Roemer, J. E. (1998). *Equality of opportunity.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Raftery, A. E., & Hout, M. (1993). Maximally maintained inequality: Expansion, reform, and opportunity in Irish education. *Sociology of Education, 66*(1), 41-62.

Schofer, E., & Meyer, J. (2005). The worldwide expansion of higher education in the twentieth century. *American Sociological Review, 70,* 898-920.

Shavit Y., & Blossfeld, H. P. (1993). *Persistent inequality: Changing educational attainment in thirteen countries.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Shavit, Y., Arum, R., & Gamoran, A. (Eds.). (Forthcoming). *Expansion, differentiation and inequality of access to higher education: A comparative study.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Trow, M. (1974). Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education. In OECD (Ed.), *Policies for higher education* (pp. 51-101). Paris: OECD.

World Bank. (2000). *Higher education in developing countries: Peril and promise.* Washington DC: World Bank.

Yizengaw, T. (2006). *Globalisation forces in relation to access and equity.* Internal paper. Fulbright New Century Scholars Program.

3

Higher Education and Social Cohesion: A Comparative Perspective

*Stephen P. Heyneman, Richard Kraince,
Nancy Lesko, and Michael Bastedo*

Introduction

That higher education can play an important role in promoting understanding between social groups and building a sense of unity in diverse societies has long appealed to educators and policymakers alike. In addition to supplying technical skills and advancing knowledge, higher education has been utilized to build an intellectual basis to promote pluralistic cultures, increase state-society synergy, and support broad-based national development initiatives. The traditions of empirical analysis, independent reasoning, and informed debate that are emblematic of the university are increasingly understood as integral to the development of a rational and self-critical society in which a shared sense of citizenship can bridge divisions based upon race, ethnicity, religion, and other factors. Because a college education strongly correlates with variables such as social connectedness, appreciation of diversity, civic participation, and trust in social institutions, higher education's influence on social cohesion is recognized as one of its most important contributions as a public good (Institute for Higher Education Policy, 1998; Putnam, 1996).

In spite of the potential for universities to take on a larger and more deliberate role in the advancement of social cohesion, analysis of higher education in various national contexts reveals numerous pitfalls associ-

ated with such endeavors. Some academic cultures reject the idea that the university has any social role to play other than preparing students for careers. Others choose to set themselves apart from society or ignore particular social problems. In some cases, universities themselves have become models of immoral or unprofessional behavior by institutional-izing corruption and other self-serving practices.

On occasion, the social role of the university has been hampered by governments. Curricula have been imposed that support the con-solidation of political power among favored groups at the expense of the less dominant. Ruling parties have introduced courses designed to advance ideological indoctrination or repress competing worldviews. In some instances, criticism of public policy from within the higher education community has resulted in tensions or even violence involv-ing the government, the academy, and militant elements of society. In other instances, discussion and debate--essential ingredients in univer-sity quality--have been avoided because of fear of retribution. In all of these situations the institutions involved can be said to have failed to fulfill their social role. Some have made social cohesion more difficult to attain while others in the worst-case scenarios have even exacerbated intercommunal conflict.

This report provides evidence from four research studies detailing the successes and failures of universities in addressing social cohesion in six countries: Indonesia, South Africa, the Netherlands, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, and Georgia. It develops a comparative perspective of the social role of higher education as manifested in a variety of settings including societies where the university is seen as having a positive role to play in the promotion of intergroup relations, societies where univer-sities have become suspect as a result of corruption or state domination, societies where the university's role has been diminished as a result of politicization or social trauma, as well as societies in which the univer-sity has not been viewed traditionally as a legitimate social actor.

The report begins with a theoretical examination of how institutions of higher learning may affect social cohesion. It then offers a brief syn-opsis of the field studies conducted by the four researchers. The third and largest section is an overview of 12 major findings based upon comparative analysis of the research studies. The report concludes with recommendations relevant to optimizing the role of universities in the advancement of social cohesion.

Leveraging Social Capital to Affect Social Cohesion

With the rise of current inter-ethnic, interreligious, and public health crises, universities are increasingly called upon to use their resources

to address particularly controversial social problems. Traditionally, their willingness and ability to confront contentious issues is shown in the way that they avoid or encourage debate; by the manner in which they fairly guide the terms of debate; in the way they allow for alternative and/or minority views; and in the way that faculty and administrators conduct themselves professionally. These activities remain central to the university's mission; however the intractability of so many of the world's problems compels education leaders to better understand how the university might elevate its ability to bridge social divides as it brings its resources to bear on contentious issues.

The essential dilemma of universities is how to ameliorate tension among social groups and proponents of differing philosophies while at the same time preventing the association of such efforts with the politi-cal powers and class structures that reflect societal divides. How can the university promote intergroup understanding, tolerance, and mutual respect in the context of social discourse despite many precedents to the contrary that may exist in the wider environment? Can particular institutions of higher learning withstand the considerable pressures to become like other institutions in the society that may have been overwhelmed by the forces such as corruption, ideology, or prejudice? Can faculty adhere to the universalistic social norms that they are sup-posed to teach, such as fairness, impartiality, and advancement based on achievement, while powerful elements of the societies in which they operate are driven by emotional, cultural, or ideological concerns? Such questions can only be answered affirmatively when higher education leaders become serious about defining and communicating a broader social role for their institutions.

It is axiomatic to think of higher education as a public good, with many of its benefits and costs affecting society at large. However, what specific effect higher education may have, and how those effects can be defined, measured, and calculated, has been a subject of long debate. With the emergence of many new nation-states in the 1960s, the debate tended to center on issues of nation-building, including the general educational roles of broadening outlooks and increasing tolerance and the desire to participate in the political process (Lipset, 1959); the con-nection between education and democratic stability (Almond & Verba, 1963; Puryear, 1994); and the degree to which education was associated with greater voluntary political participation (Gintis, 1971; Verba, Nie, & Kim, 1978). Higher education specifically was thought to add to a nation's technical human resource capacity, its ability to participate in political and economic debate, and, at the highest level, its ability to generate new knowledge (Harbison & Myers, 1964).

Currently, consideration of the role of universities in society has to do not just with human capital in terms of skills, attitudes, and marginal productivity, but also with the wider set of mechanisms by which higher education affects social cohesion. Social cohesion is commonly defined in terms of the relative strength and distribution of social capital in a given society. Colletta and Cullen (2000) described social cohesion as a function of the intensity of intercommunal bonds (bridging, horizontal social capital) as well as the level of integration of communities and individuals with markets and the state (vertical social capital). Societies with high degrees of both horizontal and vertical social capital tend to be cohesive because avenues for the mediation and management of conflict are already in place when conflict breaks out; in contrast, societies that lack social cohesion are vulnerable to conflict because they do not have the "compliance mechanisms" necessary for the assertion of social control as well as the "reinforcing channels of socialization" necessary for the formation of shared values (p. 13).

This understanding of social cohesion has important implications for higher education. First, the university experience offers abundant opportunities to bring individuals from diverse backgrounds into close contact with one another so that they may begin to bridge community divides. The importance of such activities in creating the "networks of engagement" that can translate into bridging social capital has been well documented (Varshney, 2002). As the extensive literature on university access points out, establishing a higher education system that reflects societal diversity is an essential step for policymakers serious about capitalizing on the opportunities that a shared college experience presents and broadening understanding of its function as a public good (Kezar, Chambers, & Burkhardt, 2005).

Second, the impact of higher education on individual advancement should not be viewed as simply a private good when all segments of a diverse population are afforded opportunities to advance. As members of less dominant groups attain social mobility through college, vertical social capital is created. While campus diversity does not ensure social mobility, it is a necessary precondition for it (Karen & Dougherty, 2005). If other sectors of society do not impose obstacles, the result can be the creation of a more diverse national leadership, a broader market sector, and a more integrated and resilient society overall.

A third aspect of the university's role in the promotion of social cohesion is the influence that it can have on the development, improvement, and management of compliance mechanisms used to assert social control. As has been observed in conflicts throughout the globe, intergroup clashes at the local level can turn into major human rights

catastrophes when the legal, security, or governance sectors have broken down at higher administrative levels (Meyer, 2003). For this reason, the university's role as a critic of public policy and administration is invaluable in bringing attention to potential sources of conflict before violence erupts. Moreover, as Mathews (2005) has described, universities can help communities in the midst of conflict by analyzing and framing the parameters of the conflict so that specific issues can be better understood and effective solutions perhaps more easily found. In this regard, faculty diversity as well as student diversity is a clear advantage because analytical models that are based on inputs from a wide spectrum of society are likely to be both better informed and also more widely received by those engaged in or suffering from conflict.

A fourth implication for higher education, based on the social capital model of social cohesion development, relates to the formation and socialization of shared values among higher education's various constituent groups including the general public. Institutions of higher learning--especially those whose members reflect social diversity--provide an important environment for the exploration of social change. They also provide channels through which social norms and expectations are transmitted. For this reason, universities have a vital role to play in supporting a concept of citizenship that is accepting in outlook, pluralistic in composition, and inclusive in practice. Although the theoretical development of such concepts is important, modeling is perhaps the primary means through which values such as tolerance, pluralism, and open-mindedness are conveyed.

Higher education has a long history of modeling the kind of civil debate that can promote intergroup understanding, diffuse tensions, and encourage greater cohesion in society. One way that it does this is through the encouragement of dissenting points of view and the promotion of a tradition that allows those views to be voiced. One of Plato's great achievements in his establishment of the Academy was that he did not allow the institution to become a site for the perpetual reworking of his ideas (Freeman, 1999). In spite of Plato's disillusionment with democracy, the institution he founded promoted the kind of independence of thought that inspired and protected people like Aristotle who were diametrically opposed to some of Plato's fundamental teachings.

Examples of the universities' role in promoting debate can be found in non-Western settings as well. For example, examination of Buddhist education texts from Nalanda, one of the world's first residential centers of learning founded in the fifth century C.E. in India's Bihar state, suggests that a dialogical approach was taken that encouraged critical thinking and debate. While centuries earlier the nominally

Buddhist Emperor Asoka's famous edicts promoted social cohesion by restricting speech that praised one's own faith or disparaged others (Sen, 2005, 2006), Nalanda scholars appear motivated by the Buddha's famous Kalama Sutta in which he told his students to question all they are taught and even not to accept his own teachings until they had tested them for themselves (Mookerji, 1960).

In the West, the creation and management of protocols for dissent has been a traditional role for universities since their origin in the 12th century. Born out of a merger between guilds in law, medicine, and theology, the university flourished once it incorporated the lessons taught in the dialogues of Plato. These lessons call for faculty to pose appropriate questions in the pursuit of truth and base their responses on either reason or observational and empirical evidence. In comparison to the acceptance of answers given only by God and through the Pope, the university's role was revolutionary (Perkin, 1984). Generally, the institutionalization of Socratic inquiry as an educational paradigm can be reduced to the instillation of respect for dissent and difference and a sense of responsibility of the nonconformist to respect the rights of the majority. In some ways perhaps, such notions are parallel to recent analyses of the United States in which dissent is considered to be an integral and normal part of discourse in any established democracy (Colatrella & Alkana, 1994; Ravitch, 2003).

Universities also teach in literal and symbolic ways about the pursuit of substantive values. In critically oriented teaching and scholarship, for example, beliefs in equality, justice, and an active citizenry may be articulated and supported (Alexander, 2006). University policies, such as academic freedom and enrollment and hiring policies, also communicate substantive values about the institution's position on tolerance and inclusion. By representing inclusive principles in teaching, research, and program administration--even if imperfectly implemented--universities promote social cohesion.

A Comparative Approach: Field Studies

This collaborative research project, conducted under the auspices of the Fulbright New Century Scholars program in 2006, is intended to provide a comparative analysis of the role of higher education in social cohesion. While it is inappropriate to assume that universities have identical roles and functions in different parts of the world, it *is* appropriate to suggest that universities hold some essential common functions. Higher education across the globe is highly diverse as it controlled to a significant degree by political authorities operating with the context of the nation-state. It has also been vocationalized in many

parts of the world; and as institutions, universities at times have been steered away from social concerns for political reasons or because of an overemphasis on strictly academic questions. However, to be legitimate, all universities should have the right to ask whatever questions are necessary to understand truth as well as the obligation to base their answers on the outcome of inquiry. Understanding the degree to which institutions are able to fulfill these requirements forms the basis of the work undertaken on behalf of this project.

As a group we have explored the degree to which universities, as organizations, (a) live up to their potential to ask penetrating questions to be answered by using evidence freely gathered, (b) model correct behavior in the resulting discussions, (c) protect student and faculty participants from political persecution, and (d) offer themselves as illustrations for other organizations in the underpinning of social cohesion. This section provides a brief overview of the country contexts where field research was carried out.

Richard Kraince explored the role of public Islamic higher education in strengthening relations between various social groups in post-authoritarian Indonesia. His research documents how Islamic education leaders affiliated with public Islamic colleges and universities have worked to secure space for objective scholarship and advance a tradition of critical intellectualism within the discipline of Islamic studies. Kraince's study provides an analysis of how these traditions have served as a foundation for educators seeking to promote democratization and to address issues of social cohesion through both formal civic education programming and nonformal university-society engagement. It examines some of the core values expressed by educational leaders as they have transformed the most prominent State Institutes for Islamic Studies (IAIN) into genuine universities. The study also highlights the conservative backlash against public Islamic higher education and other sources of progressive thought in recent years.

Nancy Lesko examined how one university in South Africa, the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN), has responded to the pandemic of HIV/AIDS. In light of ongoing social divisions, lack of coherent leadership by the government, and public divisiveness over medical advancements and public health mandates, she explored the question of how different approaches to teaching about HIV/AIDS might affect social cohesion. She also sought to understand how university teaching, program development, and collegial relations respond to intense pressures surrounding the crisis. The research highlights the work of faculty members who have included HIV/AIDS-related topics in their teaching and who discuss the pedagogical, curricular, and disciplinary

challenges of this integration. Interviews with faculty members, class observations, interviews with students, and curriculum document analysis were the primary sources of data. Central administrators connected with campus-wide HIV/AIDS curriculum and research initiatives were also interviewed. Her work presents grounded generalizations about universities' limits and possibilities for promoting social cohesion in the context of contested and politicized knowledge about HIV/AIDS (Schoepf, 2004; Treichler, 1995).

Stephen Heyneman conducted research on the role of higher education in social cohesion in three universities in Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, and Kazakhstan. He observed that universities in the former Soviet Republics have been subjected to two significant challenges recently. The first has been how to conceive of a new nation that has significant ethnic divisions as well as strong political forces that emphasize one ethnic group over the others (Heyneman, 2002-2003). The second has stemmed from a precipitous collapse of public expenditures and subsequent growth in education corruption (Heyneman, 2004). Heyneman explored issues relating to how history is taught, what language should be used as the medium of instruction, and broader questions relating to civics and citizenship. He examined the equity of ethnic and class representation among students and faculty. He also examined issues regarding the professional conduct of faculty and administrators. His research illustrates methods by which universities have tried to cope with societal pressures on their integrity and responsibility.

Michael Bastedo examined how Dutch universities responded to conflicts over the integration of immigrants from religious minority populations. Using interviews with faculty in two major universities in Amsterdam, he argues that Dutch universities have largely failed to adapt to these social changes due to entrenched beliefs in university culture. If the European Union and the Dutch government seek to improve social cohesion through universities, a new bottom-up model of governance will be required that matches government needs with university cultures.

Findings

These case studies make it clear that views on the role of universities in social cohesion are mixed. Nevertheless, where conditions are conducive, institution-led approaches to social cohesion can be highly effective. In Indonesia and South Africa, courses have been designed to serve as forums for students to consider contemporary issues from multiple, and sometimes unpopular, perspectives. This has been true for the teaching of the social and political antecedents of the HIV/AIDs

crisis in South Africa as well as the teaching of interreligious tolerance and ecumenicalism within public Islamic universities in Indonesia.

In the Netherlands, innovative contributions have not necessarily been disseminated from the central university administration, but rather from innovative faculty acting in their roles as 'public intellectuals' on controversial issues such as the integration of Muslim immigrants. In the former Soviet republics, student-led mock courtrooms have been established to 'try' corrupt faculty—complete with defense attorneys, public prosecutors, and professional judges to help students understand their rights. The decision to allow foreign universities has helped establish local precedents for relatively corruption-free institutions. There are also many instances of faculty 'resisters' to corruption—the 15-20% who declare their adherence to impartiality and their imperviousness to corrupt pressures even in the face of administrative sanction and unsustainably low remuneration.

In South Africa, both top-down and bottom-up responses to the HIV/AIDS pandemic exist side by side, with the former serving as a provider of science and technical understanding and, based on the interests of specific faculty and departments, the latter providing debate over the social, racial, and political ramifications of the crisis. In some faculties, all students are expected to take a public health HIV/AIDS course in efforts to bridge social divides over how the crisis is interpreted (Schoepf, 2004; Treichler, 1995). Universities in South Africa have also been active in outreach activities involving local high schools and the community at large in which a variety of views and approaches to the problem are represented.

Each of us observed both successes and failures in regard to the role of higher education in addressing social cohesion. The administration of a South African university was found to treat the complexity of the HIV/AIDS dilemma with simplistic technical explanations; but meanwhile, two academic departments of the same university were engaged in profoundly important reflection and questioning of common assumptions about HIV/AIDS counseling and education. Universities in the Netherlands were found to be largely silent and inactive on the sensitive issue of Muslim immigration, but individual faculty members were engaged in addressing these issues as public intellectuals. Islamic universities in Indonesia were found to be actively promoting religious tolerance but, at the same time, struggled with new forces attempting to silence those who promote tolerance as well as impose exclusivist views. In the former Soviet Union universities were often found to be corrupt; yet in each, individual faculty were found who resisted corruption in spite of considerable pressures from senior colleagues, administrators, and

even family. In each instance, we found evidence that universities were likely to hinder social cohesion; and in each instance, we also found evidence that universities were modeling behavior likely to make social cohesion more possible.

Comparative analysis of these case studies resulted in the identification of 12 features that characterize universities that have been successful in legitimizing a broader social role as well as leveraging academic resources in order to address specific issues of social cohesion. These features include:

1. Proactive leadership that explains and defends the role of higher education
2. Public debate on sensitive issues
3. Engagement with international scholarly communities
4. Curriculum that reflects social problems
5. Empirical research on social issues
6. Students and faculty who are broadly representative of the wider population
7. Linkages with the wider community
8. Academic freedom
9. Institutional autonomy
10. Publicly available standards of student and faculty conduct
11. A transparent process of adjudication for misconduct
12. Multiple sources of finance aside from government.

1. Proactive Leadership That Explains and Defends the Role of Higher Education

Education leaders who have been most successful in bringing university resources to bear on social issues have been proactive in expanding debate on the overall role of higher education in a given society. Every society has a historical precedent for how universities tend to be perceived by the general public. In some countries, long traditions of university engagement in social issues are celebrated. In others, higher education is seen purely as a vehicle for human resource development. While most countries fall somewhere on a continuum between these two poles, consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of such paradigms provides a starting point for enhancing a university's capacity to operate as a legitimate social actor with a role to play in the cultivation and sustenance of social cohesion.

One of the first tasks for educational leaders interested in expanding the social role of the university is to recognize that institutions operate within the context of increasingly globalized societies, yet must negotiate the terms of their existence within the confines of a nation-

state. While scholarship is becoming an international affair, academics remain accountable to their institutions and ultimately to the publics that they serve with regard to fulfilling the teaching and service missions of the university. For this reason, if they are to be effective in enhancing the ability of their institutions to address issues of social cohesion, education leaders must be proactive in defining their work with respect to specific cultural and historical realities.

For example, in Indonesia, university educators have won support for their involvement in social causes by harkening back to the contributions of the proto-nationalist student groups that first spoke out against colonialism and envisaged a unified independent state. In South Africa, the contribution of campus-based activists during the struggle against apartheid has provided a basis for continued institutional engagement in wide social concerns.

In other settings, history has led in different directions. For example, in the former Soviet republics, the kinds of university-sponsored service efforts that are seen as idealistic in many parts of the globe are viewed with extreme suspicion as memories of harsh "national service" in Siberia are recalled. In the Netherlands and several other European countries, the politicization of university faculties during the 1960s, as well as frustration over the fruitlessness of those efforts, greatly diminished the ability of the university to take unified action—much less to be an entity able to address social concerns today such as the integration of Muslim immigrants.

These realities make it clear that the wholesale importation or imposition of views from abroad on the social role of higher education could be counter-productive. However, evidence from all of these case studies suggests that the very act of encouraging comparative analysis and debate on the role of higher education in a given society can broaden awareness of the potential role of universities in addressing issues affecting social cohesion. Cross-fertilization of ideas on the role of higher education encourages educators to identify the strands within their own cultural and historical narratives that may help them define or redefine the relationship between the university and society.

In the United States, the importance of this relationship is reflected by the use of "covenant" to describe the bond between some public universities and society (Kellogg Commission, 2000). Only through intense dialogue with constituent groups in the broadest sense can a higher education community achieve a shared understanding of the relationship between university and society as well as the important responsibilities that such a relationship implies. Leadership that understands the potential role of the university in promoting social cohesion

must begin this process of dialogue.

Once educators and their constituents have firmly established the nature of the university's function in society, they must work proactively to ensure that its role is understood by the publics that they serve. This is essential, because those who would abrogate the covenant between university and society will find it much more difficult to criticize higher education and diminish its influence in societal affairs once its role has been defined and vigorously communicated to the wider society.

2. Public Debate on Sensitive Issues

Having secured a theoretical role in influencing social cohesion, university leaders must remember that the power to affect society is manifest in action. Of the many activities that comprise legitimate university action in the area of social cohesion, the promotion of civil discourse on sensitive issues is one of the most important. The analysis of these case studies suggests that universities that take action on issues affecting social cohesion by promoting public debate on sensitive issues appear to have a higher level of impact on social stability.

Here "sensitive issues" refers to those issues that tend to produce a particularly emotional reaction from members of the general public or from minority groups. They often reflect national tragedies or are related to particularly divisive periods of a nation's history. In Indonesia, for example, issues affecting interreligious relations are particularly sensitive in light of the brutal conflicts that erupted between Christians and Muslims in Eastern Indonesia soon after the collapse of authoritarian governance in 1998. In South Africa, discussion of the influence of social class on the spread of AIDS represents a sensitive issue. While the prevalence of AIDS has reached epidemic proportions in several areas, the lack of a sense of crisis over the issue within some quarters of society underscores the problem of social cohesion in the new South Africa.

In spite of these national crises, universities in both Indonesia and South Africa have remained true to their traditions by addressing the problems that they perceive. Scores of Indonesian universities have adopted civic education programs that specifically address interreligious relations by promoting candid discourse on the problems that various religious communities face. This approach is antithetical to the policy of avoiding sensitive issues in the classroom during the era of authoritarianism. In South Africa, certain faculties at the University of KwaZulu-Natal have gone beyond clinical analysis of the AIDS crisis and have begun to investigate psychological causes of exposure as well as theological approaches to providing support for those afflicted with

the disease. In both of these settings, universities are clearly living up to their reputation of having the wherewithal to turn their ideals into action by facing sensitive issues in spite of criticism from partisan groups.

Our case study from the Netherlands provides a different perspective. Dutch universities have largely neglected the issue of Muslim integration even though it has become one of the most important social policy debates of the decade. While individual faculty members have addressed the problem as public intellectuals, Dutch academics tend to see the lack of social mobility among immigrants as a political rather than a social problem. Moreover, they simply do not view the university as a legitimate social actor that might play a role in building a greater degree of cohesion between native Dutch and recent migrants.

Despite a growing body of research on the importance of social capital acquired through participation in higher education, Dutch universities have done very little to increase access and retention for immigrants. In fact, by largely failing to target the issue as an area of research, by neglecting to prepare a significant segment of their population to take on leadership positions, and by failing to critique public policy, Dutch higher education in this instance has undermined the social charter and discouraged healthy public debate on democratic opportunity in the Netherlands. As a result, Dutch society has exhibited an unprecedented level of conflict in recent years.

University leaders who would play a larger role in the promotion of social cohesion must seek to inform public policy debates by providing objective analysis on sensitive topics and to encourage public debate so that a wider understanding of the problem becomes known. In order to do so effectively, institutions of higher learning should be encouraged to develop clear standards governing how civil debate should take place. The process through which these standards are developed should be highly participatory, transparent, and inclusive of student leaders as well as faculty and other stakeholders in society. Once established, vigorous public information campaigns should be carried out to promote a deeper understanding of the university's role in facilitating civil debate as well as the importance of academic freedom (discussed below). The ultimate goal of this effort should be to educate the public about norms of behavior for holding public discourse as well as the dangers of ignoring intolerance.

3. Engagement with International Scholarly Communities

Institutions of higher learning that have been successful in promoting social cohesion tend to place a high value on international linkages. International linkages help develop a form of social capital through which

individual faculty members find themselves involved in a wider professional network. These relationships open up new avenues for academic support, yet they also broaden the circle to which faculty are responsible in terms of ensuring the quality of their research and teaching. As international linkages expand and institutions develop cooperative programs, a university's international reputation grows in importance. For this reason, these kinds of relationships increase the importance of international norms of scholarly and institutional behavior.

Sharing best practices on institutional and academic activities is one way in which international linkages are beneficial. For example, international linkages involving Indonesia's public Islamic universities and Western institutions have promoted mutual understanding of contemporary international affairs, higher standards of academic accountability in teaching about Islamic issues, and the development of personal and professional relationships that transcend religious differences. As a result, academics from both countries are better able to counter voices on both sides that appear intent on driving wedges between Western and Islamic populations. The impact of this form of social capital on international social cohesion should not be overlooked.

4. Curriculum That Reflects Social Problems

If universities are to influence students, other social institutions, and public debate more broadly, their curricula must address contemporary social problems. Students and university instructors must consider current issues from a number of disciplinary perspectives and discuss various responses or solutions. A central function of universities is the teaching of undergraduate and graduate students. If curricula remain sanitized of relevant social concerns, students and faculty members will likely see the university as irrelevant and irresponsible. A democratic view of education must consider the importance of preparing citizens to understand, debate, and take a position on vital social issues as a central role of and rationale for education.

In post-apartheid South Africa, for example, universities recognized that as they faced a changing student population, curricula had to be developed to reflect multiple points of view. New faculty members were recruited to develop new programs of study. However, as the catastrophic human toll of the HIV/AIDS crisis has become apparent, individual academics have expressed frustration with institutional inaction. Volks (2004) described South African universities as attending to "business as usual." While some members of the academic community feel that it is their responsibility to help students understand the epidemic in all of its personal, social, economic, health, and political manifestations, the

university as a social actor has not adequately fulfilled its role. Similarly, in Indonesia, public Islamic universities have instituted a civics course that focuses on the development of tolerance, civil dialogue, and democratic decision-making in order to respond to past and future threats of intolerance and violence. However, some private Islamic universities have balked at adopting the curriculum in its entirety because they prefer not to address some of the sensitive issues that it deals with, such as the rights and role of women in society.

In general, we found that socially relevant curricula are possible in almost any discipline and can take many forms. Discussion of current social problems can be located in sociological or historical perspectives, service-learning courses, specific "social problem" classes, community outreach projects, and the supervision of students' independent research projects. Regardless of how such programs are instituted, it is clear that such activity works best when implemented within the context of a critical-thinking educational environment. Moreover, such programs are much more effective when they are supported by policymakers as well as faculty. For this reason, concerned educators should emphasize intersector synergy when attempting to build support for curricular reform.

5. Empirical Research on Social Issues

Just as teaching about contemporary social problems is important, faculty research on social issues is also vital. The publication of empirical studies on issues affecting social relations has the potential to attract a wider audience, to strengthen analysis, and to broaden and deepen debates about immediate social problems. As with curriculum development, empirical research can take various forms. For example, at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN) education professors published articles on numerous topics related to HIV/AIDS. Faculty in teacher education examined national reports on HIV/AIDS education and conducted extensive national surveys on teachers' knowledge and practices. In early childhood education, qualitative research focused on children, sexuality, and knowledge of HIV/AIDS. In literacy and psychology, a team of professors wrote about the use of photography and video to raise understandings and discussions of HIV/AIDS and gender violence among teachers and students alike. Gender, sexuality, and curriculum were the foci of a team of UKZN and U.K. researchers. Another scholar examined young people's responses to a national media campaign about safe sex.

If universities are to be social actors that can affect social cohesion, Zlotkowski (2000) believes they must be actively involved in develop-

ing "new knowledge" and related attitudes and skills to respond to social issues. The proliferation of research topics and methodologies at UKZN underscores how important current social issues are to faculty and illustrates the viability of multiple approaches and sets of knowledge about contemporary problems. While the different and competing perspectives may at times confuse the issue, we consider this kind of diverse attention to a social problem as an essential element of democratic dialogue.

6. Students and Faculty Who Are Broadly Representative of the Wider Population

Universities, even when privately funded, are often viewed as public or social resources. As such, it is imperative that the student and faculty populations are representative of the wider society. In post-apartheid South Africa, for example, the maintenance of predominately white universities would present glaring problems for the new democratic nation. In the United States, media attention is often focused on college admissions, because access to post-secondary education is not only symbolic of a sense of social fairness and openness, but is also a proven path to greater economic and social opportunities. As described above, both vertical and horizontal social capital are created when access to higher education is opened to less dominant groups. When minority access is prioritized, social cohesion can be significantly improved.

Diversifying university populations also affect what issues will be taught and researched at universities. As feminist scholars attest, gender and women's issues received scant attention when men dominated student and faculty ranks (Gumport, 1988). Research also shows that campus diversification tends to improve the education of non-minorities by exposing them to a wider variety of views. Thus, university enrollment and hiring policies are important for a number of practical reasons in addition to the support that such policies lend to social cohesion.

It should be recognized that inclusive student and faculty access policies present challenges. For example, bringing speakers of minority languages to universities may heighten debates over the language of instruction. Mixing students from different cultural, racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds may in some cases even exacerbate patterns of intolerance if university resources are not allocated to prepare for these kinds of changes. Nevertheless, it is clear that excluding minorities and ignoring the educational inequities that this practice entails is a greater danger to social cohesion in many cases.

The failure of Dutch universities to adequately address the integra-

tion of immigrants demonstrates this point. Many Dutch educators understand that social tension in the Netherlands could be ameliorated by greater social mobility for immigrants. However, they generally fail to see a role for higher education in addressing the problem because admission to the university is considered "open" or blind to racial, religious, or ethnic background. Most of the Dutch informants involved in this study thus denied that any "access" issues exist. They acknowledge that students from "black schools" are far less likely to have the training, qualifications, or financial resources to succeed at the university, but they do not see any appropriate role by which the university should address the problem. The fact is that faculty in the Netherlands do not see "the university" as a singular entity, but rather as a more federal configuration or even as a group of separate colleges that are little more than co-located. In spite of excellent examples of successful affirmative action programs in other settings (e.g., Crouch, 2001), many European educators fail to grasp or are even hostile to the idea of augmenting the university's role in social cohesion.

7. Linkages with the Wider Community

Building social cohesion requires a commitment to forging linkages with the wider community. A university that is engaged in the community demonstrates to the public that everyone can benefit from higher education and that the university cares about the health of its surrounding community. Ultimately, this helps facilitate integration and goodwill between "town and gown."

Universities can do this by demonstrating that the boundaries of the university are not constrained by its buildings. The Wisconsin Idea--that "the boundaries of the university are the boundaries of the state"--can be applied in any country around the world. This is done by creating substantive engagements with local communities that would not otherwise benefit from the university's knowledge and expertise. Students can be engaged in the community through service learning activities, where students learn by participating and working in local organizations. At the California State University at Monterey Bay, for example, students are required to engage in service-learning activities to graduate with a bachelor's degree, and these service-learning activities are suffused through each major in the curriculum so that both students and communities benefit.

In the Netherlands, while universities are disinclined to address issues of social cohesion institutionally, individual university professors see participation in public meetings, engagement in the political process, and televised public debates as part of their role as public intellectuals.

Their expertise thus plays an influential role in developing public policy and reducing the social distance between university professors and the rest of society. Such action has helped to ameliorate problems caused by the lack of university adaptation in general.

8. Academic Freedom

Positive social cohesion cannot exist in an environment of intellectual repression. Academic freedom fosters open and public debate over the major issues facing society, which serves to validate the concerns of the public, across the political, social, and economic spectrum. In this way, all of society benefits from the representation of their perspective in the public arena.

Academic freedom facilitates scholarship by addressing controversial topics that are crucial for the society to gain insight and wisdom. Scholarship in this tradition provides an empirical basis for public arguments and debate, and points the way to answers that are more credible and legitimate. Declaring certain topics "off limits" only serves to allow these problems to fester over the long term without additional insights or knowledge that would allow these problems to be addressed or resolved.

Academic freedom also creates a robust and energetic university in general, facilitating high quality intellectual thinking and encouraging substantive debate (Daxner, 2004). If a vigorous university is crucial to the development of a healthy and integrated society, academic freedom is equally crucial to ensuring that the university is a place where energetic and high quality minds will be attracted and retained.

In spite of the perceived long-term benefits of academic freedom to the whole of a society, many governments or even societal groups feel threatened by the idea of unrestricted social research. Under the Soviet Union, for example there were many examples of state harassment of academics and the frequent abrogation of principles of academic freedom. Access to foreign publications was restricted as a matter of course with most higher education institutions not cleared for such privileges; but there were worse policies than censorship. On some occasions particular theories and interpretations were considered heretical and subversive. Among their precedents were psychotherapy, genetics, and certain education policies addressing language of instruction.

The breakup of the Soviet Union did not end the compulsion for control, though the role of universities has shifted in the former Soviet republics. Universities have changed from being an administrative component in a larger ideological machine to an organization with service and technical expectations in a labor market where the rules have

changed. They are also expected to supply both knowledge workers and new knowledge for a globalized labor market (Gibbons, 2005). A key element that will govern the future of higher education in this region is the degree to which universities can control their own curriculum and research agenda.

9. Institutional Autonomy

High-quality universities cannot thrive under excessive government regulation and control. Time and time again, excessive regulation has been shown to create an environment of mediocrity, where universities are too constrained to engage communities, facilitate high-quality scholarship, or compete for the best and brightest students. Each of these is an ingredient in a vigorous university that contributes to social cohesion and integration.

Institutional autonomy requires not just freedom from excessive government intrusion but also a stable source of resources, both financial and human, to ensure institutional survival and capacity. It requires a faculty that is supported in a broad range of activities ranging from scholarship to public engagement.

As a result, trends toward profit-making by public universities and the shift to using part-time faculty without adequate institutional structures can undermine the institution's public responsibilities. Increasing demands for efficiency and accountability may have the unintended consequence of limiting opportunities for the kinds of public engagement that facilitate social cohesion. Universities and national governments should thus be sensitive to the consequences of these demands and find methods to ensure that these vital faculty roles can be continued and enhanced.

10. Publicly Available Standards of Student and Faculty Conduct

If traffic laws are not well known and are not posted, how can one obey the speed limit? Similarly how is a student to know the difference between using a source for research and committing plagiarism unless the difference is defined and accessible? How is a faculty member to know the difference between a gift and a bribe unless the difference is carefully spelled out ahead of time?

A code of conduct is a written statement, signed by faculty, students, and administrators which outlines obligations and responsibilities with respect to each other and to their institution. Codes of conduct are important because they help students, faculty, and administrators understand what is right and wrong. Codes of conduct are normally available in universities in OECD countries, and this lowers the cor-

ruption risk. Corruption occurs when there is ambiguity over the rules or when the rules are not well defined or well understood. Universities that do not have a code of conduct available to the public are open to suspicion of corruption, in spite of their claim that corruption does not exist. A university which has clearly advertised codes of conduct may be assumed to have tried to lower the risk that corruption may occur.

In Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, and Georgia, principled faculty exist even in the most austere and debilitating of environments. Some lead by virtue of moral principle; others rise to the occasion and lead on the basis of practical assessment. Because honest and principled faculty exist in debilitating environments, it can be said that there is a universal standard of the professoriate. The standard is parallel to the characteristics identified by Braxton and Bayer (1999) and includes the promise to treat all students with fairness and impartiality and a common hierarchy among differing moral principles. It requires that faculty choose principle of fairness (to students and colleagues) over the principle of loyalty to family and friends.

11. A Transparent Process of Adjudication for Misconduct
Those who have been accused of breaking a code of conduct need a fair hearing. The rules of what happens if someone should be accused of breaking the code of conduct should be clear and transparent. In some instances, hearings of student misconduct can be conducted by other students and faculty misconduct with other faculty. It is normal, too, for the public to expect annual accounting of the hearings which have occurred, the nature of the offense, and the punishments decided.

12. Multiple Sources of Finance Aside from Government
All universities aspire to augment three elements: the quality of their programs, access to their programs by additional students and equity of representation among students and faculty. However, few universities can expect to attain all three goals solely on the support of public monies. To perform their functions well today means that universities need to diversify their sources of revenue.

Revenue may come in the form of philanthropy and income-generating services, including research, returns on invention copyrights, private investments, and the like. In South Africa, for example, research grants from the government and international agencies provide vital support for multiple individual and collaborative research projects. These educate diverse students through apprenticeships, support the development of new knowledge, and often design and pilot new programs. The more a university is able to finance its own educational

objectives the more impact it is likely to have on the social cohesion in the wider community.

Conclusion and Recommendations
We found that universities can have profound effects on social cohesion. If their student and faculty populations reflect national diversities, they can forge strong relations across social divides. Kazakh and Russian faculty shared a common sense of curricular purpose and adherence to academic standards. As individuals, Dutch faculty were drawn into leadership roles in the national debates over immigration. Together different social groups challenged many of the assumptions of the causes and effects of HIV/AIDS in South Africa. Similarly, Islamic universities in Indonesia developed standards of religious tolerance in consultation with various minority groups.

We found that universities can enable minorities and the rural poor access to governments and markets, and to positions of political and economic power. The new standardized achievement examination in Georgia is an illustration of the importance of unbiased mechanisms for selection and advancement so that universities can play these socially beneficial functions well. The introduction of general studies courses within Islamic higher education in Indonesia likewise demonstrates how the adoption of educational standards has enabled previously marginalized groups to attain social mobility--in this case, rural Islamic boarding school students.

The university's role as a critic of public policy and government administration represents another aspect of its influence on social cohesion. How to question policy in an environment where such activity has been interpreted as treasonous is complex; yet we found that universities which encouraged informed and reasoned debate were, in effect, modeling legitimate mechanisms for questioning public policy. The universities in Kyrgyzstan, Indonesia, and in the departments of religion in the University of KwaZulu Natal are examples of institutions that model this important behavior in spite of the pressure to avoid disagreement.

Perhaps the most important contribution of higher education to social cohesion has to do with the university's influence over the formation and socialization of shared values. The fact is that universities that support social cohesion are not values-neutral. They value a culture that debates rather than shies away from sensitive issues. They value institutions that are open to international linkages rather than those that are intent on walling themselves off from the world. They value teaching and research that is concerned with social issues. They value academic

freedom, institutional autonomy, transparency, and the rule of law. Universities that hold these values as important are not shy about expressing them, and they are not shy about enforcing them on their campuses. In the final analysis, all societies depend on universities to demonstrate these values in a courageous yet responsible manner. Moreover, those societies that have universities which express these values effectively have greater prospects for economic development and social cohesion, precisely because they have good models from which to learn.

References

Alexander, J. C. (2006). *The civil sphere.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Almond, G. A., & Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Braxton, J. M., & Bayer, A. E. (1999). *Faculty misconduct in collegiate teaching.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Colatrella, C., & Alkana, J. (1994). *Cohesion and dissent in America.* Albany: SUNY Press.

Colletta, N. J., & Cullen, M. L. (2000). *Violent conflict and the transformation of social capital: Lessons from Cambodia, Rwanda, Guatemala, and Somalia.* Washington DC: World Bank.

Crouch, H. (2001). Managing ethnic tensions through affirmative action: The Malaysian experience. In N. J. Colletta, T. G. Lim, & A. Kelles-Viitanen (Eds.), *Social cohesion and conflict prevention.: Managing diversity through development* (pp. 225-262). Washington DC: World Bank.

Daxner, M. (2004). *Academic freedom and university institutional responsibilities in South Eastern Europe.* Bologna, Italy: Bononia University Press.

Freeman, C. (1999). *The Greek achievement: The foundation of the western world.* New York: Viking Publishers.

Gibbons, M. (2005). Engagement with the community: A new basis for university autonomy in a knowledge society. In Observatory for Fundamental University Values and Rights (Ed.), *Managing university autonomy: University autonomy and the institutional balancing of teaching and research* (pp. 121–150). Bologna, Italy: Bononia University Press.

Gintis, H. (1971). Education, technology and the characteristics of worker productivity. *American Economic Review, 61*(2) 266–279.

Gumport, P. J. (1988). Curricula as signposts of cultural change. *The Review of Higher Education, 12*(1), 49–61.

Harbison, F. H., & Myers, C. A. (1964). *Education, manpower and economic growth: Strategies of human resource development.* New York: McGraw-Hill Publishers.

Heyneman, S. P. (2002-2003, Winter). Defining the influence of education on social cohesion. *International Journal of Education Policy: Research and Practice, 2*(4), 73–97.

Heyneman, S. P. (2004). Education and corruption. *International Journal of Education Development, 24*(6), 638-648.

Institute for Higher Education Policy. (1998, March). *Reaping the benefits: Defining the public and private value of going to college.* Washington, DC: Author.

Lipset, S. M. (1959). Some social requisites of democracy: Economic development and political legitimacy. *American Political Science Review, 53* (1), 69–105.

Karen, D., & Dougherty, K. J. (2005). Necessary but not sufficient: Higher education as a strategy of social mobility. In G. Orfield, P. Marin, & C. L. Horn (Eds.), *Higher education and the color line: College access, racial equity, and social change.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of the Land Grant Universities. (20000). *Renewing the covenant: Learning, discovery, and engagement in a new age and different world.* Washington DC: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

Kezar, A. J., Chambers, T. C., & Burkhardt, J. C. (2005). *Higher education for the public good.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mathews, D. (2005). Listening to the public: A new agenda for higher education. In A. J. Kezar, T. C. Chambers, & J. C. Burkhardt (Eds.), *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement* (pp. 71–86). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meyer, M. J. (2003). The role of governance and public administration in developing a foundation for participatory, peace-sustaining governance. In Division for Public Administration and Development Management, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, *Reconstructing governance and public administration for peaceful, sustainable development* (pp. 1-24). New York: United Nations.

Mookerji, R. (1960) *Ancient Indian education (Brahmanical and Buddhist).* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Perkin, H. (1984). The historical perspective. In B. Clark (Ed.), *Perspective on higher education: Eight disciplinary and comparative views* (pp. 17–55). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Puryear, J. M. (1994). *Thinking politics: Intellectuals and democracy in Chile, 1973–1988.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University

Press.

Putnam, R. D. (1996). The strange disappearance of civic America. *The American Prospect, 7*(24), 34–49.

Ravitch, D. (2003). *The language police: How pressure groups restrict what students learn.* New York: Knopf.

Schoepf, B. G. (2004). AIDS, history, and struggles over meaning. In E. Kalipeni et al. (Eds.), *HIV and AIDS in Africa: Beyond epidemiology* (pp. 15-28). London: Blackwell.

Sen, A. (2005). *The argumentative Indian: Writings on Indian history, culture and identity.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Sen, A. (2006). *Identity and violence.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Treichler, P. A. (1995). *How to have theory in an epidemic.* New York: Routledge.

Varshney, A. (2002). *Ethnic conflict and civic life: Hindus and Muslims in India.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Verba, S., Nie, N., & Kim, J. (1978). *Participation and political equality: a seven nation comparison.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Volks, C. (2004). The role of tertiary institutions in the HIV/AIDS epidemic. In K. D. Kauffman & D. L. Lindauer (Eds.), *AIDS and South Africa: The social expression of a pandemic* (pp. 161-175). New York: Palgrave.

Zlotkowski, E. (2000). Civic engagement and the academic disciplines. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (pp. 309-322). Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

4

Rethinking the Public-Private Mix in Higher Education: Global Trends and National Policy Challenges

Sunwoong Kim, Zulfiqar Gilani, Pablo Landoni, Nakanyike B. Musisi, and Pedro Teixeira

Introduction

Globally, higher education is experiencing a rapid and unprecedented expansion. However, growing fiscal demand for other public needs such as health care and public pensions forced many countries to seek alternatives to public funding for higher education, thus creating a fertile environment for the growth of private higher education. At the same time, more competition for students and funds among institutions has been introduced, creating a quasi-market situation within and between the public and private sectors (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Teixeira, Dill, Jongbloed, & Amaral, 2004).

A number of salient features characterize this marketlike situation. First, over the past two decades, the global trend has been toward the privatization of traditionally public activities. This trend has led both to the growth of private institutions and to the adoption of private-like behavior by many public institutions. In many countries, private higher education is expanding more rapidly than public, and this growth is also taking place in countries where it would have been unthinkable two decades ago.

A second feature is the diversity in the private education sector. The