TRANSFORMATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

HIGHER EDUCATION DYNAMICS

VOLUME 10

SCOPE OF THE SERIES

Higher Education Dynamics is a bookseries intending to study adaptation processes and their outcomes in higher education at all relevant levels. In addition it wants to examine the way interactions between these levels affect adaptation processes. It aims at applying general social science concepts and theories as well as testing theories in the field of higher education research. It wants to do so in a manner that is of relevance to all those professionally involved in higher education, be it as ministers, policy-makers, politicians, institutional leaders or administrators, higher education researchers, members of the academic staff of universities and colleges, or students. It will include both mature and developing systems of higher education, covering public as well as private institutions.

The titles published in this series are listed at the end of this volume.

TRANSFORMATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Global Pressures and Local Realities

Edited by

NICO CLOETE
Center for Higher Education Transformation, Cape Town, South Africa

PETER MAASSEN
University of Oslo, Norway

RICHARD FEHNEL
Consultant, Seattle, U.S.A.

TEBOHO MOJA
Department of Education, Pretoria, South Africa

TRISH GIBBON
Consultant, Durban, South Africa

and

HELENE PEROLD
Consultant, Johannesburg, South Africa

Springer

A C.I.P. Catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN-10 1-4020-4005-9 (HB)
ISBN-13 978-1-4020-4005-4 (HB)
ISBN-10 1-4020-4006-7 (e-book)
ISBN-13 978-1-4020-4006-1 (e-book)

Published by Springer,
P.O. Box 17, 3300 AA Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

www.springer.com

Printed on acid-free paper

CONTENTS

PREFACE

At the beginning of the 1990s the world was watching with anxiety at South Africa. Would the country be able to get rid of the despicable apartheid regime without bloodshed? Could a civil war be avoided? And would it be possible to develop a democratic society without having to build up a whole new set of social institutions? The latter concern certainly referred to the educational sector that was steered at each level by a number of separate Ministries of Education, i.e. one for each identified race group.

Given the developments in other countries in the region as well as elsewhere in the world the prospects were not too hopeful. In addition, many especially white South Africans left the country the weeks before the first elections, and the stories of violence and contradictions between the various political groups in the country dominated for a while the international press' coverage of the pre-94-election situation. However, ten years after the first democratic elections in 1994 it is fair to say that South Africa has gone through a far-reaching transformation that is characterised by a remarkably low level of political violence. The general impression of the transformation suggests that the country has managed to change rather smoothly most of its social institutions, without dramatically affecting the continuity in the operations and performance of these institutions. This also refers to higher education. Most of the post-1994 conflicts on campus were related to governance issues and not to racial tensions. Further, change in higher education has taken place within the institutions, for example, in the composition of the student body, not in the institutional landscape per se. Only recently merger processes have been initiated by the national Ministry of Education; but after 1994 no major new public universities or technikons have been set up, nor has any of the pre-1994 institutions been closed down.

When trying to find out what the 'real story' is behind this positive façade, it is of importance to use the knowledge produced by scholars from South Africa. The huge interest in the transformation of the South African society also included scholarly interests. Consequently, many international publications on the social transformation of South Africa after 1994, including the changes in the higher education sector, have been produced by non-South African scholars. However, a valid examination of the developments in a sector such as higher education has to include national expertise and knowledge; not in an isolated way, but conducted within internationally recognisable and applicable conceptual frames. Only through such examinations knowledge can be produced on South African higher education that is of relevance within the South African as well as international context.

The HEDY book series aims at contributing to the strengthening of the field of higher education studies internationally, by publishing and distributing high quality, research-based manuscripts on higher education. It is for that reason that this book

on the transformation of South African higher education since 1994 forms such a welcome contribution to the HEDY series. It is based on a multi-year study in which many prominent South African, and a few international scholars form the field of higher education studies were involved. It uses the expertise and experience of those involved in a way that is of relevance to a South African and an international audience.

The first edition of the book was published in South Africa in 2002 and was rapidly sold out. This new edition is meant for a South African as well as an international market. It contains a new final chapter, as well as a re-written introduction. Also a number of editorial changes have been introduced. The thematic chapters cover most of the intra-institutional aspects of South African higher education ranging from funding, leadership, and research, to students, staff and curriculum. In addition, a number of chapters are addressing the institutional developments, starting with a reflection on the impact of global change trends on higher education in South Africa. These are complemented by chapters in which the developments in the South African institutional landscape are discussed, including the rise of the private higher education sector. The final chapter discusses and interprets the developments in the governance and policy context with respect to South African higher education, applying a conceptual framework derived from more general social science literature.

The book represents a collective effort that is aimed at a large international audience. The transformation of South African higher education after 1994 deserves the interest of such an audience. As such this book represents a major contribution to the national and international understanding of what really happened in South African higher education after 1994.

As the editor of the HEDY series I want to express my gratitude to the Centre for Higher Education Transformation (CHET) in Cape Town that not only coordinated the original study, but also took care of the production of the manuscript underlying this book. In addition, I want to thank the people at Juta, the South African publishing company responsible for the first edition of this book. Without their help and cooperation this new edition would not have been possible.

Peter Maassen
Oslo

December, 2004

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The past decade represents a remarkable period in South Africa generally, and in higher education in particular. This book is the product of a collective effort tracing and examining the twists and turns taken by processes of change in the South African higher education system in a context of profound societal and global transformation.

The endeavour was made possible through the generous support of the Ford Foundation, especially of Alison Bernstein and Jorge Ballan, and the encouragement of the board of directors of the Centre for Higher Education Transformation (CHET), of Colin Bundy (formerly of the University of the Witwatersrand), and Nasima Badsha (Department of Education). We hope that the results justify their support and encouragement. None of these supporters, however, are in any way responsible for the opinions expressed in this book. Nor should it be inferred that the book necessarily reflects their views on higher education policies in South Africa or elsewhere.

The development of this book would also not have been possible without the hard work of many individuals who contributed in different ways. Foremost among these was our key group of writers – Ahmed Bawa, Ian Bunting, Paula Ensor, Jane Kabaki, Tembile Kulati and Johann Mouton.

The following wrote commissioned background papers (see Appendix 1) that deepened our understanding of the local context, provided important information and helped shape the thinking of the primary writers: André du Toit, Trevor Sehoole, Adam Habib, Kallie Strydom, Bernadette Johnson, Rolf Stumpf, Andre Kraak, George Subotzky, Johan Muller, Sam Thobakgale, Nthabiseng Ogude, Edward Webster, Nic Olivier, Sarah Mosoetsa and Edward Pratt.

A number of international scholars produced case studies (see Appendix 1) of their own national systems, that provided important comparative reference points for understanding change in a global context. These were Alberto Amaral, Akira Arimoto, David Dill, K.K. George, Reji Raman, Lynn Meek, Terfot Augustine Ngwana, Lazar Vlasceanu, Jan Sadlak and Peter Scott.

A fourth group, all central players in the process of change in South Africa, willingly subjected themselves to lengthy interviews (see Appendix 2) and provided invaluable insight through critical reflection on their own personal experience. For this, thanks are due to: Marcus Balintulo, Fred Hayward, Sibusiso Bengu, Mandla ka-Mabuza, Peter Bezuidenhoudt, Chabani Manganyi, Theunis R. Botha, Roy Marcus, Margie Cairns, Njabulo Ndebele, Stef Coetzee, Carools Reinecke, Trevor Coombe, Flip Smit, Brian Figaji, Kallie Strydom, Brenda Gourley and Dénis van Rensburg.

Special conceptual assistance was provided by Johan Muller, Stephen Gelb and Rolf Stumpf, and by all those who served on reference groups and contributed to workshop discussions of draft chapters (see Appendix 3).

The development of the website, a vehicle for publishing insights, reflections, historical documents, case studies and the like, would not have been possible without the expertise of Bridget Nichols. The hundreds of documents, drafts, revisions and transcripts would have been a chaotic deluge without the diligent tracking and co-ordination done by Bharati Parekh, who completed the project when Shireen Badat, one of the original editors, left the project. Special thanks are due to Fathima Dada for interfacing with the publishers, Michelle Nadison for managing payments, and Linda Benwell who ensured that everybody arrived at their destinations.

The Editors
Nico Cloete, Peter Maassen, Richard Fehnel,
Teboho Moja, Helene Perold and Trish Gibbon

ACRONYMS

ANC	African National Congress
AUT	Advisory Council for Universities and Technikons
CEE	Central and Eastern European
CEPD	Centre for Education Policy Development
CHE	Council on Higher Education
CHET	Centre for Higher Education Transformation
Cosatu	Congress of South African Trade Unions
CSIR	Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
CTP	Committee of Technikon Principals
DACST	Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology
DET	Department of Education and Training
EPU	Education Policy Unit
FRD	Foundation for Research Development
FTE	Full-time equivalent
Gear	Growth, Employment and Redistribution
GNU	Government of National Unity
HBT(s)	Historically black technikon(s)
HBU(s)	Historically black university/universities
HSRC	Human Sciences Research Council
HWT(s)	Historically white technikon(s)
HWU(s)	Historically white university/universities
HWU (Afrik)	Historically white Afrikaans-medium university
HWU (Eng)	Historically white English-medium university
ICT	Information and communications technology
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
ISI	Institute for Scientific Information
IT	Information technology
Medunsa	Medical University of South Africa
NACI	National Advisory Council on Innovation
NCHE	National Commission on Higher Education
NECC	National Education Co-ordinating Committee
NECSA	Nuclear Energy Corporation of South Africa Ltd
Nedlac	National Economic, Development and Labour Council
Nehawu	National Union of Health and Allied workers
Nepad	New partnerships for Africa's Development
Nepi	National Education Policy Investigation
NGO	Non-governmental organisation

NIF	National Innovation Fund
NPHE	National Plan for Higher Education
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
NPWE	National Plan for Higher Education
NRF	National Research Foundation
NRTA	National Research and Technology Audit
NSFAS	National Student Financial Aid Scheme
NSI	National System of Innovation
NTSI	National Training Strategy Initiative
Nusas	National Union of South African Students
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
RAU	Rand Afrikaans University
RDP	Reconstruction and Development Programme
RSA	Republic of South Africa. Prior to 1994 the term 'RSA' was used to refer to the parts of South Africa not included in the TBVC 'republics' (see below)
Sached	South African Committee for Higher Education
SACP	South African Communist Party
Sansco	South African National Student Congress
SAPSE	South African Post-Secondary Education
SAQA	South African Qualifications Authority
Sasco	South African Students Congress
SASM	South African Students Movement
Saso	South African Students Organisation
Sauvca	South African Universities Vice-Chancellors Association
SET	Science, Engineering and Technology
SPII	Support Programme for Industrial Innovation
TBVC	Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei. The acronym refers to these four 'republics' set up by the apartheid government.
Thrip	Technology and Human Resources for Industry Project
TSA	Technikon South Africa (the dedicated distance education technikon)
UCT	University of Cape Town
UDF	United Democratic Front
Udusa	Union of Democratic University Staff Associations
UDW	University of Durban Westville
UFH	University of Fort Hare
Unesco	United Nations Education, Science and Culture Organisation
Unin	University of the North
Unitra	University of Transkei
Unisa	University of South Africa (the dedicated distance education university)
Unizul	University of Zululand
UPE	University of Port Elizabeth
UWC	University of the Western Cape
Wits	University of the Witwatersrand

INTRODUCTION

After South Africa's first democratic election in 1994, higher education was confronted with social, political and economic demands of a kind not encountered during the apartheid era. It was initially assumed that the main driver of change would be government policy, informed by a participatory policy formulation process and implemented by a new, progressive bureaucracy. But change in higher education institutions followed a variety of routes that resulted in certain apartheid differences being accentuated and new differences emerging in the institutional landscape. This book examines the extent to which the changes were in line with policy intentions, particularly with regard to equity, democratisation, responsivity and efficiency, and how a new institutional landscape started emerging. Central to the new landscape were the different ways in which institutions responded, or adapted, to the new environment. An argument is presented for understanding reform not only as a centralised, government driven, policy-implementation-change paradigm, but also as a process affected by differences in institutional behaviour and the limits of policy driven change.

While most of the content of this book is based on the South African reform process, it also attempts to situate South Africa in an international perspective, thus contributing to the international debate on higher education transformation.

1. THE PRODUCTION PROCESS

This book is the product of a project in which six editors interacted with one another, key writers and the reference group participants over a period of 18 months to develop and explore the analytic framework that the project sought to explore, viz. how complex interactions between state, society (including the market) and the institutions shape change in higher education systems. The editors commissioned the six writers to produce empirical analyses of various aspects of the South African higher education experience post-1994, using the analytic triangle as a framework.

Fifteen researchers drafted commissioned background papers, eight international scholars wrote national-system case studies, and 18 influential vice-chancellors and senior bureaucrats shared their reflections on the policy-making and transformation process with the editors who interviewed them.

As was the case during the national policy implementation process, certain trade-offs had to be made as more material was produced than could be accommodated between the covers of a single book. The dilemma was resolved, not always to the satisfaction of all the knowledge producers, by creating a companion website (www.chet.org.za/highed1.asp) where the commissioned papers, the reflections and the case studies are published.

N. Cloete et al. (eds.), Transformation in Higher Education, 1-4.

In terms of objectives, there are two sets of objectives: one aimed at providing an analytic record of policy proposals developed after 1994 and at assessing outcomes; the second attempting to add to the knowledge base and develop a framework for understanding higher education reform.

Methodologically, there were also two different approaches: one privileged a quantitative, statistical record of change; while the other favoured understanding change as a more historical, interpretative narrative. The more attentive reader will be sensitive to the tension, never completely resolved, between trying to 'assert' overall coherence through a consistent editorial line versus producing an edited volume with relatively independent chapters.

Chapters 1, 11, 12 and 13 flow from a strong editorial framework, and display a powerful international influence. The chapters on the South African experience (mainly in Section 2) are, by their very focus, more local. They present a wealth of new information, both qualitative and quantitative, based on empirical findings, statistics and interpretation of trends that represent the first comprehensive attempt to document and understand the changes in higher education in South Africa's new democracy.

2. DEVELOPING THE ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK

Two threads to the narrative emerged. One grand theme was the familiar South African problematic equity and democracy. Here the aim was to assess whether progressive policy intentions had been realised, to examine how certain aspects of the racial/ethnic heritage continued to affect higher education, and to establish how this apartheid mould was breaking. It leads to the conclusion that the new emerging landscape cannot be attributed to racial/ethnic effects alone.

The second thread of the narrative involved rethinking a model of change that assumed a causal trajectory from progressive policy to implementation and realisation in transformation. This meant trying to understand why so many policy proposals did not follow the expected path. In taking this route, a whole 'new' literature about reform processes was encountered by the South Africans, enabling them to develop, as a framework, an *analytic triangle* called a 'network of co-ordination'. This analytic triangle locates change within a complex interaction between the state, society and institutions, within the context of globalisation. The overarching intention of this approach is not to attribute culpability to individual agents or agencies, but to develop a structural understanding of how systems change in the course of complex interactions between state, institutions and society.

3. DATA COLLECTION AND INTERPRETATION

In addition to trying to develop new ways of analysing and understanding higher education, a feature of the book is that it pulls together an enormous amount of data collated by different authors with access to different data sources. These include the

official government South African Post-Secondary Education (SAPSE) system and certain special investigations undertaken by the Department of Education, the SAKnowledge base at the University of Stellenbosch, and the Centre for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE) at the University of the Western Cape. The project did not have resources for mining new data, but questions raised during the process of analysis often led to the re-interpretation and re-framing of existing data. However, despite having a wide range of expertise with access to very different types of information, a perennial problem faced by policy analysts and policy makers universally is inaccurate and dated information. This problem not only hampers scholarship, it also has a negative effect on policy implementation, as the National Plan for Higher Education (2001) laments.

Apart from data problems, there are also a number of areas in which higher education scholarship is highly underdeveloped. For instance, the editorial team could find no illuminating writings on campus environments where there is a remarkable lack of racial tension but also a lack of integration, as many racial and ethnic groups live apart from each other. Another area is HIV/AIDS. The country is awash with widely varying horror statistics, but no coherent, defensible picture has emerged for higher education. Quality assessment and quality promotion are other areas where, despite a number of overviews, it was impossible to obtain an incisive assessment of the current situation. In all these important areas the editors commissioned short pieces which are captured in extract boxes in the relevant chapters.

4. STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

This book is divided into three sections. Section 1, The Transformation Context, identifies certain key global reform trends and develops an analytic framework to understand some of the reforms that occurred in the eight commissioned case studies. It identifies certain key strands for the rest of the book – the tensions between local and global reform demands, the fact that globalisation is not monolithic, that governments and institutions can and do respond very differently, and that reforms always have unintended consequences. Chapters 2 and 3 sketch the apartheid higher education landscape that confronted the government in 1994 and the policy framework that was developed, in the words of Nelson Mandela, to 'preserve what is valuable and to address what is defective and requires transformation' (NCHE, 1996:1).

Section 2, The South African Experience, consists of four parts. In Part 1, the chapters on funding and students are linked because the two components are interdependent. Funding instruments provide the means through which government can exercise considerable influence through subsidies dependent on student enrolments. The adaptive strategies of institutions, with their consequent differentiation effects, are integrally linked to the funding–student nexus. These chapters demonstrate that institutions developed very different strategies regarding students and funding, and these strategies have had marked effects on how institutions have fared in the new South Africa.

The central themes of Part 2, Staff and Leadership, are equity (changing the composition of staff) and democracy (coming to grips with the lofty aims of greater

participation as part of the new co-operative governance policy). This part of the book shows that equity gains with regard to staff were much more difficult to achieve than with students, and that with increased pressures for more efficiency and workplace changes that started following global trends, different forms of managerialism emerged that put severe strains on the ideals of collegial co-governance.

Part 3 focuses on research and curriculum, and grapples with different and competing notions of responsivity. It describes government and institutional strategies to make curricula and research more responsive to national needs and markets, and explores how certain institutions responded to this with great enthusiasm, while others either resisted or could not respond.

Part 4, The New Terrain, starts with an analysis, published for the first time in a book, that examines the burgeoning private higher education sector that developed after South Africa opened up to the rest of the world. Chapter 11, The Emergent Landscape, describes a new typology of four types or categories of institutions that are developing in the post-apartheid era and shows a continuing policy oscillation between differentiation and isomorphism.

Section 3, Policy, Institutions, Society and Globalisation, consists of two concluding chapters. Chapter 12, South African Realities, shows that many positive and unanticipated changes occurred in the new policy environment. Crucially, it suggests that most of the changes occurred not as a result of centrally-driven government policies, but through complex interactions among policy, societal and market forces and, above all, through a wide range of unexpected institutional responses. It also demonstrates that global reform trends played a much more important role in driving institutional transformation than was anticipated in the initial policy emphasis on equity and democracy.

Chapter 13, Modes of Governance and the Limits of Policy unravels different understandings of policy and describes how the initial focus on symbolic and grand policy could not be implemented, even with adequate capacity. It shows that certain trade-off choices were made, with consequences that were often not commensurate with earlier policy intentions. In conclusion, it is argued that, instead of trying to apply 'grand policy', there should be a stronger recognition of the role of institutions in the transformation process within a framework of differentiated policies in which there is much greater interaction and mutual responsivity between government and institutions. More nuanced policy is needed to steer institutions with different missions and capacity towards mutually agreed-upon goals that serve regional and national needs.

SECTION 1

THE TRANSFORMATION CONTEXT

CHAPTER 1

PETER MAASSEN & NICO CLOETE

GLOBAL REFORM TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Towards the end of the 1980s the contours of a 'new world order' became more and more visible. Its rise was marked by the collapse of communist regimes and the increasing political hegemony of neo-liberal market ideologies. These established an environment for socio-economic and political change during the 1990s that would assert considerable reform pressures on all sectors of society, higher education included.

South Africa's negotiated settlement (Kraak, 2001) or 'implicit bargain' (Gelb, 1998, 2001) in 1994 must not only be seen as an isolated moment of a 'miracle transition' at the southern tip of Africa. It was also part of a political and economic transition process on a planetary scale that a large number of analysts have tried to capture as globalisation (Castells, 2001; Held et al., 1999). Even though globalisation is a far from uncontroversial concept, there is general agreement that most nation states are going through a transformation process that is strongly affected by global trends and pressures.[1] These trends and pressures form, for example, an important basis for national public sector reforms with respect to higher education.[2]

Globalisation impulses stem from financial markets that started operating on a global scale and from the explosion that occurred in international 'connectedness' – both virtual and real – mainly through the internet, mobile telephony and intensifying travel patterns. Simultaneously global and regional free trade agreements proliferated and expanded. The most important examples of these are the World Trade Organisation (WTO), the European Union (EU), the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the Common Market of the Southern Cone (Mercosur in Latin America), the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC), and the Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation Forum (APEC). These trends are also promoted through international agencies such as the United Nations and its organisations, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank.

All these 'planetary' changes created environments within which nation states had to consider a reorientation and repositioning of their still predominantly public higher education systems. This did not mean that governments were looking for alternatives to higher education. Instead the higher education institutions became a part of the national development policies in countries all over the world, with Finland, Ireland, and the East Asian Tigers as the prime examples. In South Africa a senior official in the new

N. Cloete et al. (eds.), Transformation in Higher Education, 7-33.

democracy's first education department, Trevor Coombe (1991), summed up their role as follows:

> Universities remain great national storehouses of trained, informed, inquiring and critical intellects, and the indispensable means of replenishing national talent. They have considerable 4 reserves of leadership and commitment on which to draw. Impoverished, frustrated, dilapidated and overcrowded as they may be, they have no substitutes.

It was within this rapidly changing global context, that six months after South Africa's watershed first democratic election, Nelson Mandela issued a proclamation appointing a National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE) to 'preserve what is valuable and to address what is defective and requires transformation' (NCHE, 1996:1). This Commission had two central tasks: to rid higher education of the aberrations of apartheid and to modernise it by infusing it with international experiences and best practices.

With hindsight it is clear to see that few in South Africa realised at the time that these international 'best' practices, which like little streams had slowly gathered momentum in most other parts of the world, would overrun the national reform agenda for higher education like a flood through a hole in the wall. The 'wall' had up till that time isolated South Africa and other countries, such as those in communist Central and Eastern Europe, from global changes and had been a bulwark against a pent-up demand for internal change.

What were the global change trends that faced South Africa? A number of scholars have shed light on these developments and the underlying starting points. The Norwegian political scientist Johan Olsen (2000) has produced, for example, an interesting contribution to the policy debate on the modernisation of higher education in his country that is relevant to the South African debate.

Olsen claims that the traditional pact between society and higher education has become problematic. The signs of this are, first, that public support for higher education is decreasing, both politically and financially. In addition there are widespread accusations of insufficient quality, responsiveness, effectiveness, and efficiency in higher education. And finally there are many complaints about the lack of intellectual capacity in higher education at a time when there seems to be a growing need for it. As a consequence of the deterioration of the relationship between higher education and society, the re-interpretation of higher education as a service-company with society as its marketplace, is becoming the dominant one taking over from the traditional emphasis on academic freedom and collegial self-steering of academics.

According to Olsen (2000) academic self-steering was part of a large democratic-constitutional social order, with partly autonomous institutions. Constitutional regulations defined these institutions and their roles, competence, social and political relationships, and responsibilities. From this perspective institutional autonomy is a condition for legitimate governmental steering of higher education and peaceful co-existence with other institutions.

National debates about institutions are not new. They have regularly taken place and have led to many challenges concerning institutional autonomy. What is new, however, are the effects of international reform ideologies that fundamentally challenge the notion of institutional self-steering in higher education. According to the underlying ideas and

assumptions of reform thinking, universities and colleges should be externally controlled, their activities should be formally evaluated, they should be held accountable for their performance, they should be steered by market forces and not by governmental or state mechanisms, they should be run by professional leaders and managers instead of by academic *primus-inter-pares* ('first among equals'), and they should be included as service industries in regional and global trade agreements.

Among the consequences of the acceptance and application of these reform ideas and assumptions at the national level are the decreasing importance of specific national and institutional characteristics, cultures, histories and interests. In the policy goals of efficiency, effectiveness, responsiveness and competition embodied in many higher education reform programmes, national authorities transform their public higher education systems from national organisations with multiple social roles into global players mainly operating on the basis of economic considerations. The role of the state is to act as a 'watchdog' and to make sure that external audits and evaluations of higher education institutions take place regularly.[3]

Another author contributing to the discussion on higher education reform and its consequences is Stanford's Patricia Gumport (2000). Her starting point is that there is a growing tension between two dominant perspectives on higher education: the first interprets higher education as a social institution while the second sees higher education mainly as a part of the national economy, in other words as an industry. The 'social institution' position states that higher education must attain goals related to its core activities, retain institutional legacies and carry out important functions for the wider society such as the cultivation of citizenship, the reservation of cultural heritage, and the formation of skills and the characters of students. The 'higher education as an industry' approach emphasises that higher education institutions sell goods and services, that they train an important part of the workforce and that they foster economic development. It argues that the exposure of universities and colleges to market forces and competition will result in improved management, programmatic adaptation, maximum flexibility, improved efficiency and customer satisfaction.[4]

These two perspectives differ fundamentally concerning the most important societal functions of higher education, the main problems confronting higher education, and the best solutions and approaches for dealing with these problems. According to Gumport (2000) the perspective of public higher education as an industry has become the dominant one, at least in the USA. The mechanisms through which this development has taken place are, first, the rise of academic institutional managers and professional administrators; second, the idea of the sovereignty of the consumer, especially students; and third, the re-stratification of academic subjects and academic staff on the basis of their use-value. These three mechanisms have led to an institutional eagerness to embrace effectiveness and efficiency as policy priorities. The vicious circle in which higher education seems to be trapped as a result of all of this, is that the leaders of higher education institutions feel forced to use more and more market discourse and managerial approaches to restructure their institutions. Yet the more they move away from the traditional basic characteristics, legacy and functions of higher education, the more they seem to face formidable legitimacy challenges as public institutions.

One of the most influential publications in recent debates on higher education reform is Burton Clark's book on entrepreneurial universities based on five case studies in four European countries: Finland, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United Kingdom (Clark, 1998). He argues that all universities should adapt and become more entrepreneurial because societal demands with respect to higher education are growing while governmental support (financially, legally and politically) is decreasing. As a consequence of local and global changes in the context of higher education and changes in expectations with respect to higher education, the imbalance between societal demand and institutional capacity has become a global phenomenon. The success or failure of institutional strategies for dealing with this imbalance will determine whether an institution will belong to tomorrow's winners or losers.

Whether one agrees with the arguments and conclusions of the authors cited above is not the issue here. The issue is that these (and other) analysts have identified important changes in the USA and Europe in the relationship between the state, the higher education institutions and society. In addition they have pointed to the important influence of globalisation on these changing relationships. The changes in European and US higher education have paved the way for the introduction of the underlying reform ideas and assumptions in other parts of the world too. They are crucial variables in any attempt to analyse and understand the nature and effects of higher education reforms. In this book the triangular relationships between state, institutions and society and the effects of globalisation on these relationships are used as the framework for analysis. In the next sections we will discuss the way in which the three actors – state, society and institutions respectively – as well as the concept of globalisation are interpreted within this analytic triangle which is used throughout this book.

1. THE STATE

What is the role of the state in the new patterns of steering and policy arrangements emerging with respect to higher education? Since the early 19th century (Neave, 1988) the continental European nation states have taken upon themselves the regulatory and funding responsibilities with respect to higher education. This state control model was also introduced in the colonies and remained the dominant model after these countries became independent. The model implied that the state took care of the public interest in higher education. It designed and regularly adapted the regulatory frameworks for higher education, and it was the main, if not sole, funder of higher education. Social expectations with respect to higher education were not addressed in direct links between social actors and higher education, but were taken up by the state. Consequently in most countries, including South Africa, until recently the society/higher education institutions dimension was the weakest side of the triangle presented alongside.

Major exceptions with respect to governmental steering of higher education were the USA and the United Kingdom. Their steering approaches have been characterised as state-supervision (Maassen & Van Vught, 1994) or arm's length (Scott, 1996) models.

In the USA individual states are traditionally responsible for higher education. In many states a governance model has been used that promotes a market-type of interaction between higher education and society. Even though the US state governments also have funding and regulatory responsibility with respect to public higher education, in most states the financial and regulatory instruments are not very restrictive and provide a lot of autonomy to the institutions. However, this does not mean that the USA overall has a market-driven higher education system. There is considerable diversity in state governance models and in a number of US states higher education is steered in a 'state-controlled' way, with line-item budgeting comparable to the traditional European government's way of steering higher education.

In the United Kingdom the academic oligarchy has for many years played an important role in the funding and regulatory decisions concerning higher education. An important body in this respect was the University Grants Committee (UGC). After the abolition of the UGC in the 1980s the British government's 'arm's length' approach to the steering of higher education changed and became more restrictive. The successive Conservative British governments which succeeded the first Thatcher government of the early 1980s developed policy approaches that promoted the abandonment of tight government control; with respect to higher education, however, they actually tightened budgetary controls and introduced more elaborate regulatory instruments (Scott, 1996:123). Given that South African higher education has its roots in both Continental European and British traditions, an interesting mixture of traditional state control and arm's length government steering approaches can be observed in the system.

The differences in governmental steering models did not imply that the general assumptions concerning the role of the government remained constant throughout the last few decades. For example, from the late 1950s through the 1960s and early 1970s there was a worldwide belief in the political 'makeability' of society. It was assumed that society could be 'moulded' into specific forms and patterns by designing appropriate policies and implementing them with the use of the right instruments. Examples of such instruments were the Planning-Programming-Budgeting-System (PPBS; see, for example, Lyden & Miller, 1968; and Schick, 1973) and other forms of planning.

Studies of policy implementation showed convincingly that policy outcomes were hardly ever the same as the policy intentions (see, for example, Pressman & Wildavsky, 1973; and Cerych & Sabatier, 1986). This brought back a sense of reality into policy-making. Interestingly enough, while many actors directly involved in policy-making have become more modest and realistic in their policy-making efforts, many politicians in different political regimes still seem to cling to the 'societal makeability' assumption. Consequently there is a wide, and in many respects widening, gap between politics and political programmes on the one side, and the dynamics of public sectors such as higher education on the other. Policies are expected to fill this gap, sometimes being directly derived from a political programme, sometimes reflecting societal reality, sometimes a combination of both. It is obvious that the wider the gap, the more unlikely it will be that policy outcomes will be in line with the original policy objectives.

The state corner of the analytic triangle reflects this tension between high political expectations and differentiated societal and institutional realities. Part of the aim of this

book is to show how this tension has worked itself out in South Africa and what its effects were on the practice of South African higher education.

Another piece of the puzzle that is needed to understand the relationship between policy intentions and policy outcomes with respect to South African higher education, concerns the relationship between educational and economic reform agendas. In South Africa there is a tension between the higher education reform agenda which emphasises national topics such as redress, democratisation and equity, and the global reform agenda which promotes issues such as efficiency, effectiveness, competition and responsiveness. The former is developed and driven by the Ministry of Education; the latter falls under the responsibility of other ministries, such as Finance, and Trade and Industry. As is the case in most other countries, in South Africa the national higher education agenda has been made subservient to the global reform agenda.

This tension can be illustrated, for example, by the way in which various ministries deal with the issues of quality and diversity (Meek et al., 1996). Ministries of Education have interpreted, and made operational, quality and diversity issues in policy-making processes from an academic point of view. However, the concepts of quality and diversity are also regularly used in the reform programmes of other ministries. In these programmes quality and diversity are not launched from an academic point of view, but mainly from an economic and accountability perspective. In practice this means, for example, that a Ministry of Education may attempt to introduce a quality assessment approach based on peer review, implying that it is improvement-oriented and mainly driven by academic values. Ministries of Economic Affairs, Labour, or Trade and Industry, on the other hand, tend to be more interested, for example, in the quality of higher education from the perspective of labour market demands, or from the perspective of using quality to increase institutional efficiency through competition between public and private providers of higher education.

Finally it is relevant to reflect upon the role of the state in the promotion of the public interest. As indicated above, until recently, the state in many countries, including South Africa, took care of the translation of social expectations with respect to higher education. It decided which social expectations and needs to include in the higher education policy agenda and how to include them. As a result of disappointments with the outcomes of state actions, however, and the growing complexity of higher education, it was generally recognised by all actors involved, including Ministries of Education, that this near monopolistic position could not be maintained. The new governmental steering approaches with respect to higher education introduced in the late 1980s and early 1990s in Europe (Gornitzka & Maassen, 2000) and other parts of the world (Neave & Van Vught, 1994) reflected this recognition. In the white papers and other policy documents in which the rationale behind the new steering approaches were explained, governments emphasised that they aimed at a more direct relationship between higher education and society. They indicated that the state should act as one of the stakeholders with an interest in higher education, instead of as the only stakeholder – again an indication of the growing prominence of the society/higher education dimension in the triangular relation between state, society and higher education.

2. SOCIETY

Over the last ten to fifteen years the social demands with respect to higher education have clearly intensified. In respect of the second corner of the analytic triangle it has been argued, for example, that higher education has to take into account, more and more, the interests of a variety of external and internal social stakeholders (Clark, 1998; Maassen, 2000). As having a higher education degree increasingly became a necessary condition for entering, not only the professions, but also the rapidly expanding service and technology-orientated jobs, the demand for access increased dramatically. This was accompanied by the need for 'retooling', or lifelong education in order to keep abreast of rapidly changing job requirements.

Increasing participation in higher education has become a global orthodoxy, promoted by national governments as well as agencies such as Unesco, the OECD and the World Bank. Several countries, for example the USA, Finland and South Korea, already have participation rates of more than 60%, implying that two out of three students leaving secondary education will enter higher education, either directly or after a certain time lag. In many developing countries with high population growth, such as Brazil and Indonesia, the participation rates may not be increasing, but the actual student numbers in higher education are growing as a result of the demographic structure of these countries.

But it is not only a matter of increased access and participation; it is also a question of access for whom. Higher education came to be regarded as a key (re-) distributor of opportunity and an interesting paradox can be observed in relation to this process. While social needs and expectations were leading to higher numbers of students enrolling in higher education worldwide, the public investments in higher education decreased, at least in real terms. This implies that compared to 1980, for example, universities and colleges now receive far less public funding per student, relatively speaking. As a consequence, higher education has been forced to move out of its ivory tower. Referring to the authors above (Clark & Maassen) one might wonder whether higher education, in coming out of its 'ivory closet' has gone to the other extreme in its relationship with society.

This would imply that instead of isolating itself from social needs, higher education is now trying to respond to all social and economic demands unloaded on it despite the growing imbalance between demands and the institutional capacity for responding to them (Clark, 1998). For example, higher education institutions are expected to address societal contestations around race, ethnicity, gender and diversity – the intensified human rights struggles of the latter part of the century – in their institutional policies. In some circles higher education is even expected to find the solutions to these social problems.

Discussing this development from a conceptual angle, we can again refer here to Olsen (1988) who set up four models to represent the relationship between higher education and society: the sovereign, institutional, corporate-pluralist, and classical liberal (or supermarket) state models.[5] The sovereign and classical liberal models are comparable to the state control and arm's length models referred to above. However, in order to

understand the growing importance of society in the analytic triangle, it is useful to discuss one of Olsen's models, the corporate-pluralist model, in more detail since it can also be said to apply to the post-1994 situation in South Africa to some extent.

According to this model the state is no longer a unitary actor with a monopoly over power and control. Rather there are several competing and legitimate centres of authority and control with respect to higher education. The role of higher education reflects the constellation of interests voiced by different organised interest groups in the sector, such as student unions, staff unions, professional associations, industry and business, and regional authorities. A Ministry of Education is just one of the many stakeholders in higher education. These stakeholders all have a claim on the role and direction of development of higher education. The main arena of policy-making consists of a corporate network of public boards, councils and commissions. Parliamentary power is reduced – policy-making goes on in conference rooms and closed halls outside of parliament. Players in policy-making act strategically to further the special interests of their own organisation or interest group.

Decision-making is segmented and dominated by clusters of interest groups (government being one of them) with recognised rights to participate. The dominant mode of decision-making is one of negotiation and consultation, with an extensive use of 'sounding out'. Societal participation takes place through organised interest groups (according to Olsen, the 'corporate channel'). There is little co-ordination across policy sub-systems and the domain of government interference is dependent upon power relationships. The structured negotiations favoured by this model interfere with market forces and hierarchical decisions. The autonomy of universities and colleges is negotiated and the result of a distribution of interests and power. Changes in higher education are influenced by changes in power, interests and alliances.

In applying this model to South Africa one has to keep in mind that it was developed within a Northern European welfare state context. Therefore it will not reflect all the details and nuances of the current South African state model, nor of the institutional governance models promoted by the 1997 White Paper (Department of Education, 1997; see also Cloete & Bunting, 2000). Nonetheless, the network relations incorporated in this model seem to do more justice to the practice of the relationships between society and higher education in South Africa than the way in which the other models represent this relationship. Elements of the other models, i.e. a strong state, academic elitism, and market interactions, can be observed in the steering of South African higher education, but not as prominently as the corporate-pluralistic network connections. This will also become clear when we discuss the third corner of the triangle in which the institutions are located.

3. HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Higher education institutions interact with many different actors in external and internal policy processes. In order to understand the nature of these interactions it is important, first of all, to make a distinction between academic and administrative governance

structures. Higher education institutions, especially universities, have traditionally been run by academics, i.e. the professoriate. Institutional administration was seen as an 'unavoidable evil' necessary to create the optimal circumstances for the professors to operate autonomously. As such, higher education institutions were professional organisations with one dominant profession, the academic profession.

A core characteristic of professional occupations is that they want not only control over the conditions of their work, but also over the definition of work itself. Scott (1995) has distinguished three kinds of work-related control which professionals are seeking. The first is regulative control: professionals want to determine what actions are to be prohibited and permitted, and what sanctions are to be used. The second is normative control, implying that professionals want to determine who has the right to exercise authority over what decisions and actors in what situations. The third is cognitive control: the drive to determine what types of problems fall under the professionals' responsibility and how these problems are to be categorised and processed.

In addition to these general characteristics of professional occupations, some specific characteristics of universities and colleges are worth mentioning here. First and foremost, it is knowledge that provides the organisational building blocks of these institutions. Secondly, this knowledge-based structure leads to a high level of organisational fragmentation. Thirdly, these institutions have loosely articulated decision-making structures. Finally, change generally takes place in an incremental, grassroots way.

These characteristics are unique. They make universities and colleges different from other types of organisations. What we are referring to here are differences such as higher education institutions lacking a single, clearly definable production function, and demonstrating low levels of internal integration. Another important difference is that the commitment of the academic staff to their discipline and profession is higher than the commitment to their institution. With respect to the nature of institutional management important differences can be mentioned such as the low ability of institutional managers to hire and fire staff, or the fact that institutional managers are more accountable to stakeholders than to their counterparts in business.

All in all it can be argued that the traditional characteristics of universities and colleges make it difficult to initiate and steer organisational changes in them from the outside. This doesn't mean that these institutions are not influenced by external factors, but that the exact effects of these factors are impossible to control and very difficult to predict.

Over the last ten to fifteen years in Europe and Australia, and at least a decade longer in North America, this traditional set of characteristics and the academic control of administration and governance in higher education institutions have been challenged by a number of developments. With the massification and subsequent growth of higher education, this sector became more and more complex. Furthermore, the need to find alternative, non-public, sources of income to make up for reduced government funding, has added to the complexity of the institution. In many countries this complexity has led to the professionalisation of the administration, although this does not necessarily mean a growth of the administrative staff; there are indications that traditional administrative support functions (secretaries and clerks) are being replaced by professional administrators (Gornitzka et al., 1998; Gornitzka & Larsen, 2001).

Increasingly, a more professionalised management is seen as a necessary condition for the institutions' attempts to deal more adequately with both external and internal pressures and demands. External demands range from new policy initiatives and new government legislation to opportunities for the formation of industry or community partnerships. Internally, greater planning and more efficient allocation of resources are required, as well as providing incentives to academics to respond to opportunities or markets. The rising administrative profession is, implicitly and explicitly, challenging the traditional dominance of the academics in institutional affairs. This development might actually lead to the university becoming a bi-professional instead of mono-professional organisation.

The strengthening and expansion of institutional management aims at achieving a number of functions. Amongst other things, it aims to enable institutions to become more strategic and responsive in order to compete nationally and internationally, to introduce efficiency measures, and to help drive the implementation of national policy agendas. Globally it is recognised that as part of the above-mentioned complexity of higher education institutions, these institutions will have to be managed more and more as hybrid organisations, i.e. organisations containing public and private elements. In terms of the analytic triangle this can be illustrated by stating that the society/institution dimension will become the private dimension in universities and colleges, while the state/institution dimension will remain in the public domain.

A last institutional aspect to be mentioned here is that higher education institutions are increasingly attempting to present themselves as cultural sites, hoping to profit in a number of ways (including financially) from their cultural activities and their cultural image. One positive result could be that well-educated knowledge workers will expect to live within easy access distance from institutions where both new technological and cultural knowledge is produced and is available. The educated network society thus expects more interaction with higher education institutions (Carnoy, 2001:32).

This book reflects on how the three dimensions of the analytic triangle – state to society, society to institutions, and institutions to state – have affected the way in which the ambitious policy intentions of the early 1990s have been handled in the complex reality of the new institutional landscape of South African higher education. Obviously these three national dimensions have been affected in many ways by global forces from outside the country.

4. ASPECTS OF GLOBALISATION

Globalisation encompasses global financial markets, growing global interconnectedness, global and regional trade agreements, media, information systems, labour markets, telecommunication, etc. By some it is seen as a process leading to reduced poverty and a better distribution of wealth among countries and individuals, while others regard it as 'the source of all evil'. According to Held and his colleagues (1999:1) the lack of a precise definition creates the danger of globalisation becoming 'the cliché of our times: the big idea which encompasses everything […] but which delivers little substantial insight into the contemporary human condition'.

Despite the danger of becoming a cliché, globalisation does capture the notion of rapid worldwide social and economic transformation. This notion includes many aspects of our societies, too many to capture in this book.[6] However, in order to underline the relevance of global processes, ideas, and forces for higher education reform, we will discuss some of the aspects of globalisation of relevance for higher education in more detail. These include, amongst other things, trade liberalisation and its effects on higher education. In addition we will point to some of the globalisation tensions that have arisen in higher education systems around the globe.

A tension that globalisation poses, particularly for developing countries, is that on the one hand, the nation state is expected to create the conditions for economic and social development within the framework of trade liberalisation, predominantly through producing more and better educated citizens and increasing knowledge production, which is a prized commodity in the global economy. On the other hand, globalisation introduces pressures to reduce the role and contribution of central government in education (Carnoy, 1999). The double-edged challenge is to produce more graduates with high-level knowledge skills, but with less direct government support per graduate.

Another effect is that globalisation increases the pay-off to high-level skills relative to lower level skills, thus reducing the complementarity between equity and competitiveness-driven reforms (Carnoy, 1999). The fact that the national government's capacity to steer from the top may be restricted, combined with increasing inequality, affects the government's ability to address redress. Contradictorily, while globalisation can weaken the state, it also expects, and demands, efficient state apparatuses with well-developed civil societies that provide growing markets, stable political conditions and steady public investment in human capital (Carnoy, 1999). However, not all states are weakened by globalisation; some are thriving under it, which contributes to the expanding global digital divide (Castells, 2001a).

In order for higher education institutions to be able to respond successfully to this challenge, globalisation 'encouraged' higher education to become more business like. For example, higher education is increasingly expected to interpret international student recruitment from an economic perspective. During an earlier era attracting foreign students was either part of ideological competition between east and west, or part of the development of former colonies. Thus countries such as the USA, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands and Germany sponsored students from third world countries to study in their advanced higher education systems. But during the late 1980s and particularly the 1990s, higher education institutions gradually started seeing fee-paying students as a source of revenue and this led to the development of an international market for higher education students.

In this market the strategy of some institutions is to attract foreign students to enrol in one of their regular programmes against far higher tuition fees than regular national students have to pay. This is especially the case in English language countries such as Australia, the United Kingdom and the USA. Another example is of institutions in non-English language countries, such as the Netherlands and Germany, that are offering English language programmes to foreign students against high tuition fees. A third example consists of institutions that are establishing branches in other countries, such as

Australian universities entering South Africa, or US institutions establishing campuses in Central and Eastern European countries, or entering partnerships with institutions in these countries to develop joint programmes for fee-paying students.

Of further interest for understanding the working of globalisation in the South African context is that, in general, politics is 'running behind the facts of global developments'. The global economic developments that gained momentum in the 1980s, amongst other things in the slipstream of the new trade liberalisation agreements, were not regulated by individual nation states, even though the legal authority for regulating these developments was and is to be found at the level of the nation states.

General examples of these developments are the lack of regulations concerning the boundary-crossing flows of capital, and the regulatory demands of the internationalisation of labour markets. In the area of higher education one can think of quality control demands rising from the growing export and import of higher education services. The only regulations coming from national governments were in the area of developing conditions that were investment-friendly, such as the lifting of trade barriers, sound management of fiscal policy and internal stability (Carnoy, 2001; Gelb, 2001).

Finally a number of institutions are using information and communication technology (ICT) in different and new types of education delivery for foreign students – thus blurring the traditional distinction between contact and distance education. In tandem with competition from public institutions in advantaged countries came the expansion of private higher education at the national level, supported vigorously by international agencies such as the World Bank and by international and local business who suddenly saw higher education as an investment opportunity.

All in all these developments covered by the heading of globalisation have created a very specific global context for national reform in higher education. It is radically different from the contexts of previous decades. This does not imply that we want to suggest that globalisation is a deterministic concept, in the sense that national governments can only act in ways allowed for by globalisation.[7] What we do assume, however, is that the global context, shaped by globalisation, influences national policy-makers in such a way that they emphasise in national policy processes and reforms issues that 'fit' the globalisation discourse, such as efficiency, effectiveness, and competition. Specific national issues, such as institutional and individual redress in South African higher education, are in the practice of national policy more often than not marginalised in favour of the global issues. Chapter 13 explores this further.

5. COUNTRY CASE STUDIES

As part of the broader project around this book a number of higher education scholars were asked to discuss recent higher education reforms in their countries: Lazar Vlasceanu and Jan Sadlak (Central and Eastern Europe), Alberto Amaral (Brazil), K.K. George and Reji Raman (India), Terfot Ngwana (Cameroon), Akira Arimoto (Japan), David Dill (USA), and Lynn Meek (Australia). They produced short case studies that are accessible on the CHET website at www.chet.org.za/papers.asp. The following reflections on the

experience of higher education reforms in these countries are based on the original reports and use the analytic triangle as a framework.

5.1. Central and Eastern Europe – changing the changes

The transformations in Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries form an obvious frame of reference for South Africa. Like the South African apartheid regime the former CEE regimes were excessively ideological and repressive. Nonetheless, the state was expected to be a core actor in the reform of public sector components such as higher education after the fall of the repressive CEE regimes. As was the case in South Africa, the market and the higher education institutions significantly affected the outcomes of the state-initiated reforms.

The reforms of CEE higher education started in 1990, and the changes correlated strongly with other major transformations in the political, economic, social and cultural sectors. In interpreting these transformations through the analytic triangle, the first observation is that in reshaping the *state/higher education relationship*, the post-revolutionary CEE governments relied heavily on legislative policy instruments. The creation of new legal frameworks was considered to be the key to introducing and consolidating major changes. However, due to the lack of a strong and direct relationship between the formal rules put in place by higher education legislation and the informal rules and values of the academic ethos, no new law has been able to survive for more than two to three years. Successive laws have been adopted, giving the impression that it was inappropriate to use the law as a national institution for the purpose of generating stability in the system, at least in the way it was used by the government. Instead of creating stability, the legal framework created a situation of flux, and 'changing the changes' thus became the rule.

The national higher education policy debates were initially dominated by national topics, mostly related to the need to diversify the rigid, centralised and monolithic structural and institutional contexts of higher education. This included, for example, de-ideologising the curricula. The new CEE governments had to demonstrate a break with the past. Global policy issues, however, such as efficiency and effectiveness, were also gradually entering the policy debates in the CEE countries. What we can see in the CEE *state/higher education relationship* is a state that is trying to diversify the national higher education system and the structural and legal conditions under which higher education is expected to operate. At the same time the policies of each state are being influenced more and more by global trends. These trends give a clear message: increase the autonomy of the universities and colleges with the expectation that they will become more efficient, effective, competitive and responsive. Furthermore, because the state's treasury cannot afford to fund higher education at an appropriate level, the market is introduced as an arena in which the higher education institutions should seek new resources, while it is also assumed that the global expectations (of efficiency, responsiveness, etc.) will be addressed. In the CEE countries, however, the market entered the equation without much regulation, thus accounting for 'disorganised