently understood" (Castles, 1989: 9). (Kogan, 1996: 401)

In analysing the structure and governance of higher education systems internationally, some scholars have offered comparative case studies of private sectors in higher education (Geiger, 1988; Levy, 1986). Over time, these sectors have become increasingly significant. To a considerable extent, the neo-liberal policies alluded to in the previous section promoted and privileged private higher education sectors in systems that have long been characterised by the dominance of the public sector. Currently I am in the process of undertaking, with a Mexican colleague in the Center, an exploration and analysis of the ways in which the public/private sector distinctions in Mexico are fundamentally different from those in the United States. The work has important connections to the ways in which we understand public policy and private practice in this realm. Yet, even as I begin to outline the contours of some of those differences, I want also to underscore some interesting and ironic similarities. Both emerged at a recent meeting hosted by my Center and attended by ten representatives of public and private Mexican universities. The purpose of the meeting was to establish partnerships among the University of Arizona's Center for the Study of Higher Education and Mexican universities, towards the end of conducting joint research projects, academic programme cooperation at the graduate level, and professional development workshops and activities.

Two exchanges at the meeting captured essential differences and similarities not only between the public and private higher education sectors in Mexico, but also between the nation's leading public university, UNAM, and state universities throughout the country. The first exchange was over dinner, after a full day of discussions. As the conversation unfolded an interesting pattern emerged. On one topic after another it was clear that there were fundamental divergences between the parties at the table. It was also clear that those divergences were organised largely by institutional affiliation, breaking down by public versus private sector, and by UNAM versus one of the state universities (in Puebla) that has begun to adopt policies that make it increasingly like a private university – capping enrolments and seeking to increase the quality of the student body. For the most part, the topics had little directly to do with education, although one of the most heated exchanges revolved around "the social role and responsibility of higher education". But other topics ranged from foreign policy (specifically, Fidel Castro and the Vicente Fox administration's decision to support the U.S. heightened restrictions on travel to Cuba) to sports to music. Jokingly I suggested a switch of topics to films: one of the representatives from a private university laughed and referred to the recent Mel Gibson movie, The Passion of Christ. The entire table broke out in laughter, realising that "the Church" was yet another topic on which the parties fundamentally disagreed. The representatives from the secular private universities were largely practising Catholics, whereas the public representatives, particularly the one from UNAM, were passionate about the problems of the church as a social institution.

The second exchange was during the presentations of the Mexican universities, in which they briefly described their activities in relation to the field of higher education. In one presentation after another, it was clear that the Mexicans had advanced far beyond U.S. universities in their use of technology in instruction. One representative, Jaime, from a public university discussed how at his institution they were building their own computers and instructional platforms. However, they still had a contract with a U.S. company, BlackBoard, which provided the general instructional platform that was used by most faculty. "Are you planning on marketing the technology you develop to other universities in Mexico?" I asked. When he shrugged "No," I asked, "But why do you remain technologically and economically dependent on a U.S. company for your platform when you have the capacity and sophistication to develop your own technology, and to do so in a language and in a way that is tailored to your particular needs?" A representative from a leading private university interjected, "You don't want to do that. We have developed our own platform, and it is terrible. We are constantly revising and re-engineering it, always looking to improve it. It's a project that is never done." Then I asked him, "Does your institution market this technology in Mexico, or in Latin America?" Like the public university representative, Enrique shook his head, "No. We still rely mostly

on BlackBoard," he said. Although his institution was a very successful private university, and generated its own revenue from tuition, fund raising, and from a nationwide lottery, SorteoTec, the idea of commodifying the instructional technology was not part of their calculus, despite the fact that they had been working on their high tech, instructional model for nearly a decade. Similarities amidst profound differences.

One of the leading scholars of higher education in Latin America is Dan Levy, like Kogan a political scientist. Levy (1986) has written about private sectors in Latin America generally, and in Mexico in particular. As a postdoctoral researcher at the time with Burton Clark, Levy's analysis is based on a set of structures by which he compares various national systems – finance, structure, and governance. In each of these regards he details the extensive differences between the public and private sectors of Mexican higher education. Indeed, he opens his discussion by stating that "There may be no national system of higher education anywhere with more salient private-public distinctiveness" (Levy, 1986:114). He summarises his findings by characterising the gap between the two sectors as "wide and deep." And he counsels against drawing comparisons to the private sector in the U.S., which is fundamentally different. Yet despite Levy's thorough treatment of dramatic differences between the two sectors, there is a distanced, disembodied characterisation of the sectors that does not capture the deep-seated competition and even hostility between them. Instead, Levy analyses them as two separate systems. Put in the context of Kogan's analytical interest in values, conceptions of knowledge, and models of governance, I offer a different rendering of the two sectors.

Part of the depth of the contest between the public and private sectors in Mexico has to do with what is at stake. The dominant public university in Mexico, UNAM, has played a central role in building and defining the nation, politically and culturally. The interconnection between UNAM and the government in Mexico has historically been very tight (Ordorika, 2002). However, in recent years, UNAM's dominance has been waning. Indeed, with the election of Vicente Fox, private university leaders have gained increased policy influence vis-à-vis the government. The battle between publics and privates in Mexico is not so much a competition over research resources or students, as it is in the U.S. (at least in the elite sector); rather, it is a battle over who defines the orientation and structure and purpose of higher education nationally over the coming years. Leading universities in Mexico have a key national policy role. They are nation-positioning institutions in a way that universities in the U.S. simply are not. And they are nation positioning institutions in terms of a political and cultural role, not just an economic one.

Given the dramatic differences in function between the public and private sectors in Mexico, one might also expect dramatic differences in conceptions of knowledge. Elite privates are largely about undergraduate education, in contrast to U.S.

elite privates, which are deeply invested in graduate education and research. Over 80% of the research nationally is done in publics. And, as Levy has detailed, there is considerable difference between the sectors in terms of the fields of study they offer. Yet there are some interesting ironies here. In contrast to the U.S., where publics are increasingly moving to be more like privates, in Mexico, the largest private university system, Monterrey Tec, is expanding its activities to include the focus of elite public universities on doctoral education and research. And as the vignette with which I opened this section suggests, privates are less focused on the commodification of knowledge than might be expected. Further, although they adopt different approaches to how to handle the goal, institutions in both sectors are oriented to some form of social service for students, with an explicit emphasis on social responsibility that is unusual in a neo-liberal world. So amidst the sharp competition and deep differences, there are some important continuities and commonalities among Mexican higher education institutions.

Public and private universities also differ substantially in terms of models of governance. Private universities are far more managerial at the campus level but less dependent on state ministries, from which they receive little direct support. At the campus level, public universities have elected administrative positions, and the elections can be highly politicised. However, professorial influence is substantially reduced by the fact that over two thirds of teaching staff nationally are part-time. And the institutions are almost entirely dependent on the state ministry for financial support. In both sectors there is a shared trend towards emphasising productivity, accountability/quality assurance and efficiency, and in the public sector that trend is incentivised through the availability of ministry monies for institutions that have programmes for improving the education and efficiency of their administrative staff. Even as the competition between sectors is heightened, there is some common movement towards more managerial models of higher education administration, though these are specified very differently and to greatly varying extents, in different public universities.

CONCLUSION

Which issues should a fully developed political science of higher education tackle? We may group the issues in either of two ways: by themes that emerge at all or at most points in the political system, or by levels of the system. Since the texture of the politics of higher education changes markedly as we move from one level to another, I take the analysis through three levels: the intrainstitutional; the relationship between institutions and the larger polity; and politics at the centre. (Kogan, 1984: 62)

In providing a brief closing discussion of comparative studies of governance, policy, and change in higher education, I look to move beyond some of the boundaries in Kogan's scholarship. The most significant of these is the concept of a political system, which is largely bounded by the nation state. In addition, there is the concept of separate systems within a country – the profession, state, and marketplace – as expressed in Clark's (1983) triangle model of governance, or Becher and Kogan's (1992) modification of it. To fully understand the neo-liberal changes in higher education that have been discussed above, one must look beyond the nation-state to regional and global agencies and agency (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002). Moreover, one must look within national systems and recognise the increasing permeation of boundaries between markets, states, and higher education institutions.

At the same time, with a bow to Maurice, I close by stressing the significance of distinctive local continuities amidst neo-liberal changes, the comparative importance of the particular. In his famous essay, "Science as a Vocation", Max Weber indicated that the role of the social scientist is to point out inconvenient facts (Gerth & Mills, 1946: 147). Maurice Kogan is a master of probing for and seeing the differences among the commonalities in comparative higher education. Thus, even as I look to go beyond the boundaries of his work, I also seek to probe the patterns for the locally defined premises and foundations of higher education policy and practice.

As I have suggested elsewhere (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002:285), "Scholars note the prominence of neo-liberal reforms across nations, but there is little theorising about or empirical analysis of the inter-national and/or regional agencies and activities through which these common policy changes are effected…" Various sorts of agencies and collective activity at the regional or global level can come into play in higher education policy and practice. Some connect to various professional groups in the academy. For example, many professional associations have memberships that cut across national boundaries, leading to a circulation of ideas and influence among national systems. Moreover, professionals often move across national boundaries as consultants. Thus, in analysing the percolation of quality assurance mechanisms across national boundaries, Barbara Sporn and I (Rhoades & Sporn, 2002) traced some of the professional mechanisms in Europe, as U.S. ideas about accreditation and quality were "translated" by scholars and policy makers in the UK and the Netherlands, and then further translated into practice from one country to another, according to their particular values and governance structures. These and other professional mechanisms are probably important in developing countries as well; for instance, many professionals in Third World nations have been educated in the West, providing another avenue for ideas to circulate internationally.

Other sorts of agencies and collective activities are also of much importance in shaping higher education policy and practice internationally. In studies of Second

and Third World countries, students of globalisation and critical scholars often focus on the World Bank's dominating influence on policy in education (e.g., see Kempner & Jurema, 2002; Mollis & Marginson, 2002). In tracing such international agencies' influence, it is also important to examine how their activities intersect with and are supported by the collective efforts of various national and local players. Thus, for example, a colleague at the Center has explored the role of key higher education groups and national policy makers in Mexico in locally interpreting, translating, modifying, and specifying the pressures of international agencies such as the World Bank, the Ford Foundation, and the Interamerican Development Bank (Maldonado-Maldonado, 2003; 2004). She has also pointed to the significance of the work of OECD, which norms and thereby influences policies not only in Western Europe but in Mexico as well.

To fully understand the changing governance patterns that Maurice Kogan has so ably detailed, then, it is necessary to go beyond the boundary of the nation state, to the regional and global political economies, and agencies and agents that act and exercise influence within them. Yet it is also necessary to trace the mechanisms by which those regional and global influences are played out at the local level.

So, too, within national systems and institutions. It is necessary to go beyond the boundaries that have defined much of the analysis in comparative higher education scholarship, including that of Kogan. Much of the analysis surrounding entrepreneurial universities (Clark, 1998) has to do with the shifting balance of states, markets, and higher education institutions. For the most part, these are conceptualised as separate institutional realms and systems, as indicated by different points on the triangle heuristic of Clark, and of Becher and Kogan. Yet these boundaries are becoming increasingly permeable and difficult to define. Rather than categorising where systems and institutions lie according to particular boundaries, it might be useful to begin to trace the movement of higher education institutions, units, academics, and academic managers back and forth across these boundaries, nationally and globally (universities are, after all, international agencies and actors). Different parts of the very same university may encompass and express a different range, balance, and mix of entrepreneurial and "traditional" academic behaviours in research, teaching, and service. Indeed, that is an understanding that emerged inductively out of my study of department heads and faculty, and it is a central feature of the thesis and theory that Sheila Slaughter and I have developed in "Academic capitalism and the new economy" (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). It is precisely that different balance and mix of elements that makes it so essential to locally specify the concrete manifestations of academic capitalism.

As a comparative higher education scholar, then, I am struck by the global advance of neo-liberal policies in higher education systems. Recognising that general pattern, I want to look beyond some of the boundaries of Maurice Kogan's scholar-

ship to understand what is shaping and promoting that general pattern. At the same time, a major part of what I see as important in this global pattern is what it means by way of values, conceptions of knowledge, and models of governance in higher education. And sharpened by Maurice's insights with regard to continuities amidst the change, and seeking to emulate his interest in the concrete realities of that pattern, I look to distinctive local continuities at the institutional level, in case studies with thick description. I thereby appreciate and try to express in my work a fundamental feature of Maurice's, the comparative importance of the particular.

REFERENCES

Acosta, J. (1998). NAFTA, *Globalization, and Higher Education Departments of Business Administration: Case Studies From Northwestern Mexico*. Doctoral dissertation, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona.

Becher, T.& Kogan, M. (1992). *Process and Structure in Higher Education.* Second edition. London: Routledge.

Bracamontes, A. (2003). *Feminist Academics in Mexican Universities: Social Origins, Institutional Experiences, and Social Activism*. Doctoral dissertation, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona.

Clark, B. R. (1983). *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation.* Oxford: IAU Press and Pergamon.

Geiger, R.L. (1988). "Public and private sectors in higher education: A comparison of international patterns." *Higher Education* 17, 699-711.

Gerth, H. H. & Mills, C. W. (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. & Trow, M. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.

Jansen, J. D. (2002). "Mode 2 knowledge and institutional life: Taking Gibbons on a walk through a South African university". *Higher Education,* 43(4), 507-21.

Kempner, K. & Jurema, A. L. (2002). "The global politics of education: Brazil and the World Bank". *Higher Education,* 43(3), 331-54.

Kogan, M. (1996). "Comparing higher education systems". *Higher Education,* 32(4), 395-402.

Kogan, M., with Edward Boyle & Anthony Crosland (1971) *The Politics of Education*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Kogan, M. & Hanney, S. (2000). *Reforming Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I. & Henkel, M.. (2000). *Transforming Higher Education: A Comparative Study*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Leslie, L., Oaxaca, R., & Rhoades, G. (2002). "Revenue Flux and University Behavior". In Priest, D., Becker, W., Hossler, D. & St. John E. (eds.). *Incentive Based Budgeting Systems in Public Universities*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 55-92.

Leslie, L., Rhoades, G. & Oaxaca, R. (1999). *Effects of Changing Revenue Patterns on Public Research Universities*. A report to the National Science Foundation. Grant number 9628325.

Levy, D. (1986). *Higher Education and the State in Latin America: Private Challenges to Public Dominance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leyva, S. L. (2001). *La Vinculación de las Instituciones de Educación Superior con el Sector Productivo en el Noroeste de México*. Culiacán: Universidad Autónoma de Sinaloa.

Maldonado-Maldonado, A. (2003). "Investigación Sobre Organismos Internacionales a Partir de 1990 en México". In Ducoing, P. (ed.) *La Investigación Educativa en México. "Sujetos, Actores y Procesos de Formación", Formación para la Investigación. Los Académicos en México, Actores y Organizaciones*. México: COMIE-SEP-CESU.

Maldonado-Maldonado, A. (2004). The Influence of International Organizations in the Field of Higher Education in Latin America: The Analysis of One Epistemic Community in Mexico. Doctoral dissertation, Boston College.

Marginson, S. & Rhoades, G. (2002). "Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic". *Higher Education,* 43(3), 281-309.

Mollis, M. & Marginson, S. (2002). "The assessment of universities in Argentina and Australia: Between autonomy and heteronomy". *Higher Education,* 43(3),311-30.

Ordorika, I. (2002). *Power and Politics in University Governance: Organization and Change at the National Autonomous University of Mexico.* London: Routledge.

Premfors, R. (1980). *The Politics of Higher Education in a Comparative Perspective: France, Sweden, United Kingdom*. Studies in Politics 15. Stockholm: University of Stockholm.

Rhoades, G. (2000). "Who's doing it right?: Strategic activity in public research universities". *The Review of Higher Education*, 24(1), 41-66.

Rhoades, G. & Sporn, B. (2002). "Quality assurance in Europe and the U.S.: Professional and political economic framing of higher education policy". *Higher Education*, 43(3),355-90.

Saunders, T. (2003). Faculty Reactions to Globalization and NAFTA in Selected Engineering Departments in a Northern Mexican Urban Area. Doctoral dissertation, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona.

Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S. & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Torres, C. & Schugurensky, D. (2002). "The political economy of higher education in the era of neoliberal globalization: Latin America in comparative perspective". *Higher Education,* 43(4), 429-55.

Valimaa, Jussi (ed). (2001). *Finnish Higher Education in Transition: Perspectives on Massification and Globalisation*. Jyvaskyla: Institute for Educational Research.

Ylijoki, O-H. (2003). "Entangled in academic capitalism?: A case study on changing ideals and practices of university research". *Higher Education*, 45(3), 307-35.

PART 1: GOVERNANCE