

Globalisation and Higher Education in Pakistan

Higher education in Pakistan is being restructured as a result of the neoliberal reform currently in process. As with other areas, these reforms are also influencing ideas about the role of universities and the policy framework underlying higher education. But while the crisis of quantity and quality in university education needs to be addressed, the reform process emphasises privatisation and self-financing through higher fees. This shortsighted approach has dire social and political consequences and undermines the notion of higher education as a public good.

NADEEM OMAR TARAR

The globalisation of higher education and the changes in the knowledge economy provide a backdrop against which national policies relating to higher education in Pakistan may be located. The purpose of this paper is to review and analyse some of the changes that have taken place in the Pakistani higher education system in the last five decades. The current institutional, curricular and fiscal reforms are aimed at modifying the structure and functions of universities in the national economy to strengthen them for competition in the global knowledge economy. These reforms will be analysed to argue for a more balanced perspective on the public financing of higher education than is evident in the restructuring of higher education in Pakistan.

Knowledge Economy and Internationalisation of Education

Following the widespread university upheavals of the late 1960s, the universities in the western world underwent a transformation which changed their role from producers of knowledge to producers of knowledge workers.¹ As significant contributors to the knowledge economy, universities became not just creators of knowledge and trainers of young minds – i.e., agents of acculturation – but major agents of economic growth that can augment human capital and help a nation to compete in the global economy. The phenomenal success of Silicon valley, attributed to the Stanford University in US, led policy-makers around the world to emulate this model in their own countries. An example is the former Malaysian prime minister Mahathir Muhammad's grandiose plans to invest \$40 billion for establishing a multimedia university to create a latter day Silicon valley in Malaysia, which was among the first nations to privatise its educational system in the early 1980s. With these changes, universities were no longer seen as a moral or cultural force but more as incubators of new industries in a technology dominated economy.²

The revolution in information and communication technologies (ICTs) that underpinned the globalisation of trade have fundamentally affected higher education. Digital broadcasting, the web, e-mail, and other fast and user-friendly ICTs have produced a global market in the teaching and training of knowledge workers. The much acclaimed Phoenix (virtual) university, owned by Apollo Communications reaps an annual profit of \$127 million

without a campus or a permanent faculty, relying on visiting course instructors and assistants as internet specialists.³ Although dominated by the US, the distant learning market is rapidly expanding in Europe and Australia, with private companies providing the capital investment and universities supplying the academic expertise.

Globalisation is a process through which industry has been able to derive and distribute its business inputs and outputs wherever it could get the maximum profit.⁴ International free trade is the hallmark of the process of globalisation. In its most common as well as its most specialised usage, the word "globalisation" has been used almost interchangeably with the word "international". While defining globalisation as a process that has international implications, Philip Altbach conceptually separates the two terms.⁵ "Globalisation" is a shorthand term for the integration of national economies, while "internationalisation" denotes the policy measures designed to cope with the effects of globalisation. The specific trends observed in the globalisation of higher education are not without their unequal consequences for the developing and developed world. These include a system of mass higher education, a global market place for the mobile population of students and faculty, aided by the global reach of internet-based technologies.

North America has been able to claim a large share of international students, who spend more than \$11 billion on tuition and living expenses. With few scholarships on offer, two-thirds of the foreign students receive their funding from personal and family sources in their home countries. Moreover, 55 per cent of the foreign students come from Asia and other developing countries, with Europe contributing only 15 per cent of the total international students in the US.⁶

In the development doctrine, globalisation is accompanied by a shift in the liberal ideas about higher education which underwrote the "traditional" model of the university. This model characterised education as a public good, which, unlike other sources of wealth like land or minerals, is neither depleted with use nor diminished by redistribution. As a quasi-public good, higher education needs to be financed and developed through government intervention and financing, since it raises skill levels and adds to the economic prosperity and well-being of society as a whole.⁷

With globalisation, the ideal of the university propagated by Alexander von Humboldt – influential in Europe from the 18th to the 20th centuries – began to erode. This perspective saw the academy as an autonomous sphere insulated from economic pressures devoted to the cultivation of the intellect and the training of young minds. In Europe today, the dominant perspective on the university is the one that sees it not as an end in itself but as a means for acquiring globally competitive knowledge workers, for promoting economically beneficial research, and for transferring knowledge to private business. The new corporate model of the university brings in a battery of administrators who challenge the autonomy of the academy and seek to convert it into a profitable enterprise.⁸

Similar trends are visible in North America where a new corporate model of the university provides for an increased role of management within the faculty. In the public universities in the US, the faculty share of professional positions has declined from 65 per cent in 1977 to 55 per cent in 1989 and continues to fall. Since management personnel cost more than the academic faculty, the unit cost of higher education rises. The corporate model is highly market-oriented and privileges profitable markets over non-profitable ones.⁹ As a result, funds are being diverted from traditional strengths like the humanities and social sciences towards professional and technological fields. Market models and managerial logic imply a restructuring and renegotiation of social relations within the university such that teachers and researchers are increasingly being turned into hierarchised managers. The neoliberal policies intensify internal differentiation and stratification within the university such that an entry level professional in certain faculties like computer education could be paid more than a full professor in another field.

The shift from the liberal to the neoliberal model has been accompanied by a shift in the balance of power between the state and the university. The traditional autonomy of the university faculty in matters relating to the academic curriculum and student evaluation is being eroded as the state increasingly considers faculty to be middle-level managers. The collegiate system, which originated in the monastic colleges of medieval Europe, and had evolved into a broadly democratic form of governance, with academics elected as rectors, and deans of faculty and in broad-based senates, is losing out to the new management experts. The idea of an academic community is being replaced by the notion of a market-oriented institution where self-employed academics and part-time professionals from the corporate sector supervise instruction, institute quality control and provide accreditation.

The globalisation of higher education has opened up new challenges for the developing countries to compete in the global knowledge economy. Since a few countries dominate the global scientific systems, and the multinational corporations and academic institutions own new technologies based in the western countries, the developing countries are dependent on the academic superpowers.¹⁰ Given the inequalities in the international systems of higher education and the intense competitions between the universities world wide, developing countries are at the losing end. They face a major problem in retaining their share of higher education personnel – students, teachers and professionals alike – not only in proportional terms but even in terms of absolute numbers.¹¹ India provides a good example: it has possibly the oldest system of higher education in the world, which is also

by far the largest among third world countries and its total student enrolment of 5.6 million is second only to the US.¹² However, despite around 200 academic programmes in higher education using English as the medium of instruction, it has been able to attract only about 10,000 students from abroad, mainly from developing countries. By contrast, India ranks third among the countries sending its students to the US, with more than 42,000 students studying abroad at one time. The so-called “brain drain” has been a long-standing problem of Indian education. A large number of Indian students who study in the US or other western countries don’t return home, despite the fact that elite Indian universities can claim to be of international standard.¹³

State Policy towards Higher Education Research and Teaching

Social science research and teaching in Pakistani universities presents a bleak and depressing picture of the erosion and fragmentation of national human capital. As Akbar Zaidi has argued in his recent book on the “dismal state of the social sciences in Pakistan”, “The ‘crisis of governance’ in World Bank parlance, is manifest in the visible demise of the public sector educational and research institutions in Pakistan”.¹⁴ One of the significant factors which led to the demise of public sector in higher education is the imbalance between the quantitative expansion of higher education and the mechanisms for maintaining qualitative control.

Since Pakistan inherited a thin educational infrastructure from the British colonial state, there was an urgency to create a post-secondary system of education.¹⁵ At the time of Partition in 1947, there were more than two dozen colleges and technical institutions but only one university in the provincial capital of Punjab, the Punjab University, Lahore. Four years later, the number of universities for general postgraduate education in the social sciences and humanities had increased by three, with two having been set up in Karachi and one in Peshawar. In the early years of the “decades of (industrial) development” in Pakistan during the 1960s under the military regime of Ayub Khan (1958-69), two professional universities were opened for engineering and agriculture, along with a federal university in Islamabad in 1965. The government also tried to reform the educational institution by implementing the recommendations of the Sharif Commission with limited success.¹⁶

The populist government of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto (1971-77) responded to the popular demands for mass public higher education, and started seven more universities in Sindh and southern Punjab, irrespective of the depleting budgetary allocations for higher education. To promote high quality research in science, engineering, agriculture, biotechnology and psychology, nine centres of excellence and seven area study centres were created through an act of parliament in 1974 in the provincial and federal universities. In the same year, under the federal education minister, a controlling authority formally known as the University Grants Commission (UGC) was put in place to regulate and coordinate inter-university affairs, along the lines of similar institutions in India and Britain. As an apex institution to monitor the quality of university education, the UGC was given the task of disbursing funds to the universities in coordination with the ministries of education and finance.

With the advent of the economic liberalisation policies of the 1980s in Pakistan, there is a visible shift in policies of the state

indicating a clear preference for professional education. Six new public universities in science, technology, engineering and agriculture were opened. The Seventh Five-Year Plan aimed to increase the number of students in technical and vocational schools to over 33 per cent by increasing the number of polytechnics, commercial colleges, and vocational training centres. Although the reform did add to the number of technical schools in the country, there is still a need for further expansion of vocational training at various levels of post-secondary education today.

Private educational institutions reappeared on the Pakistan scene in the shadow of the policy of denationalisation of public sector institutions implemented by the military regime of Zia ul Haq (1977-86). Aga Khan University made a head start in health education with the financial support of the Aga Khan Foundation. And the Lahore University of Management Sciences (LUMS) was established with the financial support of industrial groups of Lahore to offer postgraduate education in business and computer education. With the privatisation of primary education, English returned as the medium of instruction, along with the freedom for private elite schools to deviate from the curriculum of state-run schools system. However, in state-run schools and colleges, the imposition of Urdu as a medium of instruction was accompanied by strict adherence to an officially prescribed curriculum imparted through official textbooks.¹⁷ The political and social consequences of this dual educational system far exceeded the original intentions of the advocates of the privatisation of education.

In the Eighth Five-Year Plan in 1992, the government reiterated the need to mobilise a larger share of national resources for financing education.¹⁸ In a bid to decentralise the educational administration, it planned to transfer control of primary and secondary schools to non-government organisations (NGOs). The Eighth Five-Year Plan also aimed to gradually withdraw government control over higher education. But public universities in Pakistan have worked largely under the shadow of the federal ministry of education and finance, which is not directly concerned with facilitating quality research and teaching. Since they accounted for about 67 per cent of the total government funds provided to universities, federal grants became a convenient tool for undermining the autonomy of the universities. The Universities Act of 1974 had already given autocratic powers to vice chancellors, and also entitled the government to control the university administration.

On average, a new university has been started every second year since 1947, irrespective of the capacity of the new institution to deliver quality education. Despite the fact that quantity was prioritised over quality, demand has far exceeded supply.¹⁹ According to a recent official estimate, "University level enrolment has expanded almost 100 per cent, compared to a 35 per cent increase at college level over the past four decades".²⁰

In contrast to the marked increase in the demand for higher education, every year the federal budget allocation for higher education has declined. For the development of human capital, the state relied on student imports from international educational institutions in the UK and the US, while letting Pakistani higher education deteriorate. The increase in research costs also affected the quality of research and teaching, as little money was available for improvements in facilities: Eighty-five per cent of the university budget is spent on salaries and allowances,

10-15 per cent is left for other institutions, and virtually no funds are left for research, libraries, equipment, chemicals, and glassware.²¹

To meet this crisis, the UGC has been encouraging universities to steadily increase their tuition fees and other user charges. Moreover, it has been recommended that public universities place 25-40 per cent (in some cases, even 50 per cent) of their seats in "self-financing" admission schemes.²²

Given the massive increase in the demand for higher education, the relative shortfall in availability, and the low quality of universities in the country, Pakistan – like many countries in the world – is facing extreme difficulty in paying for higher education. The growth potential offered by university education leads to increasing demands for mass higher education, especially among the middle classes who see a university degree as a gateway to a secure future. However, the increasing costs of higher education against an ever deepening pool of eligible applicants has prompted the university to become more exclusive because it must shift the cost of education to students and their families. (This is also true of European countries.) The democratic commitments of nation states to provide higher education for the maximum possible numbers have eroded. Within the last 10 years, Britain has abandoned the tradition of free higher education and is forcing students to pay an increasing proportion of the cost of their education through tuition fees, besides paying all of their living costs. Similarly, while retaining the bulk of higher education within the public sector, state universities in Pakistan have already begun raising their user charges and tuition fees to such an extent that the proportion of self-generated funds in total expenditure has risen from 26 per cent in 1992-1993 to 49 per cent in 2000-01.²³

Current Reforms in Higher Education

Most of the developing countries including Pakistan are facing a perilous situation in keeping up with international standards of higher education.²⁴ The World Bank and UNESCO have sponsored a wide range of research and rethinking on higher education in the developing countries. This marks a shift in the policies of the World Bank, as it has focused exclusively on primary education for almost three decades. According to the conventional development doctrine, investments in basic education yield a higher and more reliable rate of return than those in higher education. As a result, public expenditure on higher education was considered a luxury for most of the developing world. However, the Bank contends that its intention is not to shift the focus from primary and secondary to higher education, but to achieve "the right mix among the three levels".²⁵

An independent Task Force comprising 14 educationists and development experts from 13 countries was convened by the UNESCO and the World Bank in late 1997. This report drew on commissioned research surveying higher education in the developing countries. The report *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Perils and Promise* was launched at the World Bank's Human Development Week 2000 in Washington, with effective endorsements from the Bank and UNESCO to the effect that "the findings of the independent Task Force closely matched World Bank Policy".²⁶

The report provided an educational overview of developing countries accounting for 85 per cent of world population, and

40 million students “taught by poorly qualified, poorly motivated and (no surprise) poorly compensated faculty”. It said that unless bold actions are undertaken to “train and retain” the best brains, the ability of developing countries to compete in global business will continue to be undermined by more competitive educational systems.

The report was presented in February 2003 at the Aga Khan University in Karachi and at LUMS in Lahore, in an assembly of international organisations, academics and government representatives. The principal authors of the World Bank and UNESCO report of 2000, Henry Roskovosky and David Bloom were also present. For David Bloom, the task of strengthening higher education in Pakistan was rendered more difficult by its poor health and education indicators and the burgeoning deficits in government spending and foreign trade. “A natural step”, he argues, “is to devise ways to use available resources more effectively”. The suggestions for managerial reforms are made with strong recommendations for a “science and technology base”.

This international report on higher education forms the basis of the report of the Task Force on the Improvement of Higher Education, which was instituted by the new military government of president Pervez Musharraf (1999 to date) to restructure the higher education system in Pakistan. According to its terms of reference, the Task Force was supposed to “recommend ways of improving higher education in Pakistan”, and to “identify ways and means of funding higher education in Pakistan, including new approaches for financial sustainability”.²⁷

Critics of this reform process see “striking similarities and near universal nature of the reform proposals in countries with diverse cultures and educational traditions” as pointing to a common agenda of change: Neoliberal economic ideology and globalisation have been cited as the bases of the current push towards restructuring of public institutions. Corporatisation of public universities is being seen as a global agenda that will make higher education amenable to international trade in higher education.²⁸

The membership of the Task Force, and of the subsequent Steering Committee on Higher Education (SCHE) set up to implement the recommendations of the Task Force, indicated the basic orientation of the current reforms. While the heads of two elite private universities acted as the co-chairs of the Task Force and the SCHE, there was a token representation of vice chancellors from the public universities, who are usually politically appointed administrators rather than practising academics.²⁹

The report of the Task Force, which provided a blue print for higher education reforms, makes for provocative reading. It summarily dismissed the existing higher educational infrastructure without adequate analysis. The “Effectiveness of Higher Education in Pakistan” is assessed in two paragraphs, with a quotation from a study by a consultant of the Task Force who painted a deplorable picture of Pakistan public universities. These fleeting observations are buttressed with statistics provided by the UGC on the demographics of higher education in Pakistan. In 1996, “of a population of 140 million, only 2.6 per cent of the age cohort of 17-23 years (less than 5,00,000 persons) were enrolled in the colleges and university of Pakistan”.³⁰

In the next two paragraphs a laundry list of “Past Educational Policies and Plans” is cited, with quotes from the report of the

Commission on National Education of 1959, without even a passing comment. An analysis of “the outcome of policies and five-year plans” is readily furnished by drawing on a paper prepared by the chairman of UGC for the Task Force, which provides a ready-made “Conclusion”. The universities suffered from inadequate funding due to low priority given to education in national development. Most of the recommendations made by past educational commissions and reiterated in five-year plans to improve the administrative and academic functions have not been put in place. “Sadly, whatever funds were available to the education sector were used for quantitative expansion and not for qualitative improvement.”³¹

Despite its lament that “since the planners have never been able to estimate the country’s needs, the institutions of higher education have had no guidance for defining goals”, the Task Force makes no attempt to assess the supply and demand for higher education in Pakistan. No reference is made to base line studies of the problems in public sector universities, except brief extracts from the reports of the past educational commissions in the appendices. The section ends with the “Establishment of the Task Force” and its activities. A “Vision Statement” resembling a high-minded corporate document is offered, along with a schedule of meetings held by the Task Force.

Section Two, which includes a “Situation Analysis”, starts with a statistical appraisal of “Systems of Higher Education”. A review of “Higher Education in Private Sector” provides a rationale and as well as a model of good governance in higher education. With 18 universities and nine degree awarding institutes in the country, the government’s Education Sector Reforms Action Plan for 2001-04 envisages an enhancement of the share of enrolment in private sector universities from the current 15 per cent to 40 per cent by the year 2004. This is to be achieved “through the pursuit of liberal policy to encourage the establishment of new institutions of higher education in the private sector”.³² The new dispensation privileges a “corporate model of higher education” which will not only deepen educational inequalities – the poor will be increasingly unable to improve their lives through education – but will also lead to a disproportionate investment in science and technology at the expense of the social sciences and humanities.

Identifying “politicisation” and “inadequate funding” as the key factors responsible for the poor quality of higher education in public universities, the report of the Task Force on Higher Education suggested measures to diversify the resource base of public universities in order to attract high quality faculty and generate research.³³ However, by its own admission, the problem of inadequate funding has already been solved by raising the tuition fee. According to the report, the “structural problem” lies with “archaic financial management” rather than with inadequate funding as such.³⁴ The section concludes with an argument for freeing the universities from “political, governmental and bureaucratic or other extraneous influences”, which freedom is to be earned through financial autonomy. That the current reforms in higher education intend to privatise public universities remains implicit and unclear. The effects of the withdrawal of public expenditure on higher education on the lower and middle-income groups are conveniently ignored.³⁵ It is also assumed without sufficient evidence that improvement in higher education will have a trickle-down effect on the lower tiers of education.

The current process of institutional reforms initiated in 2000 to improve the quality of research and teaching in universities and colleges, led to the replacement of the UGC with a much larger body of academics, technocrats and management professionals called, the Higher Education Commission (HEC) in 2002. A Federal Model University Ordinance was also promulgated in the same year to restructure higher education in Pakistan.³⁶

Public universities have provided the locus of much of social science research and publication in higher education in the country. Journals and books are the primary indicators of research activity. Most of the studies of higher education research in social sciences in Pakistan pointed to its dubious quality, with isolated exceptions of individual achievement. Of the 25 national research journals cited by Akbar Zaidi in his review of social sciences research and teaching in Pakistan, not a single one is refereed. Most of them are “university affairs”, meant to facilitate the promotions of university faculty.³⁷

Until recently, the funding for higher education remained abysmally low at 2.3 per cent of GNP, which is much lower than the 4 per cent recommended by UNESCO. This has resulted in decline in the quality and quantity of higher education research. The Task Force, Study Group and later the Steering Committee on Higher Education have all recommended an enhancement of government funding. Funds are badly needed for improving recruitment and retention of competent and qualified faculty; developing infrastructure for research; providing adequate library facilities including electronic access; and for maintenance and refurbishment of the physical facilities of universities.³⁸

The HEC’s Research and Development Division is responsible for developing and carrying out research programmes and projects. It also offers scholarships that support research in science, technology and social sciences. In April 2001, HEC announced a grant of Rs 600 million to promote research in higher education, and an increase in PhD allowances for the university faculty to Rs 5,000 for sciences and Rs 1,500 for the arts and social sciences.³⁹ Through the efforts of HEC the special grant for “promotion of research in universities” has been enhanced from Rs 47 million in 2002-03 to Rs 270 million for the year 2003-04.

To strengthen research in higher education, HEC has launched several programmes to provide university faculty a chance to improve their qualifications. One such programme is the “indigenous PhD fellowship programme”, under which 1,000 PhD scholars are to be enrolled each year in Pakistani universities. To ensure quality of supervision, HEC has selected a pool of more than 170 supervisors who are provided funds to purchase equipment and necessary supplies and have access to more than 16,000 research journals made available through the digital library programme.⁴⁰

However, as critics of HEC have pointed out, improvements in the quality of higher education can only come about if all levels of university education are uplifted. The pre-university education system, which provides the basis for university education is outside the purview of the HEC. The ministry of education, which controls primary, secondary and post-secondary education in the provinces, works independently of the changes in the structure of university education. Unless there is an active collaboration between the HEC and the ministry, no long-term changes can occur in the higher education system in Pakistan. The hasty plans to expand the number of doctoral

students and increase the honorarium paid to supervisors have led to a situation where some supervisors are reportedly taking on dozens of PhD students, irrespective of their capacity to supervise such a large number.

Higher education in Pakistan is in a state of flux, as large financial investments have been made in the higher education system in tandem with the neoliberal policies of the World Bank. Several other changes are taking place in the structure of universities and colleges that are aimed at strengthening their financial status and management systems. These are intended to help improve teaching and research thereby meeting the challenges posed by the internationalisation of higher education. However, given the long gestation period of these policies, the impact of reforms in higher education will only be felt after a number of years. It is important to remember that public sector universities sit at the top of the educational pyramid of a province. A large number of affiliated or constituent colleges are attached to the university, which are monitored and supported by the university in terms of curricula and examinations. Therefore, the decline in the quality of university education triggers a crisis of governance at several levels of post-secondary education, seriously depleting the capacity of the government to produce human capital that can perform in the national market and compete in the global market.

Although, there is no doubt about the need to reform higher education in Pakistan, deciding on the precise nature and content of reform requires further explorations into the reasons for the failure of state policies. The current reform process has attracted strong criticism and stiff opposition from the faculty and students of public universities. A large number of teachers were mobilised in the public universities throughout the country and expressed their dissenting views, without eliciting a clear response from the government to review the recommendations of the Task Force or SCHE.⁴¹ Any exercise in educational planning requires a critical assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the prevailing system, rather than blanket criticism or rejection of the existing system on the basis of poor outcomes. In the absence of a clearly formulated criterion for evaluating the performance of past policies, it is easy to stake claims for a new policy. Despite an obvious need to raise more funds for the cash strapped universities, it must not be forgotten that education, like national defence or a clean environment, is a public good with a justifiable claim on the public exchequer. In the rush to improve quality, we may end up erecting income barriers on the path to educational development, thereby further depleting our human capital.

Appendix

This note does not deal with the more “regional” aspects of state policies on higher education in south Asia that persist in the age of globalisation and the knowledge economy. As a reminder of the continued presence of these aspects of state policy, I am reproducing below an official notice from the former University Grants Commission (UGC) which was circulated among all faculty members in public educational institutions in Pakistan in October 2001. The circular actually named a specific researcher, but I have changed the name here to a fictitious one.

University Grants Commission Circular, No D 1783/2001-IC.V, Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Education, Islamabad, dated October 12, 2001.

Subject: Pakistani Students in Correspondence with Indians for Academic Assistance

(1) I am directed to say that one of the security agencies has observed a growing tendency among the staff members/students of various professional institutions of India and Pakistan to communicate in different fields of mutual interest; (2) For instance, Salman Khan (name changed), a student of department of crop physiology, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad has established illegal links with Indian experts/organisations; (3) It is requested that all the public/private sector universities/educational institutions affiliated, registered or recognised by the UGC/government may kindly be advised to instruct their staff members/students to follow the government directions and immediately dispense with all illegal links with foreign experts/educational institutions; (4) It may also be ensured that material to be exchanged be first got cleared from the ministry and no links with any foreign experts/educational institutions should be established without prior approval of UGC/government of Pakistan. **EPW**

Email: notarar@gmail.com

Notes

- 1 Lawrence Stone (ed), *The University in Society*, 2 vols, Oxford University Press and Princeton University Press, 1974. Also see Alexandra Olsson and John Voss (eds), *Organisation of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920*, John Hopkins University Press, 1979.
- 2 'A Survey of Universities', *The Economist*, October, 4, 1997.
- 3 John McMurty, *The Edge of a New Dark Age: The Corporate Take Over of Higher Research and Education*, Comer Publications, Toronto, 2000.
- 4 Lauchlan Chipman, 'The Eighteenth Annual John Bonython Lecture', The Art Gallery of NSW, Sydney, Tuesday, October 23, 2001.
- 5 Philip G Altbach, *Perspectives on Internationalising Higher Education*, International Higher Education no 27 (nd).
- 6 ToddMDavis, *Open Doors: Report on International Educational Exchange 2001*, New York, 2002.
- 7 Jandhyala B G Tilak, 'Financing Higher Education in India' in Suma Chitnis and Philip G Altbach (eds), *Higher Education Reform in India: Experience and Perspectives*, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 1993.
- 8 Burton R Clark, *The Academic Profession, National, Disciplinary and Institutional Settings*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1987.
- 9 Arild Tjeldvoll, *The Idea of the Service University*, International Higher Education, 13/4 (nd)
- 10 Philip G Altbach, *Perspectives on Internationalising Higher Education*, International Higher Education no 27 (nd).
- 11 Suma Chitnis and Philip G Altbach (eds), *Higher Education Reforms in India: Experience and Perspectives*, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 1993.
- 12 Philip G Altbach, *Perspectives on Internationalising Higher Education*, International Higher Education no 27 (nd).
- 13 Ibid. Also see Murli Manohar Joshi, *Higher Education in India: Vision and Action Plan*, a country paper, at the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century, Paris, October 5-9, 1998.
- 14 Akbar Zaidi, *The Dismal State of the Social Sciences in Pakistan*, Council of Social Sciences, Islamabad, 2002, p 6.
- 15 M Iqbal, *Education in Pakistan*, Aziz Publishers, Lahore, 1977. Also see, I H Querishi, *Education in Pakistan*, Maarif Printers, Karachi, 1975.
- 16 For a review of educational policies in Pakistan, see Muneer Ahmad, 'Education' in Rafi Raza (ed), *Pakistan in Perspective, 1947-1997*, Oxford University Press, Karachi, 1997.
- 17 A H Nayyar and Ahmed Saleem, *The Subtle Revolution: The State of Curricula and Textbooks in Pakistan*, SDPI, 2003. Also see *Social Development in Pakistan, Annual Review, 2002-03, The State of Education*, Social Policy and Development Centre, Karachi, 2003.
- 18 Planning Commission, *Five-Years Plans*, Finance Division, Economic Advisor's Wing, Economic Survey.
- 19 *Challenges and Opportunities: Task Force Report on the Improvement of Higher Education in Pakistan*, 2002.
- 20 Nasser Sheikh, 'Higher Education in Pakistan: The Public Sector' in *Higher Education: A Path Way to Development*, Aga Khan University and Oxford University Press, Karachi, 1998, p 41.
- 21 Ibid, p 42.
- 22 Government of Punjab, *University Grants Commission, Handbook of Universities of Pakistan*, 1994.
- 23 *Challenges and Opportunities: Task Force Report on the Improvement of Higher Education in Pakistan*, 2002, p 14.
- 24 World Bank, *Higher Education and Scientific Research for Development in Pakistan*, 1990.
- 25 Times Higher Education Supplement, March 10, 2000, 'Educated People Are No Luxury, They Are Essential'. Mamphele Ramphele, Managing Director of the World Bank, and Henry Rosovsky, Professor Emeritus of the Harvard University, were co-chairs of the Task Force on Higher Education convened by UNESCO and World Bank in late 1997.
- 26 Times Higher Education Supplement, March 3, 2000, 'World Bank Enlists HE to Narrow Poverty Gap'.
- 27 *Challenges and Opportunities: Task Force Report on the Improvement of Higher Education in Pakistan*, 2002, p 5.
- 28 Abdul Qadeer, 'Globalisation of Higher Education', (unpublished paper) 2004.
- 29 Two vice chancellors of the universities in Punjab are retired senior military officers, and the present federal minister for education is the former head of army intelligence.
- 30 *Challenges and Opportunities: Task Force Report on the Improvement of Higher Education in Pakistan*, 2002, p 2.
- 31 *Challenges and Opportunities: Task Force Report on the Improvement of Higher Education in Pakistan*, 2002, p 3.
- 32 Ibid, pp 11-12.
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 The assertions of the report flies in the face of budgetary allocations to education. In 1960, public expenditure on education was 1.1 per cent of GNP. By 1990, it has risen to 3.4 per cent. By contrast, 33.9 per cent of the GNP was spent on national defence.
- 35 Shahrukh R Khan, 'The Income Redistributive Impact of Financing Higher Education in Pakistan' in *World Development*, Vol 19, No 9, pp 1241-46, 1991. Using data on the tax structure for 1979-80 and the enrolment structure in higher education in 1981-82, Khan argues that public financing of higher education primarily represented a redistribution from the middle and upper income groups to the lower income groups. On the strength of the evidence, he argued against the policies of the state which aimed at eliminating subsidies and replacing them with user fees or scholarships.
- 36 For some of the polemical writings on the University Ordinance see, Riaz Ahmad,in *Perils and Promise of Higher Education Reforms in Pakistan: Views from Afar*, Centre for Policy and Development Alternative, Lahore, 2003 (unpublished copy).
- 37 Akbar Zaidi, *The Dismal State of the Social Sciences in Pakistan*, Council of Social Sciences, Islamabad, 2002.
- 38 Annual Report, Higher Education Commission, 2002-03.
- 39 Ibid.
- 40 Ibid.
- 41 For a representative sample of the writings, that appeared in the national press, in 2003, see, *Perils and Promise of Higher Education Reforms in Pakistan: Views from Afar*, Centre for Policy and Development Alternative, Lahore, 2003 (unpublished copy).

Economic and Political Weekly

available at

Sundar News Agents

(Magazine Market)

158 D N Road, Shop No 6

Near Kelkar Hotel

Fort, Mumbai 400 001