

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/295905082>

African Higher Education: Institutional Response to Globalization.

Chapter · January 2012

CITATIONS

8

READS

596

1 author:



Ishmael I. Munene

Northern Arizona University

83 PUBLICATIONS 305 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Higher Education in Africa: Institutional Response to Globalization

ISHMAEL I. MUNENE

INTRODUCTION

Of the numerous forces that have shaped higher education systems¹, none has had more profound consequences in the 21st century than the forces of globalization. From the developed world to the developing one, globalization has been instrumental in redefining the character and shape of universities in ways that are remarkably different from other forces that have influenced these institutions. African higher education is no exception. Beginning in the mid 1980s, international influences on the continent's university systems began to have dramatic effects which have continued to this day.

By and large, globalization is to African higher education in the 21st century what neo-colonialism was in the early 1960s at the dawn of independence. Both have had a dramatic impact in realigning the higher education system. This essay examines the impact of globalization on the continent's higher education in the years 2003 – 2004, a period that witnessed significant transformations. These transformations are manifest in “academic capitalism”²—institutional efforts and strategies to secure external financial resources. These strategies can be discerned in increased massification, enhanced accountability, rapid privatization and increased marketization of universities, all which have had considerable impact on equality of opportunity, equity, quality and efficiency of Africa's higher education.

This essay is divided into four broad sections. The first examines the concept of globalization as perceived by various scholars. The second explores the linkage between higher education and globalization. This is followed by a critical examination of the impact of globalization on African higher education in the years 2003 – 2004. Our analysis in this section will involve drawing upon illustrative cases from eastern, southern and western Africa where considerable writing on the subject has been undertaken. The examination will focus on massification, accountability, privatization and marketization along with their implications for equality of opportunity, equity, quality and efficiency in higher education. The essay will conclude with an overview of the influence of globalization on African universities.

CONCEPT OF GLOBALIZATION

Within the last couple of years, globalization has become a critical mantra in academic discourse as nations have effected socio-political and economic changes aimed at creating a single economic entity for the movement of goods, capital, services, skills and technology. Therefore, an examination of what it entails is an excellent starting point. At its most basic form, globalization has been ascribed as “what happens when the movement of people, goods, or ideas among countries and regions accelerates”.³ While the cross-border movement of people, goods and ideas has occurred throughout history, it is the current speed and quantity that demarcates the globalization era from any other period in history.

Globalization is also conceptualized as a change process, which according to Suarez-Orozco and Quin-Hilliard⁴, has four interrelated connections, (1) post-national forms of production and distribution of goods and services enhanced by enormous volumes of international trade, foreign direct investments and capital flows, (2) information,

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

communications and media technologies that facilitate the flow and exchange of ideas over wide geographic areas thereby raising the premium of knowledge-intensive work, (3) large scale migration of skilled labor and (4) attendant cultural transformations and exchanges that challenge national values and norms of sending and receiving countries. The implications of these transformations on African societies have been revolutionary, if not seismic. Rapid privatization of public enterprises and the provision of social services have occurred simultaneously with removal of public subsidies, downsizing the civil service along with cuts in government expenditures in social and productive services whose costs have been passed to the beneficiaries through “cost-sharing”. Incentives for international as well as local private investors have been provided for through tax holidays and exemptions.⁵

Chachage and Kanyinga⁶ continue to argue that not only have these transformations complicated Africa’s efforts to redress colonial-induced socio-economic disparities among the various ethnic groups, they have, in most instances, intensified these disparities. Consequently, intra-ethnic conflicts have accompanied the liberalization of the continent’s economies. The loss of the mediating effects that the state provided through the provision of social services has given rise to various patterns of exclusion and inclusion thereby igniting the conflicts.

The preceding analysis summarizes how globalization has been conceptualized including its ramifications in Africa. Some scholars such as Gustavo and Stromquist⁷ have conceptualized globalization in terms of top and down perspectives. The top perspective perceives the political, economic, cultural and social actions reaching a world wide scale. This, in turn, leads to the increasing homogenization of patterns of production, consumption and understanding among states, international corporations and societies. Local societies are inextricably interwoven in this vortex as they compete for legitimization of their particularities based on economic success. Asian countries such as China and India along with their African counterparts such as Botswana and South Africa are cited as examples of nations that have registered economic boom due to economic liberalization occasioned by globalization.

The down perspective, on the other hand, sees globalization treated with suspicion and trepidation by the poor and impoverished middle class in third-world countries. Contrary to expectations, the global market has not delivered its benefits but instead it has increased the economic might of transnational corporations, the G7 countries, international financial institutions and other supranational organizations. The outcry over the adverse effects of the World Bank’s Structural Adjustment Programs on vulnerable groups such as the poor, women and children in Africa, Latin America and Asia best exemplifies this down perspective.

The emerging scenario is that globalization has been a double-edged sword. While some have prospered economically and accumulated power politically, others have been impoverished economically and disempowered politically. The unfolding scenarios have provided opportunities and challenges for societal institutions including education. The consequence of globalization on the higher education sector is our next focus.

GLOBALIZATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION

As globalization has increased as an organizing process in socio-economic and political reforms and relations, so too has the view that education is a significant catalyst in enabling nations become globally competitive gained currency. Higher education is critical for nations to compete in global markets, attract foreign investments that call for high productivity and flexibility in the use of technology to upgrade higher value goods and services. It is higher education that provides the springboard for raising productivity and lays the foundation for technological change.⁸ It is in this context

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

that the link between globalization and higher education is most apparent.

“Higher education” notes the Task Force on Higher Education and Society “is to a knowledge economy as primary education is to an agrarian economy and secondary education to an industrial economy”.⁹ The genesis of the conflation between higher education and the global knowledge can be traced to both the Reagan and Thatcher administrations in the US and UK respectively after their countries lost economic market share to the Asian tigers—Japan, South Korea, Taiwan and Hong Kong.¹⁰ Through a conscious investment in human capital coupled with growth in research and development, most of these nations, shackled in poverty and underdevelopment a few decades earlier, had leapfrogged to be world economic superpowers. Henceforth, universities in the US and UK, through strategic funding and policy initiatives, would be tied to the economy in order to enhance the countries’ global economic competitiveness. It is this rationale that has informed the impetus for reforms in higher education to make it attune to the needs of the global knowledge economy.

Through higher education, nations would become competitive in the new global economy. The modern emergent globalized knowledge economy is fueled by applied sciences and engineering, especially information generation, processing and storage. It is one in which highly educated university graduates are indispensable. It is one in which highly productive workers would command high-paying jobs. Universities would be responsible for training of creative, inventive and innovative individuals to produce products that enhance a nation’s global competitiveness.

Resultant state policies have sought to steer universities away from their hitherto social and intellectual mission and more to the marketplace. Emergent policies have led to decreased funding in order to steer universities to solicit financial support from competitive market sources; partnerships between universities and industry that focus on product development, innovation, market of educational and business services have been enunciated; state oversight powers over universities have increased including the state bureaucrats’ abilities to shape programs and curricula, standardize academic work, and encourage and supervise contract research. Further, there has been increased managerialism to manage the both the new state-university relations and contract research while at the same time transferring costs of education to students.¹¹

That the globalized political economy has had a homogenizing effect on higher education cannot be gainsaid. The entrepreneurial university, for instance, is a local adaptation to globalization forces in which institutions with divergent histories and contrasting structure betray a converging restructuring characterized by what Vaira calls “the entrepreneurial archetype”.¹² In the case of African universities, globalization, according to Zeleza¹³, is a project and process of neo-liberalism which has been articulated through the World Bank’s Structural Adjustment Programs. This has given way to the corporatization of university management, the commercialization of learning and, ultimately, the commoditization of knowledge. The incorporation of African higher education into the neo-liberal global political economy by the World Bank rests on the amalgam of the bank’s monetary clout, technical expertise and enormous political influence.

The Banks prescription for the maladies¹⁴ afflicting Africa’s higher education have involved a combination of a reduction in state funding, competitive funding of universities, promoting state university entrepreneurship as a means of generating additional revenues, introduction of tuition fees, institution of cost-sharing to be borne by the beneficiaries of higher education, allowing the development of private universities, and instituting accountability measures. Through these reform measures African universities will not only provide equitable access to all segments of society, they will also join in the new global knowledge economy.

The World Bank reforms began in earnest in the early 1990s and reached their

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

crescendo in early 2000. We now shift our attention to the impact of globalization on African universities in the years 2003 and 2004.

GLOBALIZATION IMPACTS ON AFRICAN UNIVERSITIES

MASSIFICATION

Of the various consequences of globalization, none has been more dramatic than massification, the growth in university institutions and access to them as a means of addressing demand in higher education. The goal has been to address the problem of elitism associated with Africa's post independence national universities. New categories of institutions have emerged to occupy university places and previously under-represented students—ethnic minorities, women and those from lower socio-economic status—have found a niche in universities. The surge in enrolment is captured in Table 1, Enrolment Trends in Selected Universities in Sub-Saharan Africa, 1999-2004.

As observed in the data, surge in enrolment occurred in leaps and bounds, reaching impressive heights at in 2003 – 2004. Even in small systems like Cape Verde, the growth from 1999 to 2004 was an impressive 428%. Other nations that witnessed similar growth include Angola, Ethiopia, Ghana and Nigeria. The growth in enrollment reflects an increasing demand for higher education which itself is a function of rapid population growth. The UN estimates that Africa's population growth rate has been among the largest in the world with a mean annual growth rate of 4.4%. Rwanda, Nigeria, Ethiopia, and Angola are the sub-saharan countries that have witnessed the largest growth rate, and will continue to do so till 2025.¹⁵ It is by no coincidence that these countries are also among those that witnessed a sizeable surge in higher educational enrollment. And this surge is in tandem with global trends where there has been a dramatic growth in student enrolment as elitism, with its small enrolment, has been perceived as inimical to the necessities of national global competitiveness.

In addition to the growth in student enrolment, massification has occurred along two well-defined trajectories. The first is the establishment and subsequent growth in the number of private universities. The immediate post-independence era in Africa was suspicious, even hostile, to the notion of private universities. However, since the mid-1980s there has been a paradigm shift which has seen private universities gain a footing in the continent's higher education landscape. The second has been the increasing privatization of public universities. As demand for higher education has increased and state resources to support its growth and operations have dwindled, privatization has become a viable option to option to address the twin challenges of demand and resource generation.

TABLE 1: HIGHER EDUCATION ENROLMENT IN SELECTED AFRICAN COUNTRIES¹⁶

Country	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Angola	7,845	-	-	12,566	48,184	37,547
Botswana	5,092	-	6,844	7,406	-	9,663
Cape Verde	706	801	718	1,810	2,215	3,028
Ethiopia	52,283	67,722	87,431	101,829	147,920	172,083
Ghana	-	29,939	36,953	39,427	-	60,690
Kenya	-	44,223	45,790	47,477	-	67,556
Madagascar	23,290	25,072	24,868	24,678	28,615	33,631
Mozambique	10,322	11,619	-	-	17,225	22,256
Nigeria	392,990	-	-	-	714,338	746,424

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

The growth of private universities in Africa is a microcosm of global trends in the growth of private universities. There were hardly any private universities to speak of at the dawn of independence in the 1960s but by 2003, the number had grown so that in countries like Kenya, Uganda, and Ghana, the number of private universities exceeded public ones. In Table 2, a sampling of the number of private institutions offering university-level studies is presented. The development of these private higher education institutions has occurred in three waves. The first is religious universities which dominate private higher education in Kenya and Uganda. The rise of this type of universities was aimed at providing a religious fervor in higher education. The second wave is elite private universities. These are expensive and appealing to educational demands of the affluent who aspire for a more distinct type of higher education. Kenya's the United States International University, which attracts upper-class students from East and Central Africa, represents the elite sector of higher education. The third wave is the tuition-dependent demand-absorbing types, among the fastest growing institutional types particularly in Uganda. As the name implies, their main role has been simply to meet the growing demand for higher education.

Besides the increase in private institutions, massification has been aided by the increasing privatization of public universities through a mix of privately-sponsored fee-paying students, partnerships and linkages. Public universities in Kenya, Uganda, Nigeria and Senegal have opened their institutions to fee paying students who do not receive state subsidies to finance their education unlike their government-sponsored counterparts. Both the University of Lagos (UNILAG) in Nigeria and Cheik Anta Diop University in Senegal had by 2004 established satellite campuses in order to meet the increasing demand for higher education.¹⁷

TABLE 2: PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS & UNIVERSITIES IN AFRICA, 2003¹⁸

Country	Private	Country	Private
Benin	27	Senegal	48
Cameron	17	Tanzania	10
Ghana	28	Uganda	15
Nigeria	13	Zimbabwe	4
Kenya	14		

This new multifaceted approach to admitting students has been driven by the desire to address the growing demand for higher education amidst the decline in state funding for public higher education. Taking Kenya as a case in point, Table 3 shows the growth in self-sponsored student in the three largest public universities. By 2004, this category of students had almost equaled the number of government-sponsored students. At Makerere University in Uganda, self-sponsored students had exceeded state-subsidized students by 2004 constituting almost 80% of the student body.¹⁹

Partnerships and linkages constitute another avenue through which massification has been articulated. By partnering with private middle level colleges, public universities have been able to admit additional undergraduate students and, thereby extend their reach beyond the confines of their main campuses. This model of enrollment growth has been popular in Kenya and South Africa. Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology pioneered this model in Kenya and by 2004 had the most extensive partnership with private and public colleges in the country. Doubts about the quality of degrees granted under this arrangement have led to the charge of "garage universities".²⁰ In South Africa, the University of South Africa, the premier distance-

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

learning institution in the country, has the most extensive collaborative partnership with local and foreign colleges.²¹

TABLE 3: STUDENT ENROLMENT BY TYPE OF ADMISSION IN KENYA'S PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES²²

University	2000/2001	2001/2002	2002/2003	2003/2004
Nairobi				
JAB	11,724	13,174	13,591	12,009
SSP	3,109	11,522	12,098	12,703
Kenyatta				
JAB	7,529	9,367	8,301	8,716
SSP	2,424	2,448	7,434	7,060
Moi				
JAB	7,209	7,245	7,281	7,318
SSP	1,310	2,093	3,542	3129

Key: JAB – Joint Admissions Board (government-sponsored); SSP – Self Sponsored Program.

In a variety of ways, university massification has had considerable impact on equality of educational opportunity. While actual enrolments have increased, class-based disparities in access to university education have also become apparent. The dual-track tuition policy involving government-sponsored and privately-sponsored students has led to bifurcation of the student body along class lines. Only those capable of meeting the full cost of university education seek enrolment as a self-sponsored student since educational loans are not available to such students in Kenya and Uganda. In addition a student with lower academic qualification but with financial resources can enroll in prestigious university program (such as medicine) but one with superior qualification but without the requisite financial means cannot do so in Kenya. In Uganda only around 20 – 30% of Makerere University students are government-sponsored and entitled to free education.

Though countries like Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria and South Africa have established loan scheme programs to assist government-sponsored student pay a subsidized tuition fee, excessive subsidization of the same along with massive administrative costs have led to inefficiencies and poor recovery rates. By 2004, in Ghana, Kenya and Nigeria interest rates were between 2 – 3%, well below the cost of inflation. In South Africa subsidies led to the forgiveness of 40% of the loan if a student successfully completed their studies.²³ Oketch²⁴ has estimated that in some instances administrative costs of the student loan scheme have run as high as 20%.

Under these conditions of massive university expansion, faculty differentiation has become a notable trend. Most of the teaching staff in private universities is part-time or half-time. In public universities departments with massive enrolment and partnership colleges have had to rely on part time instructors as well. The outcome has been a dichotomous teaching profession consisting of full-time professoriate that is ingrained with the workings of academia and engaged in scholarship and a large part-time teaching fraternity operating in the periphery that has only a modicum appreciation of academia. A differentiated faculty such as this has enormous implication on quality of scholarship particularly for public universities which hitherto were epicenters of quality academic research.

It is possible to assume that university expansion has created opportunities for advancement for women academics. However, empirical evidence suggests otherwise.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

University expansion may even have exacerbated the marginalization of women. By 2004, Kenyan women academics who had joined the university teaching ranks at the inception of public universities expansion had become disillusioned because:

Their entrance into the university teaching positions and accelerated promotion to lectureships has been a dead end. Departmental establishments coupled with a lack of research funds continued to ensure that these women remain locked in junior lectureship positions. For example, some women complained that their doctoral theses stagnated because they lacked funds to conduct field work. They were constantly advised to use their own money with the promise that the university would reimburse them when funds became available. The women lacked these extra funds.²⁵

University massification, the study suggests, had reinforced a patriarchal system that favors a male patronage system, penalizes women while devaluing their work and ideas.

In all, globalization forces have stimulated the rapid expansion of African higher education as a way of meeting demand and mitigating elitism. It has been a strategy to increase the number of university graduates as a means of meeting demand along with developing manpower to enhance nations' global competitiveness. In the process, it has led to the demise of national unitary system of higher education and led to a system of highly differentiated institutions. The consequences of these developments have been apparent in equality of educational opportunity, efficiency as well as in academic quality.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND GROWING MANAGERIALISM

In order to steer universities towards the market in tandem with global competitive needs, increased accountability requirements and growth in managerialism have come to define recent higher education developments in Africa. Consequently new university structures and processes have emerged leading to the growth in the number of administrators. Administrators have acquired more powers and become key players in university governance. This re-engineering of governance has been driven by the belief that in the new globalization, administrators will serve as a linchpin connecting the assets and needs of the campus with the assets and needs of the external environment.²⁶

The paradigm shift in accountability has also seen university administrators centralize university management and become increasingly proactive in the control of academics' work. New bureaucratic structures, superimposed on old ones, have constituted oversight offices to manage income-generating academic programs. Some of the accountability measures have been in response to concerns over decline in academic quality owing to massification while others have been promulgated by state-mandates on performance accountability. In Kenya, for instance, under the State Corporations (performance contracting) Regulations 2004 Legal Notice No. 93 all state corporations (including universities) are required to sign performance contracts with the government and submit quarterly performance reports. In response, Kenyatta University established the Center for Quality Assurance to monitor the quantity and quality of work output by academics.

Similar accountability measures have been instituted at the University of Botswana which established an American-style Institutional Planning Development (IPD) office which has been responsible for setting up key performance indicators for programs and activities in line with the institution's strategic plan. Together with the Center for Academic Development, IPD has undertaken program reviews and internal quality assurance assessment.

The increased importance of accountability and the institutionalization of layers

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

of offices to monitor adherence to performance indicators has ushered in a corporate management culture in the universities. This growth in managerialism has seen a shift in emphasis as to what can be recorded, documented and reported about teaching and learning as opposed to concern with the educational process at the heart of university education. Simply put, the introduction of managerial values has cast to the sidelines the traditional democratic educational values that have informed higher education.

The need to ensure accountability and to link institutional programs to the market has also fueled the increased importance of strategic planning. Through strategic planning committees with membership drawn from various university stakeholders, administrators have been able to steer public universities in directions aimed at generating resources for the universities as well as meeting market labor requirements. Hitherto university planning was a centralized activity undertaken by central government ministries of education. By 2004, however, virtually all African universities had adopted strategic planning as a vital tool in navigating an increasingly competitive environment. Kenyatta University in Kenya embarked on its first strategic planning project in 2004 with financial and personnel support from the Rockefeller Foundation. The 2005 – 2010 strategic plan aims at transforming the university into a world-class institution, globally connected through partnership and information technology, research-oriented and training labor-ready graduates who are creative and independent thinkers among others.²⁷

Underpinning the new accountability measures has been the systematic adoption of quality assurance as the new accountability metaphor. There is nothing inherently wrong with striving for quality but in this instance, quality has come to represent a new category of managerial control. Quality is a code word for performance indicators which can be measured and recorded- objectives must be set, planning, reviewing, internal monitoring and external reporting must be continuously demonstrated. Quality assurance is a carry over from business and industry where uniformity and consistency is overriding.

Quality assurance in African higher education has been articulated through accreditation and other forms of external regulations. Whether these have promoted education quality has been a subject of intense discussion. As a case in point, in South Africa, Cosser²⁸ has challenged the notion that external accreditation necessarily translates into quality. Following a critical review of the accreditation processes undertaken by the South African Qualification Authority (SAQA) and the Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC) of the Council on Higher Education (CHE), Cosser²⁹ has observed that the emphasis on a narrow external-oriented definition of quality undermined the development of an all encompassing internal-oriented view of quality especially in private institutions.

The new accountability requirements along with the attendant growing managerialism have led to a loss of the centrality of the academic profession in the university governance process. In turn, it has led to the ascendancy of external environment, corporate managers and fundraising as the driving force in university operations as opposed to the internal environment, instruction and the academic profession. The deleterious effects of these developments on academic quality and faculty academic freedom cannot be gainsaid as Zeleza has observed:

While the benefits of globalization on academic freedom should not be underestimated, it seems to me that a market-driven higher education system undermines academic freedom in five major ways: in terms of student access and solidarity, disciplinary differentiation and devaluation, integrity of research and publishing, management and security of tenure, and permeability and dilution of institutional traditions.³⁰

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

PRIVATIZATION

We have already considered two aspects of privatization in the context of massification—the surge in private higher education and the privatization of public higher education. In this section, we examine privatization from a different perspective, namely the pressures universities have experienced to raise revenue through avenues such as consulting, grants and other non-teaching activities. Furthermore, another dimension of privatization is the transfer of management of these revenue-generating activities into private management.

These aspects of privatization are tied to globalization's neo-liberal discourse that emphasizes cutbacks in state expenditure in higher education, deregulation and liberalization. Privatization of the global development agenda compels public universities to realign their operations in order to secure external funding in a competitive environment. Some scholars have indicated there is a tinge of distinction between privatization and quasi-marketization (market-like behaviors) on the one hand and market-behaviors when it comes to public institutions on the other. Privatization incorporates "academic capitalism" (discussed earlier) and "market-like behaviors" as opposed to "market behaviors". Thus,

Market-like behaviors refer to institutional and faculty competition for money, there these are from international grants and contracts, endowment funds, university-industry partnerships, institutional investment in professors' spin-off companies, or students' tuition and fees....Market behaviors on the other hand refer to for-profit activity on the part of institutions, activity such as patenting and subsequent royalty and licensing agreement, spin-off companies, arm's length corporations, and university-industry partnerships when there is a profit component.³¹

Clark³² has further noted that due to globalization along with growing preponderance of the market, universities have been compelled to venture into areas that would guarantee them entrepreneurial revenue. Safe to say, then, that privatization in African universities has been one of market-like behavior in the sense that revenue, not profit, has been the main motivation.

State budgetary allocation to African universities has been in decline despite increase in student enrollment. This has put considerable financial pressures on universities and has hampered their operational efficiencies. In Ghana³³, in early 2000 the five state universities only received 56% of their budgetary requests from the state while in Uganda³⁴ the government was only able to fund 18% of the request for higher education in 2003. As of 2003, higher education in Africa was a US\$4 – 5bn enterprise, a low expenditure figure given that the continent's population was around 700m.³⁵

Three universities exemplify the revenue-generation entrepreneurial spirit that has permeated African higher education until 2004. The University of Pretoria in South Africa has evolved an elaborate program of revenue generation that involves lease of university facilities to Damelin, a private college 'with which it has had collaborative partnership. The university has also established a Department of Business Activities to ensure effective functioning with particular focus on customer satisfaction. In addition, it has established the Business Enterprises at University of Pretoria (Pty), a wholly-owned subsidiary, which represents business interests in various academic disciplines. In collaboration with the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), the university has formed the Southern Education and Research Alliance (SERA) to focus on the exploitation of intellectual property in both CSIR and the university through the commercialization and licensing of patents. Furthermore the faculty has been granted opportunities to work in university-owned companies as well as companies that lease university premises.³⁶ While no data has been available

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

to gauge the success of these initiatives it is apparent that university has embarked on a path dedicated to entrepreneurialism.

Makerere University, in Uganda, has long been the poster-child for university entrepreneurialism on the continent. With support from international donors such as the World Bank, Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, the university has embraced entrepreneurialism which by 2004 had saved it from pecuniary embarrassment wrought by decades of civil war that had left the country bankrupt. Though the bulk of the revenue has been generated by tuition fees, there has been some, albeit marginal, income derived from consulting and renting out of facilities. In the financial year 2002 – 2003, the revenues generated by the university included 6% from development projects, 3% facilities hiring, 1% consulting and 1% other ventures.³⁷ In Table 4 Sources of Makerere University funding are presented. From 2003 university generated revenues have eclipsed government funding in financing the university's operations and the share of private resources has reached 50% and beyond.

TABLE 4: INTERNALLY-GENERATED AND GOVERNMENT FUNDING AT MAKERERE UNIVERSITY, 1995 – 2004 (USHS. BN)³⁸

Year	Internal Funds	Govt. Funds	Total Funding	% Private
1995/96	4.1	20.3	24.4	17
1996/97	7.6	19.3	26.8	28
1997/98	8.8	19.5	28.3	31
1998/99	13.7	22.5	36.2	38
1999/00	15.1	23.0	38.1	40
2000/01	17.4	22.1	39.5	44
2001/02	19.0	26.7	45.7	42
2002/03	29.4	26.6	55.6	53
2003/04	30.7	36.6	73.2	50

In keeping with the Kenyan government declarations that “the central thrust of the new policies is to rely on market forces to mobilize resources for growth and development”³⁹ and that “...the time has come to seriously take account of universities’ potential to generate income internally”⁴⁰, since the late 1990s the University of Nairobi, along with other public universities, embarked on a program of entrepreneurial activity. Having incorporated a holding company, the University of Nairobi Enterprise & Services Ltd. (UNES), the university has invested in consultancy services, conference facilities, restaurants, lodging facilities and bookstores as primary revenue generating sources. Others include research grants and contracts as well as cost-recovery programs from student catering and accommodation. Table 5 documents revenues generated by UNES from 1997 to 2003, with 2003 revenues exceeding Ksh.1 bn.

TABLE 5: INCOME EARNED FROM VARIOUS NON-ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES THROUGH UNES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI, 1997 – 2003 (KSHS.)⁴¹

Year	Income	Year	Income
1997/98	66,696,046	2000/01	78,166,941
1998/99	82,001,449	2001/02	73,359,334
1999/00	84,160,615	2002/03	106,877,915

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

The data presented above suggest that African universities have been filling the void left by reduction in state subventions. Indeed Makerere and Nairobi universities have been able to finance critical infrastructure development and provision of educational materials that have been previously neglected due to declining resources. This financing arrangement, however, has invited questions of efficiency from a variety of angles. First, university employees operate as state-subsidized entrepreneurs, while the cost of this state subsidy has barely been accounted for in the operating costs, the cost-efficiency of these enterprises remains doubtful. In addition, since university labor is expended in competitive market environments, there is a case to be made about the exploitation of academic labor force. Publicly subsidized academic labor is expended in risky market environments without the requisite safeguards provided by private companies.

Second, and related to the first, has been institutional risk arising from academic capitalism. Risk is conceptualized as what the investor assumes on entry into the marketplace, a precarious position since universities are novices in this arena. The legal hiccups over patents and profit sharing that confronted HIV/AIDS collaborative research between the University of Nairobi and institutions in USA and Japan in early 1990 and with UK and US institutions in the late 1990⁴² demonstrate the financial and reputational risks facing African universities.

In addition to issues around efficiency, privatization has also been confronted with questions around equity. Ishengoma⁴³ notes that at the University of Dar-es-salaam, students from poor homes sublet their rooms leading to five and six in a room, and illegally prepare meals in the hostels resulting in electrical malfunctions. At Egerton University in Kenya, students from poor households have adapted to the harsh realities of cost-sharing by engaging in business activities such as selling foodstuffs, photography, electrical repairs, hair care boutiques, photocopying, printing and telephone services.⁴⁴ All these are the consequences of cost-recovery measures instituted with respect to student accommodation services. Thus, ineffective means testing to determine students' ability to financial needs for room and board coupled with inadequate loans to meet leaving expenses has meant that students from lower socio-economic backgrounds have borne the most impact from cost-recovery measures in residential life.

MARKETIZATION

Marketization is used here to denote strategies through which universities have used in order to align themselves with the marketplace. These strategies have included re-focusing student curricular interests as well as identifying opportunities for entrepreneurial activities. These strategies have resulted in coupling of university programs and activities to the market, a marked departure from the post-independence university where focus was on the development of a social and cohesive society so that the markets could function well.

A consequence of the alignment of academic programs to suit market needs has been the ascendancy of applied and technical-oriented disciplines such as biochemistry, biotechnology, engineering, computer science and tourism in tandem with the basic sciences, social sciences and the liberal arts.⁴⁵ The skills obtained from the former programs have become invaluable in the new globalized economies ushered in by the neo-liberal development policy, as they are all linked to economic productivity. Given the high demand for these programs they have become the programs of choice in most African universities, public and private, since 2000. In this context, globalization has fostered uniformity in program offering among African universities as nations have sought to enhance their comparative advantage in the global economic realm.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

The market alignment of academic programs has also been articulated through the reconfigurations in the shapes of programs and delivery modes. By 2004 African higher education had evolved, adapted and reinvented itself into a complex web involving different kinds of training and modes of delivery resulting into hybrid forms of higher education. There has been an increased movement towards non-degree short courses targeted towards busy executives in business and non-governmental organizations. East African public universities, Kenya in particular, have developed such courses in the fields of HIV/AIDS management, accounting, project management, and entrepreneurship studies. To make the degree programs student friendly and hasten the time it takes to graduate, there has been a notable reduction in residency requirements. At Kenyatta and Nairobi universities in Kenya, a written thesis is no longer a required to obtain a masters degree. Rather students have an option of either writing a project (which is considerably less rigorous and demanding) or producing a thesis. Delivery modes have also witnessed innovation with virtual universities (African Virtual University being the most prominent), correspondence courses, and sandwich programmes being the most prominent of the long distance modalities employed.

As Sall⁴⁶ noted in 2004, this evolution of African higher education has been pioneered by public universities in response to growing demand for higher education. In view of the limited higher education opportunities in the continent relative to the population, a pluralistic, well-managed public university, with multitasking capability to reach various groups seems to be the most logical response to growing local and global demand for highly skilled labor.

Marketization has also been articulated through the rapid growth in university centers and institutes as venues for organizing teaching and research in contrast to traditional academic departments. Across much of the continent, the years 2003 and 2004 had their share of growth in cross-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary research centers and policy institutes dedicated to research and graduate level teaching. These non-traditional academic initiatives have provided two advantages to the universities. First, they have provided a valuable conduit through which to fundraise externally for support in a graduate academic programming. Second, they have provided avenues for establishing short-term training programs without the convoluted process of curriculum committees and senates required for traditional academic programming.

Marketization has had considerable impact on African universities character and operations. There has been increased faculty differentiation based on disciplinary specialization. Those in highly marketable disciplines—mentioned above—have been viewed as more desirable than their counterparts in traditional academic programs. In tandem with the perceived market value of various disciplines, Kenya's Nairobi and Moi universities have instituted a differentiated salary structure in which part-time instructors in highly marketable disciplines are paid at a higher scale than their counterparts in disciplines viewed as lacking in market potential. Differential pay based on discipline is one of the leading contributors to institutional tensions thereby lowering the overall efficiency of a university's operations.

Since academics have to align their work to the market, there has been a heightened urge for academic to either unionize where unions are absent or reinvigorate existing ones. In Kenya, the need to grant more power to the academic resulted in the registration of the Universities Academic Staff Union (UASU) in 2003 after a 24-year proscription by the state. In 2004 UASU organized a nationwide strike involving all academics in public universities over terms and conditions of service including salaries.⁴⁷ In 2003 the University of Ilorin in Nigeria was a scene of faculty and student protest over the governments decisions on funding and terms of service for academics on the one hand and the university's administrators decision to

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

interfere with faculty tenure⁴⁸. In 2004, Makerere University academics went strike protesting poor pay which had persisted despite the improved financial health of the institution. These incidents suggest that while marketization may have been a boon to African universities, it has also precipitated institutional tensions centered on faculty remuneration. These incidents of institutional instability have a detrimental effect on internal efficiency in university operations.

CONCLUSION

The onset of the 21st century has been a watershed in African higher education. These early years have been characterized by the need for institutions to respond, in structure, process and outcomes, to the imperatives of globalization—a homogenizing and internationalizing force in which ideas, people, goods and services move seamlessly across borders. This movement is accentuated by improved communication technologies along with privatization of state enterprises and the provision of social services. It is a transformative process in which national competitiveness in the global arena has become significant the extent that it informs national policy agendas.

African universities have responded to globalization through institutional massification epitomized by the rapid growth in varieties of university institutions and student enrollment within a short period of time. There has also been an increased demand for institutional accountability coupled with growing managerism. This has been reflected in creation of layered offices for accountability reporting as well as emphasis on a corporate managerial culture in universities, in contra-distinction to the traditional governance model controlled by the teaching faculty.

Besides institutional massification and increased accountability demands, response to globalization has led to the rapid privatization of higher education. The rapid surge in private universities and the increased privatization of public universities have been twin reactions to neo-liberal tenets that emphasize the reduced government role in higher education and the need for public universities to identify alternative sources of revenues. Closely related to privatization has been the marketization of universities in which universities have sought to align curricular programming to marketplace demands. Marketization has in turn resulted in a variety of innovative programming and modes of delivery.

While response to globalization by African universities has been a boon to some institutions and students, it has also led negative consequences along multiple fronts. Issues of academic quality, equity in access, and internal efficiencies have confronted universities as they have made transitions to meet the growing realities of globalization. As these challenges continue to confront African higher education, questions will continue to face universities about their public roles and mission.

NOTES

1. Though the term higher education is used to denote all post-secondary educational institutions, in this paper, its use is restricted to denote universities or institutions that award either a four-year degree and/or other postgraduate qualification.
2. This term was first used by Sheila Slaughter and Larry Leslie, *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).
3. John Coatsworth, "Globalization, Growth and Welfare in History", in Marcelo Suarez-Orozco and Baolian Quin-Hilliard, eds., *Globalization, Culture and Education in the New Millennium* (Berkeley: California University Press, 2005) 38
4. Marcelo Suarez-Orozco and Baolian Quin-Hilliard, "Globalization, Culture and Education in the New Millennium", in Marcelo Suarez-Orozco and Baolian Quin-Hilliard, eds., *Globalization, Culture*

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

- and Education in the New Millennium*, 1 – 37.
5. Chachage Seith Chachage and Karuti Kanyinga, “Introduction”, *Africa Development (AD)* XXVIII, 1& 2 (2003): 1 – 16.
 6. *Ibid.*
 7. Fischman Gustavo and Nelly Stromquist, “Globalization Impacts on Third World Universities” in John Smart and William Tierney, eds., *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research Vol. XV* (New York: Agathon Press, 2000), 501 – 521.
 8. For a complete discussion on the link between education and the global economy, see David Bloom, Globalization and Education: An Economic Perspective, in Marcelo Suarez-Orozco and Baolian Quin-Hilliard, eds., *Globalization, Culture and Education in the New Millennium* (Berkeley: California University Press, 2005), 56 – 77.
 9. Task Force on Higher Education and Society, *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise* (Washington, D. C: The World Bank, 2000). Cited in David Bloom, *Ibid.*, p.65.
 10. See Sheila Slaughter and Larry Leslie, *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997) and Michael Carnoy, et. al., eds. *The New Global Economy in the Information Age: Reflections on Our Changing World* (Philadelphia, PA: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1993).
 11. An extensive discussion on these transformation can be found in Jenny Lee, et.al., *Professors as Knowledge Workers in the New Global Economy*, in John Smart, ed., *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research Vol. XX* (Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer, 2005.) 55 – 132, Sheila Slaughter and Leslie Larry, *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State and Higher Education* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), and Fischman Gustavo and Nelly Stromquist, “Globalization Impacts on Third World Universities” in John Smart and William Tierney, eds., *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research Vol. XV* (New York: Agathon Press, 2000), 501 – 521.
 12. Massimiliano Vaira, “Globalization and Higher Education Organizational Changes: A Framework for Analysis” *Higher Education*, 48 (2004): 483 – 510.
 13. Tiyambe Zeleza, “Academic Freedom in the Neo-Liberal Order: Governments, Globalization, Governance and Gender”, *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 1 (2003) 1: 149 – 194.
 14. Among the “failures” of national universities as identified by the World Bank include: small, western-oriented, elite institutions which could not meet the growing demand for more higher educational opportunities by the burgeoning population; free on-campus residence for all students which necessitated the construction of expensive housing including public-supported board services; free tuition for all without means testing to determine ability to pay; unsuitable curricular manifested by massive graduate unemployment amidst manpower shortages in the critical scientific, technological and medical fields; infrastructural decay due to inadequate facilities maintenance occasioned by the tight fiscal restraints by the national governments; and intensive politicization of the universities as they acted as the “opposition” to the one-party national regimes.
 15. See The International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis <http://www.iiasa.ac.at/Research/LUC/Papers/gkh1/chap1.htm> (accessed 29 September, 2008)
 16. Source: <http://stats.uis.unesco.org/unesco/TableViewer/tableView.aspx> (accessed 29 September 2008)
 17. Ebrima Sall, “Alternative Models to Traditional Higher Education: Market Demand, Networks, and Private Sector Challenges”, *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 2, 1 (2004): 177 – 212.
 18. N.V. Varghese. *Private Higher Education in Africa*. (Paris: UNESCO, 2004). Available at: <http://www.unesco.org/iiep/PDF/pubs/PrivatHEAfr.pdf> (accessed 9 October 2008).
 19. Bidemi Carrol, “Harnessing Private Monies to Fuel University Growth: A Case Study of Makerere University”, *Southern African Review of Education*, 13, I (2007): 77 - 92
 20. See Wachira Kigotho, “PhD: Rare Qualification in African Universities” *East African Standard Online Edition*, 8 August 2008. Available at: www.eastandard.net (accessed 8 August 2008).
 21. Mahlubi Mabizela, “The Evolution of Private Provision of Higher Education

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

- in South Africa”, in Glenda Kruss and Andre Kraak, eds., *A Contested Good? Understanding Private Higher Education in South Africa* (Boston: Center for International Higher Education, Boston College and Albany, Program Research on Private Higher Education, PROPHE, University at Albany, 2003), 43 – 52.
22. Kenya, Republic of, *Economic Survey 2005* (Nairobi: Government Printer, 2005).
 23. Bruce Johnstone, “Higher Education Finance and Accessibility: Tuition Fees and Student Loans in Sub-Saharan Africa”, *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 2 (2004) 2:11 – 36.
 24. Moses Oktech, “Affording the Unaffordable: Cost-Sharing in Higher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa”, *Peabody Journal of Education*, 78 (2003) 3: 88 – 106.
 25. Njoki Kamau. “Outsiders Within: Experiences of Kenyan Women in Higher Education,” *JENDA: A Journal of Culture and African Women Studies*, 6 (2004). Available at: <http://www.jendajournal.com/issue6/kamau.html> (accessed 10 October 2008).
 26. Daniel Rowley, Herman Lujan and Michael Dolence, *Strategic Choices for the Academy: How Demand for Lifelong Learning will Re-Create Higher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998).
 27. Kenyatta University, *Strategic Plan 2005 – 2010* (Nairobi: Kenyatta University Office of the Vice-Chancellor)
 28. Michael Coser, “Quality Through Regulation? Towards Quality Provision in the South African Private Higher Education Sector” in Glenda Kruss and Andre Kraak, eds., *A Contested Good? Understanding Private Higher Education in South Africa* (Boston: Center for International Higher Education, Boston College and Albany, Program Research on Private Higher Education, PROPHE, University at Albany, 2003), 101 – 110.
 29. *Ibid*
 30. Tiyambe Zeleza, “Academic Freedom in the Neo-Liberal Order: Governments, Globalization, Governance and Gender”, *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 1, 1 (2003): 165.
 31. see Sheila Slaughter and Larry Leslie, *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997) : 11.
 32. Burton Clark, *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation* (Kidlington: Pergamon Press) p. 3 – 5.
 33. Paul Effah, “Ghana”, in Damtew Teferra and Philip Altbach, eds., *African Higher Education: An International Reference Handbook* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), pp. 338 – 349.
 34. Nakanyike Musis, “Uganda”, in Damtew Teferra and Philip Altbach, eds., *African Higher Education: An International Reference Handbook* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), pp. 611 – 623.
 35. Damtew Teferra and Philip Altbach, “African Higher Education: Challenges for the 21st Century”, *Higher Education*, 47 (2004): 27.
 36. For a complete discussion on this see Isaac Ntshoe, “Higher Education and Training Policy and Practice in South Africa: Impacts of Global Privatization, Quasi-marketization and New Managerialism”, *International Journal of Educational Development*, 24, (2004): pp. 137 – 154.
 37. Bidemi Carrol, “Harnessing Private Monies to Fuel University Growth: A Case Study of Makerere University”, *Southern African Review of Education*, 13 (2007) 2: 85.
 38. *Ibid.*, p. 82.
 39. Cited in Crispus Kiamba, “Privately Sponsored Students and Other Income-Generating Activities at the University of Nairobi”, *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 2 (2004) 2: 55
 40. *Ibid*
 41. *Ibid*
 42. A detailed exposition on the patent hiccups surrounding the 1998 University of Nairobi, Oxford University and Pfizer Pharmaceuticals project to develop an AIDS vaccine from blood samples from Nairobi’s commercial sex workers who are resistant to HIV infections, and the 1990 failed collaboration between the university, Kenya Medical Research Institute and Amarillo Cell Culture Center in Texas, US and Japanese scientists can be found in Ishmael Munene and Wycliffe Otieno, “Changing the Course: Equity Effects and Institutional Risk amid Policy Shift in Higher Education Financing in Kenya”, *Higher Education*, 55 (2008): 461 – 479.
 43. Johnson Ishengoma, Cost-Sharing in Higher Education in Tanzania: Fact or Fiction, *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 2 (2004) 2: 122 & 124.
 44. Mwangi Ndirangu and Joseph Bosire,

HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

- “Student Entrepreneurship on Campus: A Survival Response or Career Rehearsal? The Case of Egerton University Student Entrepreneurs”, *Eastern Africa Social Science Review*, XX, 1 (2004): 58.
45. Michael Gibbons, et. al., *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Society* (Thousand Oaks: Sage).
46. Ebrima Sall, “Alternative Models to Traditional Higher Education: Market Demand, Networks, and Private Sector Challenges”, *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 2 (2004) 1: 182.
47. A detailed discussion can be found in Wycliffe Otieno & Daniel Levy, “Public Disorder, Private Boons? Inter-sectoral Dynamics Illustrated by the Kenyan Case” PROPHE Working Paper #9 (2007). Available at: http://www.albany.edu/dept/eaps/prophe/publication/paper/PROPH-EWP09_files/WP9_Levy&Otieno_FINAL_.pdf (Accessed 11/6/2008).
48. Tiyambe Zeleza, “Academic Freedom in the Neo-Liberal Order: Governments, Globalization, Governance and Gender”, *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 1 (2003) 1: 175.