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Introduction

Kamila Ghazali and Deane E. Neubauer

The twenty-first century has borne witness to a steadily increasing pattern of global interdependence, a keystone of which has been the progressive and seemingly inescapable conjoining of economic activity throughout the world. This trajectory has been amplified by the role being played by technology of all forms, but most especially (perhaps) those that link information, computing, communication, and automation. Whereas David Harvey’s judgment of 25 years ago that contemporary globalization had resulted in the annihilation of time and space seemed perhaps to border on overstatement, today it is a proposition that few would contest (1990). Situated at the center of this transformation is the nature of work in economies of all stripes, as these forces of change rapidly impact what kinds of work are done, where, and by whom. Closely linked to these phenomena is the myriad of ties that link education at all levels with what we can more appropriately term the “worlds of work.” It is also true, that there remains a digital divide, that shuts out over sixty percent of the world, which does not participate in those aspects of globalization that require this form of technology. This fact has significant implications for the link between learning and work.

In November 2013, the Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Partnership (APHERP), a membership organization of some 23 education-related entities, invited participants from across the Asia Pacific region to discuss this issue and to explore the various problematics embedded within it. In preparation for the event, the codirectors of APHERP developed a so-called “concept paper” that outlined a range of initiatives that have already appeared as various entities throughout the region to begin to “think through” different aspects of how these changes in “thinking about and ‘doing’ the world” are impacting higher education and its increasingly important role of educating graduates for a rapidly changing world—and especially, a rapidly changing world of work. A revised version of this appears as chapter 1 of this book.
The book seeks to identify some of the many forces that are producing these changes in the presumed competencies that higher education graduates should possess. These give particular attention to the challenges that have arisen through the complex dynamics of globalization, as they impinge upon and shape the forces of production and consumption throughout the world. The authors of the chapters in this book give particular attention to the changing nature of communication dynamics within contemporary economies, implications that these produce for the nature of undergraduate and postgraduate education, and the kinds of opportunities that are presented to enlarge and tailor curricula to meet such demands. In addition, one contribution, chapter 12 by A. Lee Fritschler and Arthur M. Hauptman, proposes a rather novel method of decision making for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), based primarily in the United States, faced with the kinds of decisions involving quality and relevance—that such significant structural changes are making compelling—within the higher education setting.

Discussions in various other chapters entail numerous propositions that link the phenomenon of the emerging knowledge society to contemporary higher education. At the center of these concerns stands the issue of what higher education does and can do to prepare students for the challenges that await them as they leave higher education and seek employment and viability within a continuously changing knowledge society. The book outlines the problematic that is presented in part one and follows with substantive country chapters that constitute the second part of the book.

Throughout the world, we have, over the past decade and a half, witnessed profound changes—both in how HEIs conceptualize their current missions and the changes that have taken place in response to these mission obligations, especially in regard to provisioning students with workplace skills. It goes almost without saying that the most prevalent and obvious is the encroachment by social media and social intelligence in all spheres, which does not preclude higher education. Increasingly, and transparently (as documented by several chapters in the second part of the book, perhaps most especially those by Thipakorn and Tawornpichayachai—chapter 5—and the group from Fu Jen Catholic University—chapter 14), higher education is being exposed to the need to juxtaose employers’ expectations with those of their own institutions. Beyond that is the challenge to be increasingly mindful of faculty capabilities to train, what Gibson (chapter 3) calls the NeXter generation, and the impact that a constantly evolving variety of technologies are having on the technologies of students and educators. As a variety of discussions seek to work out, a match between employer needs and graduate competencies, consideration of the kind of future world that we would want students to shape is equally pertinent—the kind of world that will make the future better than the present or the past. How, we are increasingly forced to ask, do we equip them with the necessary skills to perform jobs that do not exist yet? Perhaps it is time, as Deborah Halbert (chapter 4) suggests, that universities create a new set of academic majors that would directly embrace key elements of this problematic.

The book is organized around four conceptual chapters that constitute its first section. Hawkins and Neubauer open the discussion by revisiting the dynamic social tension created by the persistent “alignment” dilemma that exists and persists between society in general, and economic institutions, in particular, with higher education as a defined social sector that directly experiences these dynamics. They seek to establish the nature of this structural tension and begin to explore how HEIs are responding to the political, economic, and social tensions that it engenders. This introductory statement of the alignment dilemma then indicates a recognition of the increasing validity of the notion that profound changes are taking place throughout the world, in what is viewed as the overall ecology of higher education that has resulted in new expressions of need for higher education competencies that can be linked to new and emergent workplace skills. The chapter examines a limited set of these responses introduced in the United States, Europe, and Asia, and suggests that HEIs will further move in the direction of developing either these or like approaches to undergraduate education, often in the form of increasingly specific graduation requirements, with the impetus for this arising severally from multiple sectors of society as they articulate foci that have come to play a significant role in the education/employment dynamic, which itself is subject to continual change. The chapter concludes by reviewing the efforts of various major quality assurance agencies to develop evaluation criteria that reflect this direction.

Chapters 2–4, as alluded to above, seek to provide far-reaching conceptual analyses of some of the dynamics at play within this overall problematic of twenty-first century learning skills, from the pervasive interplay between social media and social intelligence (Jacobs, chapter 2) to issues related to the continuous challenges within higher education to stay abreast of emergent technologies (Gibson and Sodeman, chapter 3). From a slightly different focus, Deborah Halbert (chapter 4) goes to the very heart of what, for many HEIs, is the continuously emergent dilemma of dealing with constantly changing external environments. Namely, under such conditions, what should the curriculum be, and how can efforts to keep it (them) simultaneously timely and relevant honor and respect the traditions, knowledge, and effective pedagogies of the “existing curriculum,” wherever and whatever they might be? It is at this juncture that many of the contests over relevance are occurring within and outside higher education, especially with new higher education providers entering the market.
The second section of the book consists of country-specific chapters that seek to explore the diverse pathways that various Asia-Pacific countries are pursuing to respond to these challenges. One can gather from these explanations very different approaches to the challenges posed by the extensive and rapid vectors of change. Across the board, one can observe two dynamics. In the first instance, there is a sense of agreement on the potential reach of these dynamics may have across higher education and an appreciation that significant changes will need to occur over time. On the other hand, such changes are taking place very much within the historical structures of national higher education statuses, regulation, and financing, and within which have become some of the overarching contexts of higher education change, namely, the quest for status within international rankings, and the continuous rearticulation of higher education to align with the various assumptions and premises of an over-arching neoliberal-influenced public policy.

In this collection, seven such chapters focus on Asia specifically (chapter 5 Thailand, chapter 6 Japan, chapter 9 China, chapters 10 and 13 Malaysia, chapter 1 Vietnam, and chapter 14 Taiwan). The variation of focus and approach on these changing dynamics of higher education is, as the reader will discover, considerable—ranging (just for example) from the efforts of King Mongkut’s University for Technology in Thonburi in Bangkok to develop what it views as a third-generation engineering education program to train and graduate “imaginers,” as highly trained and self-conscious agents of social change; to Yamada’s report on the movement to bring HEIs (including her own) closer to all students and society through the development of “learning commons”; to the development of “graduate employability programs” and emerging post-graduate employment contexts in Malaysia (in the chapters by Ghazali, and Zhukaran and Le) and extensive undergraduate work/internship programs in Taiwan. Finally, Ngoc examines the self-conscious efforts in Vietnam to push back the overarching frameworks of government regulation and curricular stipulation as to allow greater cooperation between HEIs and the—largely private—employing sector.

Among the other chapters in this second section is one from Australia (Cuthbert and Molla) that seeks to track and examine, in considerable detail, the kinds of dynamics in the smaller, but yet highly complex, political economy of Australia, where, within the past few years, significant amounts of structural change, primed by a continuing society-wide pivot in the direction of neoliberalism, have occurred within the higher education sector (with a variety of consequences, see Zieguras and McBurnie 2007). In many respects Australia is an ideal site to explore changes in the nature of graduate education as its relatively small population size provides a rather transparent frame from which to examine how such changes ripple through a small but distinguished set of HEIs. In this regard, we have come to see Australia as a likely forerunner of other higher education changes likely to occur in Asia and throughout the world.3 The other two chapters in this second section of the volume focus on the United States and focus, in different ways, on the policy dimensions of the transformations associated with the kinds of changing structures and practices associated with the movement toward twenty-first century work and learning skills. Johnsrud (chapter 8) focuses on what has come to be called the “iron triangle” of US higher education: delivering high quality education with fewer resources to far more students. Johnsrud argues that no matter what demands for transformation are made to HEIs, they must, at some level, operate within the constraints represented by the “iron triangle.” Her chapter, informed by her own extensive administrative experiences in higher education, seeks to assist a wide variety of actors—faculty, administrators, legislators—and help to clarify the nature of their varied policy tasks.

Fritschler and Hauptman operate within a similar policy environment, but choose a very different approach (chapter 12). Both contributors combine extensive personal life experiences in higher education and government. From this perspective, they have observed that, all too often, efforts to resolve difficult higher education policy issues fail either because the approaches being attempted confuse the interests that varying participants have in the process, or the process itself fails to recognize the legitimacy of how different interests might, could, and should play out in different decision-making settings. In their model, Fritschler and Hauptman provide a detailed method for dealing with many of the complex change issues to facilitate informed but decisive institutional decision making.

In the final chapter, Neubauer and Ghazali provide a set of propositions and observations that seek to frame both the emerging conditions of transformation within which the Asia Pacific region is increasingly situated, and various “paths” that have been suggested by the chapters of this volume as useful and perhaps necessary responses on the part of higher education to these challenges. As an increasingly global enterprise itself, higher education in the Asia Pacific is being challenged by an array of forces, some from inside the societies within which it has grown, and some—increasingly novel—from institutions outside those societies, many of them of rather recent origin.

Notes

1. This question, originally asked by the popular Youtube video “Shift Happens,” has stirred a minor growth industry in variations of the original video some ten years ago. Available online at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=emx92kBLsds.
Chapter 13

Emerging New Identities for Public Universities: Implications for the Postgraduate Programs in University of Malaya

Kamila Ghazali

Introduction

The past decade has seen an extensive evolution of the higher education landscape at the national and regional levels. The first part of this chapter presents the discussion that had taken place with management level personnel at one institution of higher learning each in Thailand, Vietnam, China, and Malaysia. The management personnel comprise a Vice-Chancellor, a Deputy Vice Chancellor, a Deputy President, Directors of the International offices, and a Director of Research Management office. Open-ended questions were asked during one to one interviews with the objective of seeking their individual perspectives on the higher education scene at their own universities and identify similar trends that may appear. These “trends” or discursive practices are representative of the universities’ emerging identities that unfold as they take on different roles from the traditional ones they used to play.

The second part of the chapter addresses one of the implications that these trends have on the postgraduate program offered at the University of Malaya — that is, the initiation of the Dual PhD program.
Discussion

As universities move toward preparing their students for the globalized world, external forces determine the directions that universities must take in order to survive as relevant entities in the public domain. Traditional methods of universities in teaching and learning, research, skill development, and knowledge management are swiftly being re-emphasized along market lines, with a focus on the particular needs of a knowledge economy (Johnston and Murray 2004). In this era of globalization and internationalization, universities struggle to remain relevant.

Among the external agencies that have a major influence on the evolution of universities are market forces, world university ranking bodies, and quality assurance agencies. Universities go through periodic curriculum reviews and faculties provide an international flavor through planned activities such as student exchange agreements and study abroad programs. As a result, universities evolve in terms of practices and new identities emerge.

Universities in the South East Asia region have ceased to be ivory towers distant to most except for those carefully selected few that make the mark. Most, if not all, countries in the region conduct common examinations set by the respective ministries of education for all school leavers. The results of these examinations will then determine if candidates may or may not be successful in getting a place in university. And those who have made the mark in previous years are relatively few as the number of seats available in universities then were so limited. Competition was, and still is, extremely stiff to get a place in low fee (almost nil) paying public universities. In Malaysia, the government subsidizes up to more than 80 percent of the fees in public universities. Thus, there is great incentive to make one's way to a public university. Much literature has covered the phenomenon of massification of higher education (e.g., Neubauer and Tanaka 2011; Goolam 2008; Calderon 2012). The availability of secondary-level education to most which translates to an increase in the number of student population in schools, and the emphasis on knowledge-based economies (see National Higher Education Research Institute 2010 for further discussion), saw the mushrooming of higher education institutions in the past couple of decades.

As governments strive to educate the youth, they are limited in resources to meet the demands involved in setting up tertiary institutions that are capable of maintaining quality standards. Therefore, private institutions are allowed to be established and work hand in hand with public institutions to not only meet the national education agenda, but also to increase national revenue by attracting international students. There are 21 private universities, 24 university colleges, five foreign university branch campuses, and 390 colleges in Malaysia (MOE Malaysia 2014). According to Tham, in 2010, 50 percent of the total number of students enrolled is in private universities (Tham 2011).

The University as a Business Entity

Increasingly, public and private universities exist side by side in most countries. This chapter will not delve more into the history of the development of private universities in each country. However, suffice it to say that, at least in Malaysia, there seem to be blurred lines in terms of the branding of institutions of higher learning among public and private entities. Needless to say, however altruistic the intentions (in terms of setting up a university to educate its citizens), private institutions fundamentally exist to create revenue for their major shareholders. Public universities, on the other hand, do not create any revenue, and even if they did, it is negligible compared to private universities. Even so, it is observed that public universities have begun to operate like their private counterparts. They have incorporated marketing strategies, created websites that have a modern look, and pay for advertisements that employ non-traditional genres resulting in a look and feel of a younger and vibrant university and not a traditional and usually perceptibly staid university. Like their private sister institutions, public universities now produce brochures and prospectuses comparable to private institutions, which presumably charge much higher fees to include costs built-in for advertising and marketing. In addition, public universities have also included corporate communication strategies to manage image perception, as well as brand and media management.

In conversations with university management personnel, the discourse involves vocabulary more often found in business entities. This indicates, to a certain extent, a paradigm shift in the minds of civil servants to think of universities as a business enterprise. The following are extracts taken from interviews with these university personnel:

- "So now they see knowledge as a currency... Knowledge as currency of tomorrow": "...We have limited resources, human resources, we have limited funds. So... if we want to invest, then we have to identify where we should invest and who should be involved in that investment, so that the return of investment will be good for us, and
also them” (speaking on the topic of research collaboration not business transaction).

- “everyone has to come up and kind of sell and convince other people...why it is good to be ASEAN” (speaking on the topic of ASEAN solidarity).

As seen above, the use of such words as currency, to be equated with knowledge, invest and return of investment, sell, are all very specific to the business world and not academia. These and other business-like terms and genres seen in brochures are indicative of this ideological shift in the construction of identities of institutions of higher learning.

On image and branding management, one of the interviewees from a university in Vietnam mentioned, “When I was in Malaysia I was very surprised, because in our mind, the University of Malaya is not as good as Thailand. And when we came here, I said Wow, UM is far better than many universities...Maybe your PR is not very good.” In short, there is a certain level of expectation that universities should “promote” their “products” in order to sell—just like a business enterprise.

Findings through interviews and observations reveal that an emerging identity for public universities is that they have become, or are becoming, very business-like in their everyday operations. They think of students as customers and their role is likened to the service industry, which strives to provide efficient and quality service in a timely manner. University of Malaya, for example, boasts of its Quality Management System and has been certified comprehensively for all its process by MS ISO 9001:2002 since 2002. Many contend that such types of certification belong to production lines rather than at a university. However, with the certification comes better and efficient service, which puts focus on timeliness. Thus, as far as the management is concerned it works well to meet “quality” standards, which translate to efficient work processes, better monitoring systems, and students graduating on time. In other words, in simulating business production lines, the university began to work within the realm of input, process, and output.

Education as an Import and Export Product

For some countries—Malaysia and Singapore, for example—education is a form of revenue for the nation. In Malaysia, on average, an international student contributes approximately RM40,000 to the economy annually. The Minister of Higher Education was quoted in the media in 2011 as saying “about 100,000 foreign students are studying at public and private universities in Malaysia and the government hopes to increase the number to 150,000 by 2015” (Gooch 2009).

In Malaysia, internationalization is one of the five core thrusts of the Higher Education Strategic Plan, which was launched in 2007. However, Transnational Education (TNE) in Malaysia had begun developing as early as in the 1980s and was consolidated when the “Education Act 1996, Private Higher Educational Act 1996, National Council on Higher Education Act 1996, and the Accreditation Board Act 1996 were passed by Malaysian Parliament, paving the way for different institutional structure and delivery of TNE in Malaysia” (Morshidi 2006).

The passing of these Acts enabled private universities to aggressively pursue twinning programs with universities abroad. In twinning programs, also known as articulation arrangements, the degree is conferred by a foreign institution of higher learning. The student spends one or two years in a private institution in Malaysia and spends a portion of the time at the degree conferring institution abroad taking the major subjects or the final portion of the program.

The intention of the Malaysian government to allow private universities to award degrees was to retain some of the revenue that was being drained out of the country as families who could afford it sent their children overseas when they did not manage to enter any of the public universities. In time, these private universities, not just Malaysian ones, started “selling” their programs in marketing fairs and exhibitions abroad and as more countries discovered that quality education could be obtained from universities in this region, the numbers of international students started to increase on campuses in Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand, and Singapore.

In the pursuit of the internationalization agenda, public universities too have begun taking in foreign students, though in considerably lower numbers.

The University as a Microcosm of a Global Village

Within the context of higher education, Altbach and Knight (2007) differentiate “globalization” and “internationalization.” Globalization is said to occur when economic, political, and societal forces push twenty-first century higher education toward greater international involvement. On the other hand, internationalization of universities includes the policies
Chapter 15

Where to from Here?

Deane E. Neubauer and Kamila Ghazali

We believe our readers will concur that one effect of working through these chapters is the realization of the significant number and varying dimensions along which this subject of emerging work and learning skills may be tracked. It is almost simple-minded, but perhaps prudent, to remind ourselves that it could hardly be otherwise. It is a basic exercise, but often awkward, to merely reflect on what a different phenomenon higher education is across the world, after five to six decades of expansion, de-regulation, and massification, simply in terms of the numbers of students involved. Alternatively, to reflect (if one even has the capacity) on the range, dimensions, and density of technological change that has taken place over the last three to four decades.

Many of our chapters—correctly in our view—emphasize that, as an endeavor and as a set of social processes, higher education has continued to surrender its characteristic national character. By this we mean that as the world continually globalizes, an increasing number of social processes within the nation state come to be effected by such dynamics such that, in important ways, they can be viewed as developing a dynamic almost independent of how higher education is framed and constituted within the nation state itself. While this is immediately evident when one examines the growth and patterns of, say, cross border education, or mobility and migration within higher education (see e.g., Neubauer and Kuroda 2012), it is perhaps even more importantly evident when one examines the extent and degree to which national economic systems have been transformed by the varied dynamics of globalization and to many important degrees realigned by the broad, powerful dynamics of the global economy itself.
It is from this essential point of reference that once again we wish to reiterate both the persistent and dominating issue of what we have familiarly referred to as the alignment crisis or dilemma. With the hope that revisiting this issue does not prove too burdensome for the reader, we wish to emphasize both the nature of this dilemma and reiterate why it is best perceived as a dilemma or predicament, rather than in the manner in which the issue often enters policy discussions—namely, as a problem to be addressed and solved (resolved) with direct and purposive action. The crisis, as we have articulated in several places in the preceding chapters, arises for the reasons stated immediately above; namely, that with the steady and increasing strength of globalization, the ability of nations to control many of the most important things that happen within their borders is impeached, with the result that the basic institutional dynamics of important societal institutions—higher education among them—are often acted powerfully upon from “the outside,” through the dynamics of globalization. While one can locate these dynamics across wide ranges of social endeavors from health and health care to media, to finance, to patterns of migration and immigration, the effects of these dynamics are probably greatest within the root and tertiary economies of nations and societies, in the very fibers of what people find work at, and gain compensation for to conduct their economic and social lives (Again, see the range of social dimensions touched on by Steger, Batterby, and Siracusa 2014).

In a specific instance of this dynamic, one that we have witnessed as being at the center of the various “recoveries” from the economic crisis of 2008–2009, the constant interaction between three persistent factors is present. First, the relative “health” of national economies and by extension, the jobs they are producing, are leading to a relative global slowing down of job creation within specific economies, including the most advanced economies; second, there is a general and persistent mismatch between the numbers and qualities of higher education graduates and the suitable numbers of available jobs for them within and across economies, with the result that unemployment among educated 20 and young 30-year-olds is persistent around the world, and in some places (e.g., Spain, Italy, Greece) that have experienced their own structural difficulties in exiting the “Great Recession” the numbers approach epidemic proportions (Hendley 2013). However, one can easily identify similar stories in Japan, China, Malaysia, the Philippines, etc. And third, as extensive data are beginning to show, wage rates for jobs requiring extensive education to gain credentials are also either stagnant or actually falling (Hobijn and Benhal 2014).

The combination of these three factors has in some circumstances come to be termed the “higher education trap,” meaning that our current social norms lead students into higher education as a viable career path, often at ever-higher personal costs to students, and then fail to “deliver” on the implied promise of suitable and successful jobs after graduation.

Summarizing these varied dimensions of the situation is what has given rise to the widely accepted and repeated notion of an alignment crisis in higher education, by which most commentators mean some version of the mismatch between what high education imparts as quanta of experiences and knowledge to graduates, and what society at large and the economy in particular seem to require. It is certainly out of this context that the sampling of elements presented in chapter 1 of this volume by Hawkins and Neubauer was intended to signal that, within this overall structural context, it is essential to explore and concentrate on those things that are and will be happening within discrete higher education settings. However, our intentions are two-fold: one is to focus, as we have on workplace and learning skills, but the other is to encourage readers and those operating within higher education settings directly to explore and find approaches and ways to engage these alignment issues that are sensible in terms of the “local” conditions under which they need to operate, but also framed by a constant awareness of how the alignment dilemma tends to operate, and how constantly improving insights into this dimension can feed back into how higher education institutions as institutions may confront these dynamics on a continuous basis. With this in mind, let us offer just a few more remarks about the nature of the predicament and then proceed to derive a small set of hopefully suggestive propositions as a way of concluding the endeavor that frames these essays.

In their essence, predicaments and dilemmas differ in one important respect from problems, and while the difference may to some seem slight, our position is that in the variety of ways in which this difference affects the dynamics of higher education, the difference is critical. Problems, in whatever context they arise, are finite in that they contain discrete solutions; no matter how elusive or difficult they may be. By contrast, dilemmas or predicaments do not have discrete solutions, for the elemental but compelling reason that they arise in human interactions through a multiplicity of simultaneous interactions and conjunctions such that they are in a constant state of flux and change (Herschko 2011) (And, no matter that these may not be readily apparent to observers). In this sense, they are structurally akin to complex systems in which a change (or perturbation) in one part of the system will produce an effect or effects in other parts of the system. If one makes an analogy with weather as a complex system, we can easily understand the reality and commonplace acceptance of the notion that weather is unpredictable, and we accept it as such, even as we expend great sums of money both public and private seeking to make suitable and acceptable predictions about it, to the greatest extent possible, and