Michael B. Paulsen
Editor

Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research

Volume 29

Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research

Volume XXIX

Associate Editors

Michael N. Bastedo, Ph.D., Center for Higher and Postsecondary Education, School of Education, 2108C SEB, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259, USA, bastedo@umich.edu
(Organization and Administration)

John M. Braxton, Ph.D., Department of Leadership, Policy, and Organization, Payne Hall, Peabody #514, 230 Appleton Place, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37203-5721, USA, john.m.braxton@vanderbilt.edu
(College Faculty)

Stephen L. DesJardins, Ph.D., School of Education, #2108D SEB, 610 E. University Avenue, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259, USA, sdesj@umich.edu
(Research Methodology)

Linda Eisenmann, Ph.D., Office of the Provost, Wheaton College, 26 E. Main Street, Norton, MA 02766, USA, eisenmann_linda@wheatoncollege.edu
(History and Philosophy)

Linda Serra Hagedorn, Ph.D., Department of Educational Leadership Studies, Iowa State University, N243 Lagomarcino Hall, Ames, IA 50011, USA, lindah@iastate.edu
(Community Colleges)

Sylvia Hurtado, Ph.D., Higher Education Research Institute, 3005 Moore Hall, Box 951521, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA, shurtado@gseis.ucla.edu
(Diversity Issues)

Laura W. Perna, Ph.D., Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 3700 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA, lperna@gse.upenn.edu
(Policy)

Raymond D. Perry, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, 404 Duff Roblin Building, The University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3T 2N2, rperry@cc.umanitoba.ca
(Curriculum and Instruction)

Scott L. Thomas, Ph.D., School of Educational Studies, Claremont Graduate University, 150 E. Tenth Street, Claremont, CA 91711, USA, scott.thomas@cgu.edu
(College Students)

Robert K. Toutkoushian, Ph.D., Institute of Higher Education, Meigs Hall, Room 114, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, USA, rtoutkou@uga.edu
(Finance and Economics)

For further volumes:
http://www.springer.com/series/6028

Michael B. Paulsen
Editor

Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research

Published under the Sponsorship of the Association for Institutional Research (AIR) and the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE)

Volume 29

Editor
Michael B. Paulsen
Department of Educational Policy
and Leadership Studies
N491 Lindquist Center
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242, USA

ISSN 0882-4126
ISBN 978-94-017-8004-9 ISBN 978-94-017-8005-6 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-94-017-8005-6
Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg New York London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2013930232

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2014
This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law.
The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.
While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Contents

1 The Complexity of Higher Education: A Career in Academics and Activism 1
Philip G. Altbach

2 Advancing an Intersectionality Framework in Higher Education: Power and Latino Postsecondary Opportunity 33
Anne-Marie Núñez

3 Student Veterans in Higher Education 93
David T. Vacchi and Joseph B. Berger

4 The Changing Nature of Cultural Capital 153
Jenna R. Sablan and William G. Tierney

5 The Culturally Engaging Campus Environments (CECE) Model: A New Theory of Success Among Racially Diverse College Student Populations 189
Samuel D. Museus

6 Organizational Identity in Higher Education: Conceptual and Empirical Perspectives 229
David J. Weerts, Gwendolyn H. Freed, and Christopher C. Morphew

7 Student Ratings of Instruction in College and University Courses 279
Stephen L. Benton and William E. Cashin

8 College Enrollment: An Economic Analysis 327
Leslie S. Stratton

9 The Welding of Opposite Views: Land-Grant Historiography at 150 Years 385
Nathan M. Sorber and Roger L. Geiger

10 The Completion Agenda: The Unintended Consequences for Equity in Community Colleges 423
Jaime Lester

11 Using IPEDS for Panel Analyses: Core Concepts, Data Challenges, and Empirical Applications 467
Ozan Jaquette and Edna E. Parra

12 Toward a Better Understanding of Equity in Higher Education Finance and Policy 535
Luciana Dar

Name Index 573

Subject Index 589

Contents of Previous Volumes 593

Contributors

Philip G. Altbach Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA, USA

Stephen L. Benton The IDEA Center, Manhattan, KS, USA

Joseph B. Berger College of Education, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, MA, USA

William E. Cashin Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS, USA

Luciana Dar Graduate School of Education, University of California, Riverside, Riverside, CA, USA

Gwendolyn H. Freed Division of Institutional Advancement, Cornish College of the Arts, Seattle, WA, USA

Roger L. Geiger Department of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University College of Education, University Park, PA, USA

Ozan Jaquette Educational Policy Studies & Practice, College of Education, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

Jaime Lester Higher Education Program, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA

Christopher C. Morphew Department of Educational Policy and Leadership, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, USA

Samuel D. Museus Morgridge College of Education, University of Denver, Denver, CO, USA

Anne-Marie Núñez Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, University of Texas at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, USA

Edna E. Parra Educational Policy Studies & Practice, College of Education, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

Jenna R. Sablan Pullias Center for Higher Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Nathan M. Sorber Curriculum and Instruction/Literacy Studies Department, College of Education and Human Services, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, USA

Leslie S. Stratton Department of Economics, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, USA

Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark

Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Bonn, Germany

William G. Tierney Pullias Center for Higher Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

David T. Vacchi College of Education, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Belchertown, MA, USA

David J. Weerts Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, Minneapolis, MN, USA

About the Authors

Philip G. Altbach was J. Donald Monan, S.J., University Professor and Director of the Center for International Higher Education in the Lynch School of Education at Boston College; he is now a research professor. He was the 2004–2006 Distinguished Scholar Leader for the New Century Scholars initiative of the Fulbright program and in 2010 was an Erudite Scholar of the Government of Kerala in India. He has had awards from the German Academic Exchange Service, the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, and others. His most recent book, coedited with Jamil Salmi, is *The Road to Academic Excellence: The Making of World-Class Research Universities.* He is author of *Turmoil and Transition: The International Imperative in Higher Education, Comparative Higher Education, Student Politics in America,* and other books. He coedited the *International Handbook of Higher Education.* Other recent books are *World Class Worldwide: Transforming Research Universities in Asia and Latin America, Leadership for World-Class Universities: Challenges for Developing Countries*, and *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution.*

Stephen L. Benton is Senior Research Officer at The IDEA Center where he designs and conducts reliability and validity studies on student ratings. He is a Fellow in the American Psychological Association and American Educational Research Association, as well as an Emeritus Professor of Special Education, Counseling, and Student Affairs at Kansas State University, where he taught educational psychology for 25 years. He currently serves on the editorial boards of *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, and *Educational Psychology Review*. He earned his Ph.D. in educational psychology from the University of Nebraska–Lincoln in 1983.

Joseph B. Berger, Ph.D. is a professor of education and associate dean for Research and Engagement in the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. Dr. Berger's scholarly expertise focuses on higher education leadership and policy, organizational development, international higher education development, and K-16 systems alignment and evaluation. He has authored dozens of articles, chapters, and reports and has served on the editorial

boards for top journals such as *Education Research International, Research in Higher Education, Journal of College Student Development, and Journal of College Student Retention*.

William E. Cashin is a counseling psychologist, now retired. He was the director (1985–1996) of Kansas State University's Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, which he joined in 1975 when it was created. During his 21 years with the center, he consulted at over 300 different colleges and universities in 48 states on topics related to faculty evaluation, especially using student ratings of teaching, and faculty development, especially improving teaching. He authored or coauthored 19 of the Center's IDEA papers. In 2012, the AERA Special Interest Group on Faculty Teaching, Evaluation, and Development gave him the McKeachie Career Achievement Award.

Dr. Luciana Dar is an assistant professor of higher education at the University of California, Riverside. Her research interests fall into three interconnected areas of inquiry: comparative political economy of higher education, the relationship between higher education and social inequality, and the politics of higher education. Her teaching interests and expertise span a wide range of areas, including policy analysis, policy process, comparative political economy, research design, comparative public policy, higher education politics, policy and finance, and comparative state politics and policy.

Gwendolyn H. Freed is Vice President for Institutional Advancement at Cornish College of the Arts in Seattle. She has also served as Vice President for Marketing and Communication at Gustavus Adolphus College in Saint Peter, Minnesota. She holds a Ph.D. in Educational Administration and a master's degree in Public Affairs from the University of Minnesota. Her research interests include fund-raising and marketing in higher education. A musician and former arts journalist, she is a graduate of the Juilliard School and Oberlin Conservatory of Music and has written about the arts for such publications as the *Wall Street Journal*.

Roger L. Geiger, distinguished Professor of Higher Education at Pennsylvania State University, is a historian of American higher education and the American research university. He has written three volumes on the American University in the twentieth century: *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900–1940* (1986, 2004), *Research and Relevant Knowledge: The American Research Universities since World War II* (1993, 2004), and *Knowledge and Money: American Research Universities and the Paradox of the Marketplace* (2004). He has been editor of *Perspectives on the History of Higher Education* (formerly the *History of Higher Education Annual*) since 1993. In 2000 he edited *The American College in the Nineteenth Century* and in 2013 (with Nathan Sorber) *The Land-Grant Colleges and the Reshaping of American Higher Education*. His history of American higher education from 1636 to 1940 will be published by Princeton University Press in 2014.

Ozan Jaquette is an assistant professor of higher education at the University of Arizona. His research interests are organizational theory, postsecondary education

finance, and quantitative methods. His research program analyzes how postsecondary institutions change their behavior to generate enrollments from desired student populations. Specific research topics include the adoption and production of master's degrees and the recruitment of nonresident students at public universities. To conduct empirical studies, he has developed panel datasets of postsecondary institutions based on data from HEGIS, IPEDS, and other sources.

Jaime Lester is Associate Professor of Higher Education at George Mason University. Lester holds a Ph.D. and M.Ed. in higher education from the Rossier School of Education at the University of Southern California. She received numerous awards for her research and teaching including the Barbara Townsend Emerging Scholar Award from the Council for the Study of Community Colleges in 2009. Dr. Lester's research focuses on gender, organizational change, and non-positional leadership in higher education. Her most recent book examines workplace bullying in higher education.

Christopher C. Morphew is Professor and Chair of the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership at the University of Iowa. He previously held tenured faculty positions at the University of Kansas and University of Georgia. Professor Morphew earned his Ph.D. in Social Sciences and Education from Stanford University. He has also earned degrees from Harvard University and the University of Notre Dame. Professor Morphew's research focuses on issues of institutional diversity. His work has appeared in many journals, including the *Review of Higher Education, Research in Higher Education, The Journal of Higher Education, Educational Finance, Higher Education Policy,* and the *NASPA Journal.*

Samuel D. Museus, Ph.D., is an Associate Professor of Higher Education at the University of Denver. His research agenda focuses on examining the factors that affect college access and persistence among underrepresented students in the K-16 pipeline. His current research is focused on the impact of organizational environments on college success among racially diverse students. He has produced over 100 publications and national conference presentations on the racial, cultural, and structural factors that affect the experiences and outcomes of diverse college student populations. His work has been published in several peer-reviewed academic journals, including the Harvard Educational Review, Journal of Higher Education, Review of Higher Education, and Teachers College Record. His books include Creating Campus Cultures: Fostering Success among Racially Diverse Student Populations (2012) and The New Majority: A Synthesis of Research on College Students of Color (forthcoming, 2014).

Anne-Marie Núñez is associate professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at the University of Texas at San Antonio. Her research addresses the college access and success of diverse students, including Latino, first-generation, and migrant students. Her studies address several institutional contexts, including Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs). Her work has been published in several outlets, including *American Educational Research Journal*, *Harvard Educational Review*, and *Review of Higher Education.* In 2011, she received the 2011 Mildred

Garcia Exemplary Scholarship Award from the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) for her research on issues related to race/ethnicity in higher education.

Edna Parra is a Ph.D. student in the Center for Higher Education at the University of Arizona. She has an MA in economics from the University of Guadalajara. Her research foci are econometrics, higher education finance, and higher education policy. She has worked extensively with IPEDS data and organization-level data from the Office of Postsecondary Education and the Office of Federal Student Aid.

Jenna R. Sablan is a provost fellow and research assistant in the Pullias Center for Higher Education at the University of Southern California. Her research focuses on increasing college readiness and access to college for first-generation and under-represented students, analyzing K-16 policy, and evaluating educational programs.

Nathan M. Sorber is an Assistant Professor of Higher Education at West Virginia University and the coauthor of *Land-Grant Colleges and the Reshaping of American Higher Education* (Transaction Press, 2013). His dissertation, *Farmers, Scientists, and Officers of Industry*, was a finalist for the Association of the Study of Higher Education's Dissertation of the Year and a recipient of Penn State University's Alumni Association Dissertation of the Year. Sorber has published on higher education history in the *History of Education Quarterly*, *Perspectives on the History of Higher Education*, and will have a forthcoming chapter in Alan Marcus' book on land-grant colleges.

Leslie S. Stratton is a professor of economics at Virginia Commonwealth University, an affiliated faculty at Aarhus University (Aarhus, Denmark), and a research fellow at the Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA, Bonn, Germany). One of her research interests is in the decision to enroll in and the path taken through college. She is the author of a number of articles on this topic in *Research in Higher Education* and *Economics of Education Review*.

William G. Tierney is university professor, Wilbur-Kieffer Professor of Higher Education, director of the Pullias Center for Higher Education at the University of Southern California, and past president of the American Educational Research Association. His research focuses on increasing access to higher education, improving the performance of postsecondary institutions, and analyzing the impact of privatization on postsecondary education. His Center is involved with USC's Electronic Arts Game Lab in creating an interactive game for teenagers that will enable them to develop strategies for applying to college. Recent books include *The Impact of Culture on Organizational Decision-Making.*

David T. Vacchi retired from the US Army as a lieutenant colonel after 20 years and is a combat veteran of Operations Iraqi and Enduring Freedom. An adjunct lecturer in the Commonwealth Honors College at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, he is also a doctoral candidate in the higher education concentration of the Educational Policy and Leadership program at UMass Amherst. His research and academic

interests include the impact of college on student veterans, the success of student veterans, nontraditional and underserved student populations, undergraduate education, and leadership in various contexts.

David J. Weerts is Associate Professor and Director of the Jandris Center for Innovative Higher Education (*JCENTER*) in the Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development at the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities. Professor Weerts's scholarship and teaching focus on state financing of higher education, university-community engagement, and alumni giving and volunteerism. His research on these topics has appeared in many journals including *The Journal of Higher Education*, *Research in Higher Education*, and the *Review of Higher Education*. Professor Weerts holds a Ph.D. in educational leadership and policy analysis from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Chapter 1
The Complexity of Higher Education: A Career in Academics and Activism

Philip G. Altbach

Organizing a discussion of a career—and the ideas that have shaped it—that has covered more than half a century and taken a variety of unanticipated twists and turns is not a simple task. This essay is organized in two parts. The first discusses the elements of a career that has taken place entirely in the world of academe, but which was shaped in part by the social and political movements of the 1960s in America and the world. The second part focuses mainly on the ideas and concerns that have animated my work over time. These aspects are, of course, intertwined. Commitments have shaped ideas and actions, experience contributed to ideas and perspectives. Thus, this is not an autobiography in the traditional sense; the experience of a rather typical academic hardly warrants that. Rather, it is a consideration of ideas swirling in the social and academic environment of the times and how these, as well as somewhat random circumstance, shaped a career.

Origins and Formation

I was born in the shadow of the University of Chicago, grew up in its neighborhood, and was entirely educated after secondary school at that same institution—highly unusual for an American. Further, this institution was and remains a rather unusual academic institution, with its commitment to the ideal of liberal education at the undergraduate level and to research throughout. That institution has shaped my perspective on intellectual life and the role of higher education in society.

I am also the product of Chicago's South Side and particularly the neighborhood of Hyde Park that surrounds the University of Chicago. Growing up in the 1950s, it was possible to bicycle from Hyde Park to downtown along the lakefront. Later,

P.G. Altbach, Ph.D. (✉)
Center for International Higher Education, Boston College,
207 Campion Hall, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA
e-mail: Altbach@bc.edu

M.B. Paulsen (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research: Volume 29*,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-017-8005-6_1, © Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2014

urban blight in parts of the South Side made life rather more problematical. Even then, the area was highly diverse, with a growing African American population, as well as many other ethnic groups. For primary and secondary education, I am a graduate of the Chicago Public Schools, which are now much maligned but then were still a rather good public school system. The primary school I attended was next to the Illinois Central railroad and with a clattering street car out in front, making for constant motion and not a little bit of noise. At the same time, the school provided regular trips to a matinee of Chicago's symphony orchestra, cultivating in me an affection for classical music that remains to this day, as well as a solid if rather traditional grounding in basic school subjects.

Hyde Park High School, which I attended for 2 years before moving further south in the city, was then a remarkable school. By then, at least 80 % of the students were African American, and the school was rigidly tracked. The academic track was largely white and Asian. The heritage and many of the teachers remained from the days when the school was one of the best in the city. Hyde Park High School provided an outstanding education, at least for those in the academic track—as well as numerous lessons, mostly quite positive, in multiethnic relations. My final 2 years of secondary education took place at South Shore High School—then perhaps equally divided between Jews and Catholics—also an excellent school. With mostly white students and relatively homogenous in terms of social class, there was no tracking there.

During the height of the anticommunist "witch hunts" of the mid-1950s, a group of South Shore students, encouraged by several teachers, gravitated toward political liberalism, the emerging civil rights movement, and nascent radicalism. We were welcomed by the local Unitarian-Universalist Church and soon became their youth group, even though only one of our members had any connection to the church. From that base, the group sponsored talks by local civil rights leaders and joined in some of the activities of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). We also made occasional forays downtown to the recently established Second City Theatre.

By taking several advanced placement courses and an innovative summer literature program, offered by the Chicago Public Schools at the University of Chicago, I graduated a semester early from high school. Having been accepted for midyear admission to the University of Chicago—I recall applying only to the U of C and to the University of Illinois as a "safety school"—I matriculated at Chicago in January 1959. In those days, the University of Chicago had a good reputation, but it was not all that difficult to gain entry, since most of the applicants were self-selected. Students interested in the university's serious academic atmosphere and its well-known general education curriculum were attracted. Among my motivations for studying there was the appeal of the active political culture that I had already experienced as a high school student. I entered the groves of academe in 1959 and never left and have had a career of more than half a century in a variety of higher education settings.

The University of Chicago, still well known for its rigorous general education program, was soon to end its famous "Hutchins College"—what might be described

as general education on steroids. The first 2 years were a rigidly prescribed series of arts and science courses, specifically designed for all undergraduates. Many were a year-long, three-quarter (Chicago, then as now, functioned on a quarter rather than a semester system) sequence, for which an examination was given at the end of the academic year for the course. Most of the courses were a combination of lectures, given by some of the most-eminent scholars in the country, and small group discussions led not by teaching assistants but by regular members of the faculty. Textbooks were typically compilations of primary source materials. For example, the social science courses featured books by de Tocqueville, Freud, Marx, Weber, and others rather than traditional textbooks. Mathematics included the history of the topic—a course in which I did not excel. At least, the readings were English translations rather than the original French or German! Papers submitted were based on original sources and were rigorously evaluated by the instructor. Without question, this intellectual underpinning, the way in which courses were taught, provided a valuable academic base and rigorous evaluation, excellent training in critical thinking, and clarity of written expression.

Having no clear vocational commitment, I was able to take courses of interest during the last 2 years of undergraduate study. These included comparative religion, a wonderful year-long sequence in South Asian civilization, a much less excellent Chinese civilization sequence, modern literature, and others. I ended up with concentrations in sociology and history, and no particular expertise in anything.

Politics

One of the attractions of the University of Chicago was its active, mainly leftist, political culture. Even in the apolitical 1950s, and unlike most American universities at the time, there was an array of social action and political organizations on campus, from communists (a few) to conservatives (despite Professor Milton Friedman and others—even fewer). I gravitated to the small but active youth affiliate of the Socialist Party and also to the Quakers. The socialists provided a short course on interpretations of the Russian Revolution, the role of the labor movement in social change, and the argument that both the Soviet Union and the United States were culpable in the then raging Cold War. The Quakers brought ideas of pacifism and a principled opposition to nuclear testing, then a “hot button” (no pun intended) issue, and a commitment to nonviolent social action.

American politics were, at the end of the 1950s, in transition from the political apathy that characterized the immediate post-World War II period. The Cold War was at its height. Anticommunist hysteria, fueled by Senator Joseph McCarthy and numerous “witch hunts” of “subversives” in the government, the entertainment industry, and in education, along with general apathy, characterized the political scene. Chicago’s South Side, along with such places as California’s Bay Area, Manhattan’s Upper West Side, and some college towns across the country, was somewhat immune to these trends. Political debate and activism remained part of the environment.

By the end of the 1950s, social issues such as an emerging civil rights movement (especially salient on the increasingly African American South Side), a revival of interest in civil liberties in an effort to blunt McCarthyite repression, and especially a growing consciousness of the dangers of nuclear war in an increasing volatile world contributed to a modest revival of student activism (DeBenedetti 1990).

In this context, the Student Peace Union (SPU) was established in 1959 by University of Chicago students in order to bring together the nascent antinuclear groups emerging on campuses, especially in Midwest. The organization quickly grew to be the largest left-oriented national student organization in the United States, with affiliated groups on more than 100 college campuses. I was elected the SPU's national chairman and served in that capacity from 1959 to 1963. I was chosen mainly because I was happy to wear a necktie and "respectable" clothes at a time when beards and sandals were the norm in the student movement. My job was to work with other organizations and to serve as the "public face" of the SPU. In this role, I had the opportunity to organize a series of fund-raising concerts with such luminaries as Joan Baez, Bob Dylan, and Pete Seeger—most were in fact not luminaries at the time but rather emerging young talents. I also worked with the group's advisory board and donors—respected people on the left of the American political spectrum such as Socialist party candidate Norman Thomas, civil rights leader Bayard Rustin, Nobel prizewinning chemist Linus Pauling, philosopher Bertrand Russell, Harvard sociologist David Riesman, and many others. I also spent a lot of time fund raising—convincing wealthy liberals to donate funds to an emerging student movement. The political and organizational experience of the student movement provided many very useful skills.

In 1960, the SPU was invited to send two representatives to a major rally of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) in London. I was selected and at age 19 and a second-year undergraduate, I went overseas for the first time. In London, the two SPU representatives participated in several antinuclear marches and a large rally at Royal Albert Hall. Unlike in the United States, the antinuclear weapons movement was at the time a significant political force in the United Kingdom—trying unsuccessfully to keep nuclear weapons off British soil. While in England, I was impressed by the ubiquitous symbol used by CND, now known in the United States as the "peace symbol." I carried a pocketful of peace symbol pins back with me and, after considerable debate, convinced the SPU to adopt and widely disseminate it (Miles 2006, p. 116). Soon afterward, the symbol came to be used universally, as perhaps the most widely recognized sign of peace anywhere. Without doubt, introducing and popularizing the peace symbol in the United States was one of my more significant accomplishments—at the time it seemed just another small aspect of work in the student movement.

The SPU had collected some 10,000 signatures on a petition asking for an end to nuclear weapons testing to the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union, scheduled to meet in May in Paris. We set out from London to Paris with our petitions, intending to deliver them to the summit, only to learn that the meeting was abruptly cancelled by the Soviets in the aftermath of shooting down an American U-2 spy plane in Soviet airspace. We left half of the petitions at the Soviet embassy

and the other half at the American embassy in Paris—no doubt to be tossed into the garbage in both places. Two peace activists were left with nothing to do but to enjoy a first visit to Paris.

As perhaps the largest campus-based antiwar organization in the United States at the time, the SPU national office kept track of perhaps 100 campus chapters and thousands of members. The group issued a bulletin highlighting political events, as well as the organization's own activities. While the SPU had no clear ideological perspective, keeping the organization and its membership focused on the central issues of antinuclear weapons and opposition to American military forays was not an easy task. The organization's insistence on placing responsibility for the Cold War and its conflicts on both sides differentiated it from some other organizations that tended to lay blame only on the United States and of course from the general public, which viewed international relations through anticommunist rhetoric of the Cold War.

The SPU was one of the first American organizations to recognize the dangers of American involvement in Vietnam and called for the withdrawal of US advisors several years prior to Vietnam becoming a major political issue in the United States and before the escalation of American involvement. However, political events—including the Cuban missile crisis, The Freedom Rides and the growth and radicalization of the civil rights movement, and the beginning of the major student movements of the 1960s—overtook the SPU. Thus, by 1964 the SPU lost much of its energy and soon ceded leadership to the Students for a Democratic Society and other more militant groups focusing on a wider range of issues (Altbach 1997d; Gitlin 1993).

Student activism also provided several other opportunities for international involvement. In 1963, the SPU hosted a delegation from Japan's ultraradical national student union, the Zengakuren. Based on interviews, I published an article introducing Western audiences to the Japanese student movement (Altbach 1963b). Later, I was invited to Japan to look more carefully into the Japanese student movement and, through this and other efforts, brought the growing student activist movement in other countries to the attention of American students.

The SPU was also invited by the Independent Research Service—headed by Gloria Steinem, later a pioneering feminist and founder of *MS* magazine—to participate in several communist youth and student conferences in Europe. Following much internal discussion, it was decided that I would participate in a youth forum in Italy and, in 1964, a larger conference in Moscow. Representing the SPU in Italy, Gail P. Kelly, then the general secretary of the SPU and later my student at the University of Wisconsin and a faculty colleague at the State University of New York at Buffalo, and I presented an "independent left" perspective, much to the dismay of our Soviet hosts. In 1968 when *Ramparts* magazine exposed that the Central Intelligence Agency had funded a number of liberal and left publications and organizations, we discovered that the Independent Research Service was indeed a conduit for CIA activity.

My involvement in student activism also earned a Federal Bureau of Investigation dossier. In the 1980s, I requested, under the Freedom of Information Act, any files

that the FBI kept concerning me; and much to my amazement, a file of papers, perhaps an inch thick, was provided. The US government was spending its scarce resources, trying to keep track of my activities during the 1960s. They seem to have decided that I was not a subversive influence, although much of the file was redacted.

By the time I entered graduate school at the University of Chicago, my direct involvement in student activism largely ended. I learned a great deal from my experiences in the student movement. I was immersed in the central political events of the day and kept abreast of foreign policy and the Cold War, developing countries, and nuclear issues. Student politics inevitably created a need to explain global events in broader perspective. The SPU attempted, with only limited success, to draw attention to the central issues of war and peace, something that required a sophisticated argument. All of this was excellent training for an academic career. The organization sponsored a variety of events and demonstrations, including one of the earliest student-led marches on Washington, that focused on nuclear war and weapons testing. Coordinating a national demonstration that attracted more than 10,000 students to the nation's capital cultivated skills in organization. Writing newspaper articles and speaking to diverse groups was also excellent "on-the-job" training.

Graduate School

By the time I graduated from college in 1962, I had decided a career in education was as a good way to make a contribution to society and started work on a master's degree in educational administration at the University of Chicago. Staying at Chicago seemed a good choice—the department of education was well regarded and I was able to remain somewhat involved with campus politics. I thought that I could provide educational leadership as an administrator or researcher. My master's degree work focused on education policy, and I wrote a master's thesis concerning James B. Conant, an influential policymaker and former Harvard president (Altbach 1963a). I realized, however, that this career path required work experience in order to make a significant contribution, and as a newly minted 22-year-old master's graduate, I had few opportunities to acquire it. By this point I had discovered I was not especially interested in the field of educational administration; however, I was quite interested in a course I had taken on comparative education.

Quite coincidentally, the Comparative Education Center happened to be at the opposite end of the corridor from educational administration offices in Judd Hall, and was one of the best such centers in the United States at the time. I was admitted to the doctoral program in comparative education. Further, my wife was completing work on a master of arts in teaching at Chicago, and in any case I could not have imagined studying anywhere else. Because I had taken many of the required courses in education, I had the freedom to choose courses broadly in the social sciences and in development studies. The key comparative educators in the department, C. Arnold Anderson and Philip Foster, offered a variety of courses on the role of

education in socioeconomic development globally, with a special focus on developing societies. I was also able to obtain a fellowship funded by the Ford Foundation to support my doctoral study.

I was particularly interested in courses taught by Edward Shils, in Chicago's well-known interdisciplinary Committee on Social Thought. Shils, a polymath sociologist who had translated the work of German sociologist Max Weber into English, focused on higher education and the role of intellectuals in society. For many years, I maintained an active relationship with him. When I was in Chicago, even after his retirement from active teaching, I visited him—I recall one dinner when he brought me along to meet Nobel laureate and author Saul Bellow, a good friend of Shils at a rather modest Chinese restaurant. The scene, and the conversation, was reminiscent of one of Bellow's novels. On another occasion, Shils, who spent half the year as a fellow of King's College Cambridge, England, brought me to a dinner at the high table at King's—where I chanced to sit next to E. M. Forster, author of *A Passage to India*, then in his mid-90s and still quite articulate. After Shils passed away in 1995, I edited a volume of his writings on higher education (Altbach 1997a).

Professor Shils proved to have the greatest influence on my academic interests and dissertation. Through his courses, I became aware of the importance of universities in modern societies, the main interest and focus of my subsequent career. Shils had done research in India and wrote a pioneering study of the role of Indian intellectuals in society. As a result of his courses, I decided to focus my doctoral dissertation on higher education. My experience in student politics and earlier interest in India pointed me toward student activism in India. A grant available from the University of Michigan, which at the time supervised a collaboration with the University of Chicago and the University of Bombay, provided funding for a year of research. My topic focused on the history of student politics in Bombay, tracing the history of activism from the struggle for Indian independence through the 1960s.

I became convinced that higher education in general and the role of universities in particular are central to the process of social and economic development—and that universities are central cultural and research institutions in all societies. Work in India made it clear that higher education is a complicated and a many-faceted phenomenon in developing countries—worthy of study and understanding. I have kept up an interest in the manifold roles of universities, trying to understand and illustrate aspects of higher education. In fact, my entire academic career has engaged with different aspects of higher education—the role of students in politics, knowledge networks and scholarly communication, the academic profession, the role of research universities, and others. Underlying this concern has been a special interest in developing countries and a commitment to highlighting the special circumstances and problems they face.

During the period from the 1970s to the end of the twentieth century, many experts and policymakers, led by the World Bank and UNESCO, argued that the best "payoff" for development was investment in primary education and literacy training. I continued to argue for the centrality of higher education in the development process, pointing out that universities educate society's leaders, produce research, and

are central intellectual institutions. I was involved as a senior consultant, at the end of the 1990s, to one of the first influential reports that attempted to shift the balance back to higher education—*Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise* (Task Force on Higher Education and Society 2000). The report, released with great fanfare by the World Bank president, proved to be influential in restoring higher education to prominence in the thinking of major policy organizations in governments around the world.

The importance of higher education was greatly enhanced at the end of the twentieth century, no doubt stimulated by globalization, the advent of the Internet, and especially the emergence of the knowledge-based economy even in developing countries. These realities required highly educated personnel as well as linkages among institutions and countries. Further, the recognition by a growing number of people worldwide that higher education was a key to social mobility has stimulated the expansion of enrollments everywhere and the advent of massification of higher education (Altbach 1999). Postsecondary education has since then been central both to the lives and careers of young people around the world and to policymakers and the economy, as well.

While for much of my career as an international higher education researcher, my interest in universities was not widely shared nor considered very important—universities were thought of as peripheral institutions for elites in most countries. Although universities shared common historical roots, there were relatively few international links among them. However, in the twenty-first century, higher education has been recognized as a key part of the knowledge economy of the era, and academic institutions worldwide have been internationalized. Without question, there has been a sea change in thinking about the role of higher education in the emerging global knowledge society.

Encounters with India

My first significant experience outside of the United States was my sojourn to India to collect data for my doctoral dissertation. I landed in Bombay in 1964, with precious little knowledge of the details of my topic but with a reasonable grasp of Indian society and politics, due to my academic training. Since there was no information available on the student movement, I was researching an entirely blank slate. My research on student activism was the first study of that topic done anywhere in India. I was able to affiliate with the Department of Sociology at the University of Bombay and benefited from excellent mentors there—including Professor A. R. Desai. I started by delving into historical sources, including reading the back issues of the *Bombay Chronicle*, huge bound volumes of which were fetched for me from the Maharashtra State Archives, located behind Elphinstone College—and literally tossed to the ground by staff members, amidst great clouds of dust. Much more importantly, I was able to interview many of the alumni of the student movement who had been active during the independence struggle in

Bombay. I found nuggets of Bombay's activist history, such as the 1946 naval mutiny that started among Indian sailors on British ships in the Bombay harbor, and spread elsewhere in India, and was supported by the students (Altbach 1965). The mutiny helped to convince the British that their position in India was untenable, and they granted independence in 1947.

My interests moved beyond the role of students in the independence movement and into student organizations in the 1960s in Bombay, and I decided to include other contemporary groups in my dissertation. I interviewed student leaders from left to right, visited many of the colleges to examine student activities, and got a sense of higher education in the 1960s. Much to my amazement, doors were always open to a young graduate student from the United States interested in themes seldom studied by scholars. I attended the national conference of the Hindu nationalist Akhil Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad in Nagpur and numerous other meetings of groups from all parts of the political spectrum.

Indian students were active in the struggle for independence and were often considerably more militant than Mahatma Gandhi's nonviolent movement. After independence, students continued a tradition of activism—but generally without the sense of national purpose that characterized the independence movement. Student activism often moved to the campus, politicizing the colleges and universities and focusing on local conditions. In Bombay, activism ceased to be a major force, although from time to time students were enlisted in off-campus political movements. Political factions—from communist groups to right-wing Hindu nationalists—continued to be present among students.

While living in Bombay in 1964, I met Sachin Chowdhury, the founding editor of the *Economic Weekly*—later the *Economic and Political Weekly*—resulting in a 40-year relationship with that distinguished publication. I wrote brief news stories and editorials, summarizing stories from the *Economist, Time,* and other international publications that were of interest to an Indian audience. This exercise gave me invaluable training in writing succinctly and on deadline—skills that have proved invaluable over time.

I returned to Bombay in 1968 as a Fulbright Research Professor, again affiliated to the University of Bombay's sociology department. This time, my research focus was on higher education; and I researched the culture of the University of Bombay and its affiliated colleges, spending time on several of the colleges and again benefiting immensely from the cooperation of many academic colleagues. I was impressed at the time by the diversity of Indian higher education, the complexity of the system, and the importance attached to higher education by Indians. My research resulted in a short book, *The University in Transition: An Indian Case Study* (Altbach 1972). In addition, I edited several books relating to student political activism, including *Turmoil and Transition: Higher Education and Student Politics in India* (Altbach 1968c).

My research highlighted the complex relationships between the mainly undergraduate colleges and the University of Bombay and the often ignored variations among college cultures. The culture of Indian colleges is at the heart of the reality of higher education since the vast majority of students (and staff) are affiliated with India's more than, by 2013, 34,000 colleges (Altbach 1970a).

While in Bombay, due in part to my work at *Economic and Political Weekly* and also writing occasionally for *Times of India*, as well as due to my contacts with several Indian publishers, I became interested in the Indian publishing industry and how it worked. This research resulted in *Publishing in India: An Analysis*, published by Oxford University Press in Delhi in 1975 (Altbach 1975a). I also wrote a case study of publishing in the Marathi language (Altbach 1979). I think that this book was the first in-depth study of the Indian publishing industry, at the time one of the world's larger publishers of books in English.

My work on Indian higher education was immensely strengthened by colleagues in India and particularly by my collaboration with Suma Chitnis and Amrik Singh, both later distinguished vice chancellors and researchers on higher education. In 1979, with Suma Chitnis, I coedited *The Indian Academic Profession* (Chitnis and Altbach 1979). Chitnis and I also coedited *Higher Education Reform in India: Experience and Perspectives*, in 1993, based on research funded by the World Bank (Chitnis and Altbach 1993). I coedited with Amrik Singh *The Higher Learning in India*, one of the first full-scale analyses of higher education, published in 1974 (Singh and Altbach 1974).

Between 1964 and the 1970s I visited India almost annually. By the 1980s, my academic interests were less focused on India; and I was able to travel there less frequently, although I kept writing occasionally for the *Economic and Political Weekly* and other publications. In 2010, at the invitation of the Government of Kerala, I returned to India, and specifically to Kerala, for several weeks of intensive lecturing throughout the state and was introduced to the rich culture of southern India—a sharp contrast to the regions with which I was more familiar.

I suspect that I may be the only American researcher who has kept up a fairly steady interest in Indian higher education for half a century; few non-Indian scholars have a continuing interest in this topic. During the past several decades, I have contributed numerous articles to journals and magazines in India and the West, concerning Indian higher education. I have been particularly gratified to be able to contribute to the continuing debates about Indian higher education, through many op-ed articles in the *Hindu*, one of India's major national newspapers.

Over the years I have watched Indian postsecondary education expand tremendously, although I have been dismayed to see that the quality of the system as a whole has not improved—and perhaps has even deteriorated. I have been impressed by a few parts of the system, including some distinguished colleges that have managed, against all odds, to keep high standards of quality and of course the Indian Institutes of Technology and related specialized institutions. I have written that India's higher education system is "Tiny at the Top"—referring to India's very small quality sector but a very large and rather poor-quality university and college system (Altbach 2006). India's more than 600 universities and the 34,000 colleges that are affiliated to them are in desperate need of reform and upgrading. Until this happens, quality will remain modest to deficient. The proliferation of "deemed" universities—institutions, often private, given university status by acts of state or occasionally central government fiat—has, by and large, weakened the system as a whole.

I have valued my involvement with India over almost half a century and hope that I have contributed to a broader understanding of the problems and possibilities of Indian higher education (Agarwal 2012). Since I first arrived in India in 1964, I have found the country endlessly fascinating. Its complex culture, diverse ethnic and religious population, and perplexing societal and educational realities are the source of great interest. Indians may be uniquely open to letting curious foreigners have access to debates and data, and I have had the pleasure of making many good Indian friends and colleagues over the years. I have also had the unusual privilege of participating in some of the debates about higher education policy in India.

Students and Politics

No doubt, influenced by my experience in the American student movement and my research on Indian student activism, I pursued research on student politics—arguing that students, particularly in developing countries, in the mid-twentieth century were and, to some extent even now, are a potent political and educational force in many societies (Altbach 1966, 1970e; Lipset and Altbach 1967). In the aftermath of the global student activism of the 1960s and 1970s, there was considerable interest in understanding the nature of student movements and their role both in society and on campus (Altbach 1984, 1989a). It is clear that student activism has had more impact on society, including causing regime change, in developing countries than in the industrialized nations, although students on occasion have contributed to political change in the West. Not surprisingly, most of the research conducted about student political activism was published in the aftermath of the activist movements of the 1960s and 1970s. Much less analysis has appeared recently, although students remain a potent political force in many countries.

The history of student political activism remains largely unexplored, but is nonetheless of considerable importance (Altbach 1970d). Students, for example, were involved in the 1848 revolutions in Europe and the rise of nationalism (Altbach 1969), including to some extent in the rise of fascism and Nazism in Europe. The involvement of students in the struggle for Indian independence from the 1920s to independence in 1947 influenced student involvement in more recent decades (Altbach 1968b). Similarly, students were involved in independence movements in other Asian societies (Altbach 1970e). While students have never overthrown governments in Western countries as they have done in the developing world, students have been involved in political activism, and the history of that activism helped to shape the movements of the 1960s and beyond (Altbach 1973, 1997c).

Research on a peripheral aspect of the student movements of the period, the international student organizations that were enmeshed in Cold War politics, showed how student groups interacted across borders and how they were influenced by Cold War machinations (Altbach 1970c; Altbach and Uphoff 1973). While there was a good deal of international communication among student political organizations during the heyday of student activism, the fact is that student movements were

national in character, with little direct involvement from abroad. Ideas did spread across borders, but only in the broadest sense. The specific international student organizations, such as the Soviet-dominated International Union of Students and the pro-Western International Student Conference (ISC), had little influence on the struggles going on at the time. Both were, in fact, funded and largely influenced by the Soviet Union and the United States, respectively. The ISC, along with the US National Student Association, was exposed in 1967 for being funded by the Central Intelligence Agency and soon collapsed (Stern 1967).

I have come to believe that understanding the role of student movements at several key junctures in the development of higher education is central. As noted, the role of students in struggles for independence and against colonialism in the developing world was significant, and that involvement gave students a sense of power and legitimacy that lasted to the postindependence period. Students in many developing countries functioned as key political players and, in some cases where the ruling authorities were weak, managed to topple regimes, but never were able to take power themselves (Altbach 1984). In contrast, despite the powerful student movements in Europe and North America, students were never able to force governmental change, although they did influence policy in some areas, including in higher education. In Germany, for example, students influenced reforms that institutionalized for a time aspects of student involvement in university governance. After the 1970s, students in the developed world were no longer involved much in activist politics. In some developing countries, students remained sporadically involved in activism.

Research and Teaching, and Building Centers and Programs

I have had the good fortune to spend an academic career now approaching a half century, studying, researching, and teaching about aspects of higher education, mostly in an international perspective. While I have served as a department chair and in several other administrative roles, I have not held a position of senior leadership. I will describe briefly the progression of my career in part to illustrate a time, at least in the United States, when academic positions were relatively plentiful and mobility fairly easy.

My academic activities have always been grounded in research and graduate education—I have never taught undergraduates. I have been doctoral supervisor for 88 students at 3 universities and have been on many master's and doctoral committees at the universities where I have worked, as well as at several others. Former doctoral students have gone on to academic positions, in more than 20 countries, and many other key posts—including as ministers in several governments, staff members in a variety of nongovernmental organizations, and staff members at the World Bank, African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, UNESCO, and other agencies. I have always enjoyed working with graduate students and attempted to let them develop their own research foci, rather than try to shape their thinking or

methodology. I have never been skilled in building academic theories, and, perhaps as a result, I have always encouraged students to pursue detailed research and be guided by results.

While completing my dissertation in Chicago in 1965, I was invited by Professor Seymour Martin Lipset at Harvard University to join his research team as a postdoctoral researcher studying student political activism, mainly in developing countries. This research was, of course, directly related to my own interests, and I was delighted to accept this opportunity. I arrived in Cambridge, Massachusetts and had appointments in Harvard's Center for International Affairs and as a lecturer in the Graduate School of Education, where I taught a course on education and development. Marty Lipset, one of the world's most prominent sociologists, was a wonderful mentor. I learned from him the value of collecting a wide range of data and then trying to make sense of it without preconception. I enjoyed working with his team of doctoral students as well. I completed my dissertation and worked with Lipset on several books, including *Students in Revolt* (Lipset and Altbach 1967), and several bibliographies (Altbach 1970b, d).

Having completed my dissertation, I moved into the academic job market. American higher education was in its period of great expansion, and jobs were not difficult to find. Offers from two excellent midwestern universities materialized, and I joined the faculty of the School of Education at the University of Wisconsin–Madison in the fall of 1966 as an assistant professor. I was also appointed in the Department of Indian Studies and had an opportunity to teach courses both on comparative education and on South Asian education. Madison was building its comparative education program at the time. I was promoted to associate professor with tenure in 1968 and, at the age of 27, was one of the youngest tenured professors on the campus at the time. While at Wisconsin, I coedited *Academic Supermarkets*, a book about the university's challenges during the 1960s from a moderately critical perspective (Altbach et al. 1971). The book was widely ignored on campus, but I later met the chancellor while we were both in Malaysia, and he asked me why I had edited such a critical volume. Thank goodness for tenure.

In 1974, an offer to join the faculty of the State University of New York at Buffalo as a full professor with appointments in higher education and in social foundations of education lured me to Buffalo. I held a joint appointment in the School of Information and Library Studies and taught a course on international publishing. The position was a presidential professorship and I was encouraged to build up the graduate program in comparative education and establish a Comparative Education Center. With Gail P. Kelly, and later Lois Weis and Sheila Slaughter, all of whom had studied with me at the University of Wisconsin, and other colleagues, we built exciting programs in comparative and higher education. The comparative education program and the center attached to it became one of the strongest such programs in the United States during the 19 years I was on the Buffalo faculty. I became the editor of the *Comparative Education Review*, the major journal in the field, in 1978 and served in that role for a decade. At the end of my editorship, the center became the secretariat of the Comparative and International Education Society, with Gail P. Kelly as the CIES general secretary.

I moved to Boston College in 1994 to join the university's higher education program. Soon after arrival, I was appointed to the newly created Monan University Chair, a position I have held until my retirement in 2013. I proposed to President J. Donald Monan, S.J., that we establish a Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) in 1995, and the university agreed and provided support with additional funding from the Monan Chair. CIHE also benefited from 15 years of steady support from the Ford Foundation that ultimately totaled more than $1 million. Additional support for specific research projects and other programs has come from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, Rockefeller Foundation, MacArthur Foundation, Toyota Foundation, and others.

The research projects undertaken by the center dealt with a range of issues of interest to the center and our funders. Typically, a group of researchers were brought together to focus on a specific theme. The produced essays, which were discussed at a working editorial conference, were then revised and published as a book. Some of the research topics resulted in books: the rise of private higher education in global perspective (Altbach 2000), the academic profession in developing and middle-income countries (Altbach 2003), the emergence of Asian universities as key global academic institutions (Altbach and Umakoshi 2004), leadership for developing country universities (Altbach 2011), and several volumes concerning research universities in developing and emerging economies (Altbach and Balán 2007; Altbach and Salmi 2011).

The center has been closely tied to Boston College's master's and doctoral programs in higher education administration and has greatly benefited from the colleagueship of faculty in the program and also from outstanding doctoral students who have served as graduate assistants over the years. One of these students, James J.F. Forest, introduced me to the Internet in 1995, and through his efforts and additional expertise by many others, the center has had a robust Web site and other Internet resources ever since. Roberta Malee Bassett and Liz Reisberg served as managing editors of the *Review of Higher Education*, which I edited between 1996 and 2004. Damtew Teferra assisted with the Bellagio Publishing Network and initiated the International Network for Higher Education in Africa. He also obtained funding for the pioneering *African Higher Education: An International Reference Handbook* (Teferra and Altbach 2002).

Sensing in 1995 the emergence of an international consciousness in higher education, I established a quarterly publication, *International Higher Education*, to provide a forum for analysis and information concerning the rapidly expanding arena of international higher education. *IHE*, which recently published its 75th issue, has proved to be a valuable source of analysis worldwide. The concept of publishing short but authoritative articles by key experts has been successful. Busy experts are prepared to write short articles, and our audience of higher education leaders, government and organizational officials, and the research community finds short analytical articles useful. *IHE* now appears in Chinese, Russian, Spanish, and Portuguese. Discussions are in progress to expand to Arabic and Vietnamese. It is distributed in English as part of the *Deutsche Universitätszeitung*, the major publication for the German higher education community. *IHE* is distributed in paper and electronic editions.

The Shaping of Fields of Study

Two new academic fields—comparative education and higher education—and especially the international aspects of higher education have been of concern to me throughout my career (Altbach and Kelly 1986a). By editing prominent journals in these fields, *Comparative Education Review* and the *Review of Higher Education*, I have contributed to their development. I have also helped to create standard textbooks in both fields. In the field of comparative education, three volumes were widely cited for a period of time. These are *Comparative Education* (Altbach et al. 1982), *New Approaches to Comparative Education* (Altbach and Kelly 1986b), and *Emergent Issues in Education: Comparative Perspectives* (Arnove et al. 1992). These volumes were used in many courses on comparative education and helped to shape debates, at a time when the field of comparative education was rapidly expanding and the debate about whether the field was a "discipline" or a multidisciplinary field of study was actively discussed. The multidisciplinary advocates, with whom I was affiliated, prevailed (Altbach 1991b).

Even the field of higher education studies, although better established than comparative education, was relatively new. Coediting *American Higher Education in the 21st Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges* provided an opportunity to contribute to thinking about American higher education (Altbach et al. 2011). That book, now in its fifth edition (two with Prometheus Books and three with Johns Hopkins University Press), is the standard text in many courses on American higher education. The opportunity to edit the *Review of Higher Education* permitted me to contribute to shaping a key journal.

I have had the opportunity to be involved in the development of the "subfield" of international higher education just as the international dimension of university education became more central due to the impact of globalization and importance of the knowledge economy. Coediting *Higher Education Research at the Turn of the New Century: Structures, Issues, and Trends*, which surveyed key trends in the field, provided a benchmark for the field's development at the time (Sadlak and Altbach 1997). Two volumes of my essays on comparative higher education themes also made a contribution to the development of the field (Altbach 1998, 2007c). My involvement as North American editor of *Higher Education*, the pioneering international research journal in the field, between 1975 and 1996, permitted further involvement with an emerging field. Editing several book series on international higher education between 1977 and the present—from 1977 to 1984 with Praeger Publishers, 1985 to 1994 with Pergamon, and from 2005 to the present with Sense Publishers—provided an opportunity to contribute key work on global higher education.

Globalization and all of its ramifications contributed to the remarkable growth of the field during my professional lifetime. In 1970, I prepared *Higher Education in Developing Countries: A Select Bibliography* for the Harvard Center for International Affairs—it included just 1,600 entries (Altbach 1970b). The research literature dramatically expanded soon after that. Also in the 1970s, I served

as secretary for several conferences organized by the International Council for Educational Development (ICED), an early effort chaired by James Perkins to bring together senior university and policy leaders to think about the international implications of higher education policy and practice. The ICED found, for example, that there was little knowledge available about higher education systems and commissioned a series of short books on higher education in a dozen or so countries. Annual ICED conferences also produced several volumes focusing on higher education in a comparative framework (Altbach 1975b). In 1977, the first comprehensive encyclopedia on international higher education, in ten volumes, was published (Knowles 1977). At the time that UNESCO, the World Bank, and other international agencies were beginning to take an interest in postsecondary education, my book *International Higher Education: An Encyclopedia* provided an additional contribution (Altbach 1991a).

Since 1995, the Boston College Center for International Higher Education (CIHE) has played a role in expanding the knowledge base of international higher education through its conferences, books, and especially through *International Higher Education*. The center's Web site has also been a source of information and research on higher education, with a special focus on developing countries. Through articles in *IHE* and with the research that the center has sponsored over the past two decades, key issues have been illustrated.

Globally, the field has dramatically expanded. Two publications, the *International Directory of Higher Education Research Institutions* (Altbach 1981a) and *Higher Education: A Worldwide Inventory of Centers and Programs* (Altbach et al. 2007), traced the status of the field at two different times and illustrate how the field has grown and how it has developed in many parts of the world. The expansion of research and policy centers and institutes focusing on higher education in the past several decades has been unprecedented, indicating the importance of higher education in the era of massification and the knowledge economy. We also traced the development of degree programs aimed at training practitioners and researchers in higher education. Here, growth has been spotty—with most of the programs existing in the United States and in China—although expanding significantly in other parts of the world as it becomes clear that academic institutions need professional managers. As a contribution to the professionalization of academic administration and training academic leaders, I edited *Leadership for World-Class Universities: Challenges for Developing Countries* (Altbach 2011). The focus of this book is on perspectives needed for academic leadership—such as governance, strategic planning, and fund raising and financial management.

Circulation and Distribution of Knowledge

Academics and researchers create knowledge through research and analysis. They seldom consider the complexities of knowledge distribution. I have been interested, both as a practical matter and as an important intellectual theme, in issues relating

to knowledge circulation and distribution throughout my career. Both editing and publishing—and efforts to understand how these complex phenomena take place in the modern world—are central.

I was interested in these issues even as a student. I was on the staff of the *Chicago Maroon*, the student newspaper at the University of Chicago, which provided valuable experience in writing and editing. I also worked at the *Economic and Political Weekly* in India, again providing useful editorial training. As a student, I wrote for a variety of publications on issues relating to student politics and movements (Altbach 1963c).

A commitment to scholarly journals led me to editorial positions, to several of the top journals in my fields of expertise. I served as associate editor of the *Comparative Education Review*, generally acknowledged as the premier journal in its field, for several years in the 1970s, while on the faculty at the University of Wisconsin. In 1978, I later became the editor of the journal and served in that capacity for a decade. During that period, I convinced the board of the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) to move the *Review* to the University of Chicago Press, which provided professional publishing services, an arrangement that has been beneficial to both the journal and CIES for more than 40 years. The services of a professional publisher permitted the journal to transition easily to the digital age and provided valuable technical and financial services. While at Boston College, I served as editor of the *Review of Higher Education* (*RHE*), one of the top-three higher education journals in the United States, from 1996 to 2004. Again, I brought the journal from a self-published entity into a relationship with the Johns Hopkins University Press, which now publishes the journal, again enhancing the journal's professionalism. *RHE* was an original participant in Project MUSE, Hopkins' pioneering electronic platform, which increased both the impact of the journal and its income as well. I was also one of the founding editors of *Educational Policy* in 1985, along with colleagues at the State University of New York at Buffalo. *EP*, now published by SAGE, is an ISI-listed publication.

The publication of books in emerging fields, such as comparative education and higher education, is also quite important for legitimizing the field and providing an outlet for original scholarship and analysis. While there has been a revolution in knowledge transmission as a result of the digital age, books and monographs remain central to the knowledge production process, although produced and distributed now in different ways. Starting the early 1970s and continuing through 2013, I have served as editor of a number of book series that I have created for several publishers. The first of these was a book series on comparative education for Praeger Publishers, at the time managed by its founder, the legendary Frederick A. Praeger, one of the pioneers of scholarly publishing in the United States. I continued with that series after Praeger Publishers was absorbed by Greenwood Press, which itself became part of Elsevier in a series of acquisitions that characterized publishing in the latter twentieth century. Soon after coming to the State University of New York at Buffalo, I established "Frontiers in Education" at the SUNY Press. That series published more than 40 volumes until SUNY Press closed it down in the 1990s. In an effort to provide visibility for some of the best doctoral dissertations, I established "Studies in Higher Education: Dissertation Series" with RoutledgeFalmer publishers. This

series was later expanded to include nondissertation research-based volumes—40 dissertations were published over a decade. Most recently, "Global Perspectives on Higher Education" was started with SENSE Publishers. In all, some 200 books were produced in these various series. These volumes helped to build the research literature in international higher education and comparative education and provided outlets for scholarship that might not have existed otherwise as these fields were becoming legitimized as ones for analysis and as the research base expanded rapidly. Books and journals, particularly when appearing with respected publishers and in recognized journals, are central to the development of fields of study, particularly when these fields are new and multidisciplinary.

Another effort to contribute to the development of the field of higher education studies was editing two reference handbooks. Both are two-volume compendiums of key themes and chapters dealing with regions and countries. The purpose of these volumes was to bring together key analysis and research. The first, *International Higher Education: An Encyclopedia*, was published in 1991 and contributed to the development of the field of higher education studies (Altbach 1991a). The second, *International Handbook of Higher Education*, coedited with James J.F. Forest, was published in 2006 (Forest and Altbach 2006).

Translations

Almost by definition, research and publication concerning international higher education will be of global interest. Thus, publication in the field deserves worldwide circulation in languages other than English. Although English is today's main international language of scientific communication, it is not the only language, and many professionals and researchers in higher education do not have adequate fluency in English to access this scholarship. Many scholars prefer to read material in their own language. Assuming that the academic world is a monolingual English environment is not the case, even in a globalized environment.

I have paid careful attention to the translation and publication of my work into other languages and have had reasonable success in securing translated editions. *International Higher Education* appears in five languages. Many of the books I have written or edited have appeared in other languages including Spanish, French, Russian, Indonesian, Turkish, Japanese, and Arabic. Eighteen of my books have been translated into Chinese, several by Peking University Press and other leading Chinese publishers. The China Ocean University Press published a series of my books. Perhaps as a result of these translated editions, several master's and doctoral dissertations have been written about my work in China.

In most cases, the translations were undertaken on a commercial basis by publishers. In other instances, agencies such as the World Bank or UNESCO have sponsored the translations. It is not always easy to arrange for translated editions. Western publishers, and particularly the large multinational firms, sometimes do not respond to requests for translations and in some instances ask for unrealistic fees for

translation rights. Generally, both publishers and authors either do not consider translations important or measure the value of other language editions in purely commercial terms. The fact is that in a globalized world, the academic community needs to seriously consider knowledge dissemination in multiple languages.

Academic Journalism

Most academics eschew writing for popular audiences and, indeed, criticize colleagues who do as "popularizers." Indeed, there is often a price to be paid for interacting with the media. I have always thought that academics have a responsibility to communicate their ideas to a wider audience and to participate in public debate, a point emphasized by Ernest Boyer in *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer 1997). By translating academic knowledge and research into language easily understood by a wider audience and disseminating ideas and perspective in places with a wider circulation, it is possible to contribute to policy debates and intellectual life. Having been trained to write in a journalistic style for the *Economic and Political Weekly* and for publications and newspapers during my student movement days, I was able to write brief articles that make a point. For most of my career I have contributed opinion pieces, book reviews, and other analysis for newspapers and magazines worldwide. For almost two decades, I have contributed op-ed articles to the *Hindu*, one of India's main national newspapers, with a circulation in the millions. While in Buffalo, I wrote frequently for the *Buffalo News*. I have also published regularly in a Mexico City newspaper, *Milenio*, and for a time in the *Japan Times*, Japan's main English-language daily. I have also contributed articles to such publications as the *South China Morning Post* (Hong Kong), *Clarin* (Buenos Aires), and *Vedimosti* (Moscow).

I also contribute regularly to the higher education press, globally. I write regularly for *Times Higher Education* (London) and serve on their editorial board. I also contribute to *University World News*, an Internet-based weekly news source, and other publications.

In 2010, the Center for International Higher Education, at the initiative of Liz Reisberg, started a blog for *Inside Higher Education*, the online US-based daily news publication. The "World View" blog features the work of a network of internationally recognized bloggers from around the world, who write on current international higher education issues. I contribute regularly to the blog. Our effort is to bring analysis of contemporary themes to a wide audience through the Internet.

The Analysis of Publishing and Knowledge Distribution

I realized early on that the publishing industry is intertwined with higher education and the process of knowledge distribution. Without publishers, knowledge cannot reach an audience. In the age of the Internet, traditional publishing has been

significantly changed, but the business of knowledge processing and distribution remains of great importance. I was first introduced to the complexities of publishing when my doctoral dissertation, *Student Politics in Bombay* (Altbach 1968a), was published in India by the leading social science publisher of the day, Asia Publishing House. I was able to participate in the publishing process in the Indian context.

Publishers, journal editors, and others are key parts of knowledge networks everywhere. They are gatekeepers of knowledge and decide, through their publishing choices, what becomes "legitimate knowledge." Understanding the nature of publishing, editing, and knowledge distribution has significant implications for higher education and for scientific development (Altbach and Hoshino 1995). Publishers and journals in the developed countries traditionally controlled the key knowledge networks globally—with the gatekeepers in the top universities and prestigious publishing houses especially powerful. Researchers in developing countries are at a special disadvantage in this unequal relationship. *The Knowledge Context: Comparative Perspectives on the Distribution of Knowledge* provides an overview of many of the key issues (Altbach 1987).

Knowledge networks became increasingly complex in the latter years of the twentieth century, when multinational firms, such as Elsevier and Springer, purchased or established large numbers of journals and often raised prices for them. The advent of the digital age made things even more complicated and introduced new means of journal and book production and distribution, as well as possibilities for "open access" scholarship of many different kinds. The traditional publishers, with some difficulty, were able to cope with the new technologies. In addition, many new players have joined the system, creating journals and publishing books without regard to quality in order to earn profits.

Some of these new "publishers" have established hundreds of new journals and often charge authors to publish their articles with no review process. These publications are not taken seriously by the academic community but may confuse potential authors. Similarly, some book publishers publish doctoral dissertations and other works without regard to the quality of the product, do not provide editing or evaluation, and hope that a few unsuspecting libraries may purchase the volume. Digital technology and "print on demand" facilitate innovation, but technological advance does not always work to the benefit of the scientific community. Knowledge networks are increasingly confused.

India was, and remains, one of the largest publishers of books in English in the world, yet Indian publishers, even now, are not part of the global knowledge network. Further, many multinational publishers operate in India. Over the past several decades, India has become a center for editing and book and journal preparation, including copyediting, computer-based composing, and many of the "back-office" elements of publishing. My book, *Publishing in India: An Analysis* (Altbach 1975a), was the first full-scale discussion of Indian publishing.

Some of the largest and most prestigious publishers in India were, and remain, branches of large multinational firms, although with considerable autonomy. Indian-owned publishers tend, with a few notable exceptions, to be small and have problems sustaining themselves in a competitive marketplace. Publishing in Indian languages

tends to lag behind English-language publishing, to the detriment of possibilities for new journals and other printed products. As literacy increased and a middle class emerged that supported regional languages, a market for books and other publications in these languages emerged. India, with its large internal market, has a more vibrant publishing industry than most developing countries.

In an effort to assist publishing in Africa in particular and in developing countries generally, the Bellagio Publishing Network was established with the assistance of the Rockefeller Foundation. For a decade in the 1990s, I directed the Network that, in collaboration with the African Books Collective, published more than a dozen volumes of research and commentary on publishing and book distribution in Africa and the developing world. The purpose of these volumes was to assist publishers and others involved in book development to improve practice and understand the complexities of global publishing realities. Volumes dealing with copyright, feminist publishing, African publishing, journal publishing, and others appeared in "Bellagio Studies in Publishing." One of the key books in this series was *Publishing and Development in the Third World* (Altbach 1992). Our guide to publishing and development was also among the useful books published (Altbach and Teferra 1998). We also published *Bellagio Publishing Newsletter* quarterly, highlighting information and analysis concerning publishing issues in the context of developing countries.

Linking the practical aspects of publishing and knowledge distribution, such as the nurturing of journals in developing countries, is quite important. Research and analysis concerning publishing, knowledge distribution, and related themes, particularly as they affect higher education, is quite limited (Altbach 1985c). Now, in the digital age, understanding how journals and other aspects of knowledge distribution work is even more complex—and perhaps even more important in a globalized world.

Neocolonialism and Centers and Peripheries

Stemming from the more ideologically based scholarship of the 1960s, the realities of the Cold War, and research on higher education in developing countries, in the 1970s I wrote about the complex relationships between the developing countries of the Third World (as it was called then) and the industrialized nations (Altbach 1971). An influential article, "Servitude of the Mind? Education, Dependency, and Neocolonialism," was published in 1977 (Altbach 1977), which argued that educational relations and by implication other intellectual and political relations between the developing and industrialized nations were highly unequal and that these inequalities were the result of "natural" imbalances in wealth and academic strength on the one hand and of specific policies by the rich countries to maintain their influence—neocolonialism—on the other. Research on publishing and knowledge distribution in India contributed to this line of analysis—relating the various book and publishing programs financed by the Cold War powers in India, with the aim of influencing

opinion and perspectives, as well as other education initiatives. This article was one of the first that sought to tie natural inequalities to specific national policies and also to the politics of the Cold War. A broader analysis was provided in our edited volume, *Education and the Colonial Experience* (Altbach and Kelly 1984) and the earlier *Education and Colonialism*, both of which had some influence on the debates at the time (Altbach and Kelly 1978).

By linking center-periphery realities with specific policies of governments, it was possible to analyze the various forces influencing higher education and knowledge communication realities in developing countries. While center-periphery analysis was by no means a new tool, applying it to higher education and knowledge communication was original (Altbach 1981b, 1985a; Shils 1975). The larger developed nations—especially those that use English—tend to be most influential in terms of their academic institutions, the production of scientific knowledge in all fields, and editing and publishing influential journals. These countries host the large majority of international students. Their academic institutions tend to be most influential. In the twenty-first century, they dominate the Internet. Countries at the periphery tend to gravitate to one or more centers. Their universities are less influential and in recent decades do not score at the top of the global rankings of academic institutions (Altbach 2012). By applying the insights of the center periphery, it is possible to analyze the inequalities that are evident in global higher education.

Centrality is based on a variety of factors. Among them are language—using world languages in higher education and publishing, especially English, is of significance—the size of the academic system, a history of academic influence (the former colonial powers are at a considerable advantage), wealth and well-developed academic infrastructures, and others.

In the postcolonial world, it is possible to overcome peripheriality. Japan, in the years following World War II, has built a powerful and influential academic system, which does not use English. But it struggles with ways to be recognized globally. More recently, China has made considerable strides to join the front ranks of the top global academic systems (Altbach 2009). Even small countries, such as Singapore, have joined the ranks of mature academic systems. Nonetheless, they are still part of the international knowledge system, in which the major and largely English-using academic "powers" dominate.

Dependency, which takes its analytical roots from Marxist thought, argues that higher education institutions in developing countries are structurally dependent on the former colonial powers and other developed nations, because of the realities of global capitalism and the specific policies of the governments and multinational corporations of these countries. Developing countries find it difficult to break with these structures.

During the Cold War, the policies of the major protagonists (the United States and the Soviet Union) included many initiatives aimed at influencing higher education, intellectual life, publishing, and other aspects of culture and education. The "battle for hearts and minds" was very much part of the agenda. Further, in the period immediately following the end of colonialism, many of the former colonial powers were seen as trying to maintain their influence over their former colonies.

The term neocolonialism has been used to define the many initiatives that governments have used to gain, maintain, or enhance their influence abroad. While the term is mainly used as a critique of policies, careful analysis of specific instances may yield a more-balanced evaluation.

There are many examples of programs that may be referred to as neocolonialism by some analysts but as “foreign assistance” by others. Programs to translate university textbooks for developing countries, for example, can be evaluated in different ways (Altbach 1985b). The main scholarship programs sponsored by the American Fulbright program, the German DAAD, the British Council, and many others can also be analyzed in different ways. The Confucius Institutes, sponsored by the Chinese government, can be seen as “soft power diplomacy” or as efforts at neocolonialism.

With the end of the Cold War, governmental efforts to influence education and culture in other countries have slowed, but commercial interests have become the key elements. Multinational corporations in the knowledge business, such as publishers and information technology firms, play a key role in influencing developing and peripheral countries. Countries and academic institutions seek to expand their number of international students in large part to earn income from these students, but at the same time international student flows have cultural and educational implications.

If anything, globalization and information technology have led to increased international higher education relationships of many different kinds. What was once a matter of government policy and an aspect of the political struggles of the Cold War has become a much more complex phenomenon that is central to the realities of the twenty-first century.

Global Trends: Massification, Systems, and the Knowledge Economy

I have argued that the driving force and dominating reality of contemporary higher education is massification—the dramatic expansion of enrollments that began in Europe in the 1960s and has since spread worldwide (Altbach 1999; Altbach et al. 2009). Only North America was educating more than 30 % of its age cohort at the mid-twentieth century. Enrollments expanded dramatically, reaching 200 million by 2012. Huge inequalities in access continue—with much of Africa enrolling under 10 % of the age group, while most of the industrialized countries educate 60 % or more of their young people. The two largest higher education systems in the world, China and India, respectively, enrolled 22 and 13 % of the age group in 2012; and both have plans to expand access significantly (Altbach et al. 2009).

The implications of massification are fundamental. Among them is the rise of the private sector. Private higher education is the fastest-growing part of postsecondary education; increasing inequalities in academic systems as the bottom of the system seeks to provide access while the top is increasingly selective. These factors have

led to a likely overall deterioration of standards at the bottom, severe fiscal constraints, stress on the academic profession, and other problems (Altbach 1999). All countries are affected by massification, although they move through the process from elite to mass and then to universal access to higher education at different rates and with somewhat different implications (Trow 2006).

Massification has also contributed to growing inequalities in academic systems worldwide. Mass access at the bottom of the system has resulted in a proliferation of relatively modest or poor-quality postsecondary institutions. At the same time, the demands of an increasingly sophisticated global knowledge economy have created increasingly selective and high-quality universities at the top of the system.

One of the results of massification has been the growth of the private sector, much of it for-profit, globally. Indeed, private higher education is the fastest-growing part of higher education in the world. Parts of the world that were at one time dominated by public universities now have a majority of their students in private institutions—including most of Latin America, Indonesia, and some others. Much of the new private sector is for-profit. Most private postsecondary institutions are "demand absorbing" and of relatively low quality, although there is a small but growing sector of high-quality private universities (Altbach 2000). This emerging sector requires careful quality-assurance systems, and many developing countries have only limited capacity to supervise the private sector.

The advent of the knowledge economy has also created a demand for internationally linked high-quality research universities—a phenomenon discussed in the next section. As seemingly contradictory trends, for mass access at the bottom and elite institutions at the top, has led in many countries to the creation of academic systems having differentiated institutions with specific mission and foci. Indeed, such differentiation is necessary for a country to serve the increasingly diverse student population.

At the same time that massification was transforming higher education, through massive increases in enrollments and the manifold challenges that entailed, a global knowledge economy emerged that placed emphasis on the "top" of the higher education system—universities and other institutions with the infrastructures and capabilities to deal with a globalized economy and the research and training needs of highly qualified professionals. These elite institutions often hire staff from an international labor market and educate students from many countries.

Massification and the global knowledge economy necessitated the differentiation of academic institutions and in many countries the creation of academic systems with institutions serving different missions and societal needs (Altbach 1999; Task Force on Higher Education and Society 2000). In many countries, there were typically binary academic systems, with nonuniversity and mainly vocational institutions in one category, and universities, all of which had a significant research mission, in another. In a mass higher education environment and in more complex economies, more kinds of academic institutions were needed to serve different purposes—a differentiated academic system. Such systems necessarily include a small number of research universities at the top

but also larger numbers of universities focusing on teaching and perhaps more vocational in orientation, nonuniversity postsecondary institutions, and specialized schools, as well. An example of such a system is the public higher education arrangement in California, but there are many other examples. Despite the logic of such systems, it has been quite difficult for many countries to create them. Historical traditions, competing interests, dispersed policy authority, and other factors present significant obstacles.

Research Universities and Development

Universities, through their research, teaching, and service, have long been responsible for development as well as education for centuries. Universities in developing countries and emerging economies play key roles in national development (Altbach 1989b). *Scientific Development and Higher Education: The Case of Newly Industrializing Nations* was an early effort to analyze the role that universities can play in emerging research cultures. Cases from South Korea, Malaysia, Singapore, and Taiwan were presented in an effort to understand how research cultures in universities can be created (Altbach et al. 1989).

Research universities stand at the pinnacle of any academic system. Since the research university was developed by Wilhelm von Humboldt at the beginning of the nineteenth century in Germany, the institution has continued to evolve. The American version added the idea of service to society to the original Humboldtian model. They are the main producers of knowledge and link most directly to international knowledge networks. These institutions educate most of the academic profession, and produce most of the research, including both basic and applied. Although research universities constitute only a small part of most contemporary academic systems, they are of great importance (Altbach and Salmi 2011; Salmi 2009). The role of these key institutions consists of special importance in developing and emerging economies—and is often poorly understood as well (Altbach and Balán 2007). I have argued that most countries require at least one research university—particularly developing countries—in order to participate in the global knowledge economy, to bring relevant research to the nation, and to educate the "best and brightest" in the home country (Altbach 2007b).

Building and sustaining research universities are complex. They require larger expenditures than teaching-focused institutions. Their academic staff must be highly qualified and internationally linked. Students must also be carefully selected. These institutions will inevitably do a significant part of their work in English—the global academic medium—even if they do not offer teaching in English (Altbach 2007a). Creating "world-class" research universities is not an easy task in any country and is particularly daunting in developing and emerging economies. Among the challenges are creating an appropriate academic culture, sustained financial support, effective governance, and others (Salmi 2009).

Globalization and Internationalization

Universities have always been international institutions. In the medieval period, Latin was the common language of instruction and scholarship among European universities. Both students and professors came from many countries. The contemporary period has seen the expansion of the international nature of higher education in unprecedented ways. Further, globalization has brought the international role of universities to prominence and has greatly expanded the scope of campus internationalization. The traditional mobility of students has expanded to include widespread faculty mobility and the creation of a global academic profession. Branch campuses, cross-border initiatives, and twinning arrangements have greatly expanded the institutional reach of institutions (Altbach 2007c; Altbach and Knight 2007; Altbach and Teichler 2001). Student and faculty mobility was and, to some extent, remain the core of international academic relations (Altbach 1986; Altbach et al. 1985). Push and pull factors relating to global student mobility were identified in an effort to explain why students chose to study abroad—and what the consequences of the experience meant. Themes such as the "brain drain" and the common choices of students to link study abroad to migration are central to understanding what is by the twenty-first century a common phenomenon.

An element of globalization has been the establishment of international rankings of universities (Altbach 2012). The two major somewhat reliable rankings, the Academic Ranking of World Universities at the Shanghai Jiao Tong University and the *Times Higher Education* rankings, focus mainly or exclusively on research productivity and ignore other key parts of the work of universities. Further, because of their methodologies, they privilege academic institutions in the developed world. Few developing country or emerging economy universities are high in the rankings. Yet, the rankings play a significant role in determining which universities are most prestigious and at the "center" of the academic universe.

My perspective on globalization and internationalization is to analyze this phenomenon, at least in part, from the perspectives of the developing world and to point the inherent inequalities evident in many aspects of international academic relations (Altbach 2004). This analysis is directly related to linking globalization to center-periphery relationships and even to elements of dependency. Developing countries not only lack the funds necessary to compete at the top levels of science, but their universities generally lack the required infrastructure. The academic profession may not have the required training. In short, the global "playing field" is far from equal. Many authors simply point to the positive aspects of international academic relations—a wider perspective is needed.

The Academic Profession

Without a well-educated and committed academic profession, quality is impossible in higher education. Analyzing the academic profession has been a continuing research interest, in part because of the centrality of the professoriate. I have had a

special focus on developing countries. Massification has contributed to the expansion and also to the deterioration of working conditions for the professoriate in much of the world and particularly in many developing countries (Altbach 2003). Yet, as we found in the first international study of the attitudes of academics in 14 countries, undertaken by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 1995, academics in most countries remained fairly positive about their profession (Altbach 1997b). We later looked at academic salaries, contracts, and careers in 28 countries in *Paying the Professoriate* (Altbach et al. 2012). That research found significant variations in salary levels among the case-study countries and glaring inequalities both within nations and among them. Clearly, countries at the bottom of the salary rankings will have a difficult time building top-quality research universities. Research on the academic profession in China and India found significant variations in the world's two largest academic systems, although surprisingly academic salaries are higher in India than in China (Altbach and Jayaram 2006).

As with higher education trends, generally, the academic profession has become more differentiated. A small elite in almost every country is part of a global academic labor market. These academics produce most of the published research, hold doctoral degrees (in much of the world the majority of academics do not have doctorates), and tend to be globally mobile. While it is increasingly difficult to attract the "best and brightest" to the academic profession in all countries, working conditions and salaries tend to be better for this small elite, although even among this group there has been a deterioration. For much of the profession globally, salaries and conditions of work leave much to be desired. Academics are increasingly employed part time and have little or no security of tenure.

Almost everywhere, academics have lost power and authority in the management of postsecondary institutions. Universities have become large bureaucracies and the sense of academic community that existed in many institutions has been weakened. The concept of shared governance, which had traditionally been widely accepted among the better American colleges and universities, has been weakened in many of them, and power has shifted to administrators. The European tradition of domination by senior professors was weakened during the student revolts of the 1960s and no longer seems to be effective in the era of massification. Politics has intervened in academic affairs in some developing countries (Altbach 2003). The twentieth century saw the professionalization of the academic profession and the rise of faculty power. The twenty-first century, despite the increased importance of the academic profession in delivering higher education to the masses and at the same time functioning key players in the global knowledge economy, seems to be marked by a weakening of the professorial role.

Conclusion

For more than half a century, I have been fascinated by the academic enterprise. I was convinced early on that postsecondary education is not only an interesting field of research but is a central part of modern society. Based on my graduate training as

well as on experience, I took on specific elements of higher education for research and study over time. Students, the academic profession, the role of the university in society, the process of knowledge creation and transmission, and the research university have been at the core of my research foci over time. I was especially interested in these phenomena in the context of developing countries—seeking to illustrate the inequalities that exist in global higher education (Altbach 1989b).

Key developing countries that had been peripheral in global higher education, most notably China and India, became major parts of the global higher education system (Altbach 2009). The BRIC countries have taken their places as key academic powers globally (Altbach et al. 2013).

Globalization caught up with me at the end of the twentieth century, when many of the themes that I had been researching, such as global student and faculty mobility, suddenly hit the front pages of newspapers and, in keeping with the rise of the Internet, the subject of Web sites. The perspective of center-periphery analysis lent itself well to understanding higher education globalization. International higher education moved from the concerns of a few specialists to a topic of wide interest and of growing policy relevance. *International Higher Education* and the various research projects and books, with which I have been associated over time, have illustrated some of the key issues facing higher education in a globalized world and have attracted more interest as a result of the centrality of the global higher education involvement.

Acknowledgments Thanks to Edith Hoshino Altbach for careful editing and to Liz Reisberg for editorial suggestions.

References

Agarwal, P. (Ed.). (2012). *A half-century of Indian higher education: Essays by Philip G. Altbach*. New Delhi: Sage.

Altbach, P. G. (1963a, October). James B. Conant: Educator. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *45*, 11–12.

Altbach, P. G. (1963b, October). Japanese students and Japanese politics. *Comparative Education Review, 7*, 181–189.

Altbach, P. G. (1963c, August 5). The quiet campus. *New Leader*, 12–14.

Altbach, P. G. (1965, July 27). The Bombay naval mutiny. *Opinion, 6*, 40–45.

Altbach, P. G. (1966, June). Students and politics. *Comparative Education Review, 10*, 17–87.

Altbach, P. G. (1968a). *Student politics in Bombay*. Bombay: Asia Publishing House.

Altbach, P. G. (1968b, Winter). Student politics and higher education in India. *Daedalus, 97*, 254–273.

Altbach, P. G. (1968c). *Turmoil and transition: Higher education and student politics in India*. New York/Bombay: Basic Books/Lalvani Publishing House.

Altbach, E. H. (1969). Vanguard of revolt: Students and politics in Central Europe, 1815–1848. In S. M. Lipset & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *Students in revolt* (pp. 451–474). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Altbach, P. G. (1970a, October). Bombay colleges. *Minerva, 8*, 520–540.

Altbach, P. G. (1970b). *Higher education in developing countries: A select bibliography*. Cambridge, MA: Center for International Affairs, Harvard University.

Altbach, P. G. (1970c). The international student movement. *Journal of Contemporary History, 5*(1), 156–174.
Altbach, P. G. (1970d). *A select bibliography on students, politics and higher education*. Cambridge, MA: Center for International Affairs, Harvard University.
Altbach, P. G. (1970e, March). Student movements in historical perspective: The Asian case. *Youth and Society, 1*, 333–357.
Altbach, P. G. (1971, May). Education and neocolonialism. *Teachers College Record, 72*, 543–558.
Altbach, P. G. (1972). *The university in transition: An Indian case study*. Cambridge, MA/Bombay: Schenkman/Lalvani Publishing House.
Altbach, P. G. (1973, December). The National Student Association in the fifties: Flawed conscience of the silent generation. *Youth and Society, 5*, 184–211.
Altbach, P. G. (1975a). *Publishing in India: An analysis*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (1975b). *The university's response to societal demands*. New York: International Council for Educational Development.
Altbach, P. G. (1977, December). Servitude of the mind? Education, dependency and neocolonialism. *Teachers College Record, 79*, 197–204.
Altbach, P. G. (1979). Book publishing in a developing regional culture: The case of Maharashtra, India. *International Social Science Journal, 31*(2), 328–340.
Altbach, P. G. (1981a). *International directory of higher education research institutions*. Paris: UNESCO.
Altbach, P. G. (1981b, Summer). The university as center and periphery. *Teachers College Record, 82*, 601–621.
Altbach, P. G. (1984, November). Student politics in the Third World. *Higher Education, 13*, 635–655.
Altbach, P. G. (1985a). Center and periphery in knowledge distribution: The case of India. *International Social Science Journal, 37*(1), 109–118.
Altbach, P. G. (1985b). *Publishing in the Third World: Knowledge and development*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
Altbach, P. G. (1985c, April). The role and nurturing of journals in the Third World. *Scholarly Publishing*, *16*, 211–222.
Altbach, P. G. (1986, Summer). The foreign student dilemma. *Teachers College Record, 87*, 589–610.
Altbach, P. G. (1987). *The knowledge context: Comparative perspectives on the distribution of knowledge*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (1989a). *Student political activism: An international reference handbook*. New York: Greenwood.
Altbach, P. G. (1989b). Twisted roots: The Western impact on Asian higher education. *Higher Education, 18*(1), 9–29.
Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (1991a). *International higher education: An encyclopedia* (2 Vols.). New York: Garland.
Altbach, P. G. (1991b, August). Trends in comparative education. *Comparative Education Review*, *35*, 491–507.
Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (1992). *Publishing and development in the Third World*. Oxford: Hans Zell Publishers.
Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (1997a). *Edward Shils: The order of learning: Essays on the contemporary university*. New Brunswick: Transaction.
Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (1997b). *The international academic profession: Portraits from twelve countries*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation.
Altbach, P. G. (1997c). Research on higher education: Global perspectives. In J. Sadlak & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *Higher education research at the turn of the new century: Structures, implications, and trends* (pp. 4–23). New York: Garland.
Altbach, P. G. (1997d). *Student politics in America: A historical analysis.* New Brunswick: Transaction. (Originally published in 1974)

Altbach, P. G. (1998). *Comparative higher education*. Norwood: Ablex.
Altbach, P. G. (1999, Spring). The logic of mass higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management, 10*, 107–124.
Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (2000). *Private Prometheus: Private higher education and development in the 21st century*. Greenwich: Greenwood.
Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (2003). *The decline of the guru: The academic profession in middle-income and developing countries*. New York: Palgrave.
Altbach, P. G. (2004). Globalization and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management, 10*(1), 3–25.
Altbach, P. G. (2006, August). Tiny at the top. *Wilson Quarterly*, 49–51
Altbach, P. G. (2007a, September 8). The imperial tongue: English as the dominating academic language. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 3608–3611.
Altbach, P. G. (2007b). Peripheries and centers: Research universities in developing countries. *Higher Education Management and Policy, 19*(2), 1–23.
Altbach, P. G. (2007c). *Tradition and transition: The international imperative in higher education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
Altbach, P. G. (2009). One-third of the globe: The future of higher education in China and India. *Prospects*, 15–27.
Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (2011). *Leadership for world-class universities: Challenges for developing countries*. New York/London: Routledge.
Altbach, P. G. (2012, January–February). The globalization of college and university rankings. *Change*, 26–31.
Altbach, P. G., & Balán, J. (Eds.). (2007). *World class worldwide: Transforming research universities in Asia and Latin America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Altbach, P. G., & Hoshino, E. S. (1995). *International book publishing: An encyclopedia*. New York: Garland.
Altbach, P. G., & Jayaram, N. (2006, October). Confucius and the guru: The changing status of the academic profession in China and India. *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration, 20*, 395–410.
Altbach, P. G., & Kelly, G. P. (Eds.). (1978). *Education and colonialism*. New York: David McKay.
Altbach, P. G., & Kelly, G. P. (Eds.). (1984). *Education and the colonial experience*. New Brunswick: Transaction.
Altbach, P. G., & Kelly, G. (Eds.). (1986a, February). Comparative education: Challenge and response. *Comparative Education Review*, *30*, 89–107.
Altbach, P. G., & Kelly, G. P. (Eds.). (1986b). *New approaches to comparative education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007, Fall–Winter). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3–4), 274–290.
Altbach, P. G., & Salmi, J. (Eds.). (2011). *The road to academic excellence: The making of world-class research universities*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
Altbach, P. G., & Teferra, D. (Eds.). (1998). *Publishing and development: A book of readings*. New Delhi: Vistaar.
Altbach, P. G., & Teichler, U. (2001). Internationalization and exchanges in a globalized university. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 5*(1), 5–25.
Altbach, P. G., & Umakoshi, T. (Eds.). (2004). *Asian universities: Historical perspectives and contemporary challenges*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Altbach, P. G., & Uphoff, N. (1973). *The student internationals*. Metuchen: Scarecrow Press.
Altbach, P. G., Laufer, R. S., & McVey, S. (Eds.). (1971). *Academic supermarkets: A critical case study of a multiversity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Altbach, P. G., Arnove, R., & Kelly, G. P. (Eds.). (1982). *Comparative education*. New York: Macmillan.
Altbach, P. G., Kelly, D. H., & Lulat, Y. G. M. (1985). *Research on foreign students and international study: An overview and bibliography*. New York: Praeger.

Altbach, P. G., Davis, C. H., Eisemon, T. O., Gopinathan, S., Steve Hsieh, J., Lee, S., Fong, P. E., & Singh, J. S. (1989). *Scientific development and higher education: The case of newly industrializing nations*. New York: Praeger.

Altbach, P. G., Bozeman, L. A., Janashia, N., & Rumbley, L. E. (2007). *Higher education: A worldwide inventory of centers and programs*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Altbach, P. G., Gumport, P., & Berdahl, R. O. (Eds.). (2011). *American higher education in the 21st century*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., Yudkevich, M., Androushchak, G., & Pacheco, I. F. (Eds.). (2012). *Paying the professoriate: A global comparison of compensation and contracts*. New York: Routledge.

Altbach, P. G., Androushchak, G., Kuzminov, Y., Yudkevich, M., & Reisberg, L. (Eds.). (2013). *The global future of higher education and the academic profession: The BRICs and the United States*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Arnove, R., Altbach, P. G., & Kelly, G. P. (Eds.). (1992). *Emergent issues in education: Comparative perspectives*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1997). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities for the professoriate*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Chitnis, S., & Altbach, P. G. (Eds.). (1979). *The Indian academic profession: Crisis and change in the teaching community*. Delhi: Macmillan.

Chitnis, S., & Altbach, P. G. (Eds.). (1993). *Higher education reform in India: Experience and perspectives*. New Delhi: Sage.

DeBenedetti, C. (1990). *An American ordeal: The antiwar movement of the Vietnam era*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Forest, J. J. F., & Altbach, P. G. (Eds.). (2006). *International handbook of higher education* (2 Vols.). Dordrecht: Springer.

Gitlin, T. (1993). *The sixties: Years of hope, days of rage*. New York: Bantam.

Knowles, A. (Ed.). (1977). *International encyclopedia of higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lipset, S. M., & Altbach, P. G. (Eds.). (1967). *Students in revolt*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Miles, B. (2006). *Peace: 50 years of protest*. Pleasantville: Reader's Digest.

Sadlak, J., & Altbach, P. G. (Eds.). (1997). *Higher education research at the turn of the new century: Structures, implications, and trends*. New York: Garland.

Salmi, J. (2009). *The challenge of establishing world-class universities*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Shils, E. (1975). *Center and periphery: Essays in macrosociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Singh, A., & Altbach, P. G. (Eds.). (1974). *The higher learning in India*. Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.

Stern, S. (1967, March). CIA: NSA—A short account of international student politics and the Cold War. *Ramparts, 5*, 29–39.

Task Force on Higher Education and Society. (2000). *Higher education in developing countries: Peril and promise*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Teferra, D., & Altbach, P. G. (Eds.). (2002). *African higher education: An international reference handbook*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Trow, M. (2006). Part 1: Reflections on the transition from elite to mass to universal access: Forms and phases of higher education in modern societies since World War II. In J. J. F. Forest & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education* (pp. 243–280). Dordrecht: Springer.

Chapter 2
Advancing an Intersectionality Framework in Higher Education: Power and Latino Postsecondary Opportunity

Anne-Marie Núñez

The racial/ethnic diversity of the US population has increased significantly in the past decades. The Latino population has grown at an especially high rate, with Latinos becoming the largest non-White population as of 2000 and expected to double as a share of the population from 16 % in the year 2010 to 30 % by 2050 (Pew Hispanic Center 2008). Latinos' college enrollment and degree attainment, however, has not kept pace with their growth in the population. Although they constitute the largest, fastest-growing, and youngest segment of the population, Latinos continue to have the lowest postsecondary attainment among large racial/ethnic groups (e.g., Contreras 2011). Therefore, diverse agencies such as the American Enterprise Institute (Kelly et al. 2010) and President Obama's administration (US Department of Education 2011) have agreed that increasing Latino postsecondary attainment is essential to sustain the economic and social well-being of US residents.

That Latinos' postsecondary attainment continues to be lower relative to their representation in the population constitutes a social inequity that some have termed an educational crisis (Gándara and Contreras 2009). Understanding how postsecondary institutional practices and policies positively and negatively shape Latino college students' outcomes is essential to transforming this inequitable situation (e.g., Bensimon and Malcom 2012; Hurtado et al. 2012; Solórzano et al. 2005). Fortunately, much higher education research has been conducted, particularly in the past two decades, to address Latino higher education access and success (e.g., Contreras 2011; Núñez et al. 2013). Higher education access and success as defined in this research synthesis includes longitudinal outcomes ranging across the areas of college preparation, enrollment, achievement, and attainment (Perna and Thomas 2008).

A.-M. Núñez, Ph.D. (✉)
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, University of Texas at San Antonio,
One UTSA Circle, San Antonio, TX 78249-0654, USA
e-mail: annemarie.nunez@utsa.edu

M.B. Paulsen (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research: Volume 29*,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-017-8005-6_2, © Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2014

Purpose of the Research Synthesis

One of the aspects that make studying Latino postsecondary access and success challenging is the variation among Latinos in social categories including, but not limited to, (a) nation of origin, (b) immigrant status, (c) class, (d) gender, (e) sexuality, (f) religion, and (g) language fluency (e.g., Núñez et al. 2013; Torres 2004). When considering various social categories, Latinos are arguably the most diverse group among racial/ethnic groups in the USA (Tyler et al. 2008). As Latinos continue to outpace other racial/ethnic groups in the general population and the youth population growth, it is becoming more critical for higher education researchers to attend to variations among Latinos according to multiple social identity categories with respect to college access and success and how different social contexts shape access and success (Covarrubias 2011; Núñez et al. 2013; Ruiz Alvarado and Hurtado 2013). This task is important not only to enhance our understanding of Latinos' experiences in higher education, but also to inform practices and policies to promote Latino college access and success.

In this research synthesis, I review current education literature that addresses questions of how multiple social identities and societal contexts shape Latino college access and success. I argue that the conceptual lens of intersectionality—first developed in legal studies (Crenshaw 1991) and subsequently applied in fields as diverse as feminist studies, sociology, and political science (Cho et al. 2013)—provides a useful conceptual approach to guide inquiry about how variation in social identities and societal contexts constrains or supports Latino college access and success. The concept of intersectionality originated in Critical Race Feminist legal scholarship on how the status of women is shaped simultaneously by their status as women and as racial/ethnic minorities (e.g., Crenshaw 1991). Around this time, Patricia Hill Collins (1990) advanced an intersectional perspective in sociology and feminist studies as a lens for recognizing that individuals could simultaneously hold marginalized and privileged identities and that both kinds of identities could be salient in the process of navigating various social contexts and systems of interlocking oppression, such as those of racism and sexism.

An intersectionality approach recognizes a "matrix of domination" (Collins 1990) of broader interlocking systems of power and oppression—including racism, sexism, classism, nativism, and others—that play out in higher education institutions (Smith 2009). In this research synthesis, I review literature from both higher education and other disciplines that has employed intersectionality. I explore intersectionality as a perspective that has informed higher education research and identify limitations in its application to higher education research. I relate these limitations to other conversations taking place in disciplines, such as legal studies, feminist studies, and sociology, about intersectionality's capacity to study how interlocking systems of power and privilege influence the life chances of those from historically underserved groups in society (e.g., Anthias 2013; Bonilla-Silva 2013; Cho et al. 2013).

Following Cooper (1988), one goal of this research synthesis is to use intersectionality as a guiding conceptual framework to integrate the research literature on Latinos that addresses the role of multiple social identities and societal contexts of

power, privilege, and marginalization that contribute to reproduction of educational inequities. A related goal of this synthesis is to explore how and to what extent this literature accounts for dynamics of privilege and oppression that shape such inequities. Accordingly, I draw on multidisciplinary literature about intersectionality to critique existing higher education literature with respect to addressing dynamics of privilege and oppression that enhance or limit Latino college access and success. Drawing on this body of literature about intersectionality, I also propose a more expansive conceptual framework for addressing societal power dynamics in higher education. The central question guiding this research synthesis is: How can higher education research be expanded to incorporate attention to interlocking systems of oppression that contribute to social reproduction of inequities in postsecondary educational outcomes, particularly in the case of Latinos?

I begin this chapter by discussing the approach to the research synthesis. I continue with a discussion of the conceptual lens of intersectionality, including its intellectual background, definitions, and limitations as identified in other fields. Subsequently, I discuss how intersectionality has been applied in higher education research and its limitations, which reflect the limitations of the application of intersectionality as identified in other disciplines. This discussion entails addressing how the concept of power has been understudied and underspecified in higher education (Pusser and Marginson 2012). Having limited conceptual tools to study higher education societal, institutional, or organizational power dynamics engenders a condition in research that makes it all too easy to study the role of individuals, rather than institutions, in creating inequities and to ascribe inequities in educational outcomes not to inequities in educational opportunities or the practices that perpetuate these inequities, but to the perceived shortcomings of the individuals themselves and the social identity groups in which they hold membership (Bensimon and Bishop 2012; Zuberi 2001).

Next, I discuss how current higher education research can be applied to understand Latino college access and success through an intersectionality lens. Having identified the conceptual limits of intersectionality, I identify the empirical limits of current research on how multiple social identities, institutional and societal contexts, and related interlocking systems of privilege and oppression affect Latino college access and success. Then I propose a more expanded framework of intersectionality for higher education scholars who want to employ this conceptual lens, using the case of Latino college access and success to illustrate the meaning and utility of the framework. Finally, I discuss implications of this framework for future higher education research and practice.

Research Synthesis Approach

To conduct this research synthesis, I reviewed several bodies of literature within the field of higher education as well as other disciplines. This literature addressed Latino college access and success, intersectionality and higher education, and

intersectionality in other disciplines, including research that used an intersectionality lens to address Latino identities and societal opportunities beyond the field of education. First, to explore of how extant literature on Latinos in higher education fully addresses dynamics of social reproduction related to multiple social identities, I used keywords such as "Latino," "intersectionality," "race," "ethnicity," "class," and "gender" to conduct a search for studies in peer-reviewed higher education journals, general education journals, and specialized journals on Latinos or diversity in education that addressed the roles of multiple identities and institutional or societal contexts in Latino college access and success. These higher education journals included four considered by higher education scholars to be in the top tier of publications (*Journal of Higher Education*, *Review of Higher Education*, *Research in Higher Education*, *Journal of College Student Development*) as well as others that scholars report using widely, such as those in the *New Directions for Institutional Research* and *New Directions for Student Services* series (Bray and Major 2011).

In addition, I searched for research in more specialized journals that focus on racial/ethnic and other social identities, particularly of Latinos. These journals included the *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, *Journal of Latinos and Education*, and *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. I also reviewed more generalist journals in educational research most likely to publish research about the roles of social and institutional identities in shaping college outcomes, including the *American Educational Research Journal*, *Harvard Educational Review*, and *Teachers College Record*. Finally, I also consulted books, book chapters, monographs in the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) series, reports, conference papers, and dissertations, because these kinds of sources could address theory and research in its developing stages and reveal more emergent themes, particularly in the realm of intersectionality, which, as noted, is a conceptual lens that is still being refined in its application to social inquiry (e.g., Anthias 2013; Cho et al. 2013). To sharpen further the conceptual tools to understand the relationships between Latino identities, social contexts, and societal inequities, I also drew on theoretical and research sources in fields beyond education that addressed intersectionality conceptually or employed an intersectionality perspective to understand Latino identities and life economic opportunities. These fields included legal studies, feminist studies, ethnic studies, sociology, linguistics, philosophy, and political science.

Literature on Intersectionality in Relation to Latino College Access and Success

With the exception of a few sources (e.g., Covarrubias 2011; Núñez and Murakami-Ramalho 2011; Ramírez 2013), most educational research I reviewed about Latino college and access and success did not explicitly use intersectionality as a conceptual framework. However, several studies addressed intersectional themes of the roles of multiple social identities and social contexts in shaping Latinos' postsecondary educational experiences and outcomes. My preliminary sorting and review of the literature suggested that existing studies of Latino college access and success addressing

intersectional themes were focused more on describing commonalities and differences in Latino college access and success according to various social identities than on the institutional dynamics and systemic contexts shaping college access and success. I will revisit this point later in this chapter when I examine these studies more specifically.

Intersectionality and Higher Education

Because of the limited higher education studies employing intersectionality as a lens to address Latino college access and success, I also reviewed higher education research to understand more generally the role of multiple social identities and institutional contexts in shaping college access and success. In addition, while the focus of this research synthesis was college student access and success, I expanded my search to include studies of faculty, to gain a better sense of how scholars in higher education have employed intersectionality to explore dynamics of privilege and oppression in shaping inclusion or exclusion of different higher education stakeholders. When I expanded my search, I found that, similar to my preliminary findings regarding Latino college access and success, there was more empirical literature that focused on the descriptions of how multiple social identities influence agents' experiences within higher education, but less on how actors in higher education institutions themselves perpetuate dynamics of privilege or oppression. This reflected a state of scholarship in higher education that Pusser and Marginson (2012) have identified as a lack of specification of the concept of power, a point I examine in more detail later in the chapter.

Intersectionality and Other Disciplines

Seeking to gain further clarity on how intersectionality could be employed in higher education to go beyond descriptions of multiple social identity experiences in order to examine institutional and societal power dynamics shaping those experiences, I turned to literature outside of higher education about intersectionality as a conceptual lens for examining meso- and macro-, as well as micro-level instantiations of privilege and marginalization. In particular, I examined literature in legal studies, feminist studies, and sociology, where intersectionality has been more developed conceptually and empirically.

Curiously, I found that scholars were articulating similar limitations to intersectionality and the study of power in their own fields. For example, Roscigno (2011) suggested that power is an underdeveloped concept in sociology. Feminist sociologist Anthias (2013) suggested that intersectionality is currently limited in its capacity to examine how interlocking systems of oppression shape life chances. Furthermore, in a special issue about intersectionality as a field of study that included articles from leading scholars in multiple disciplines, pioneers in intersectionality scholarship argued that intersectionality research has focused more on experiences related to

multiple social identities and less on how power structures shape and constrain life chances associated with those social identities (Cho et al. 2013).

Despite these limitations, I found that this literature offered some specific suggestions for conceptualizing and guiding future research to identify interlocking systems of oppression and dynamics within those systems that constrain life chances (e.g., Anthias 2013; Dill and Zambrana 2009; Roscigno 2011). Therefore, I have drawn on this literature to propose a broader array of conceptual tools to apply intersectionality as a framework to study dynamics perpetuating inequities in higher education. Later in this chapter, I propose a conceptual model to illustrate how an expanded perspective of intersectionality could apply to the study of Latino college access and success. This model could not only guide further work in higher education research on Latinos, but also be adapted to study inequities among other social identities across various institutional contexts.

It should be noted that intersectionality and Latino college access and success are each rapidly evolving areas of study (Cho et al. 2013; Núñez et al. 2013). Assessing the research in these areas is like assessing a moving target; by the time this research synthesis is published, new studies and insights in these areas will certainly have emerged. The difficulty of searching studies in higher education according to the keyword "intersectionality" means that some related studies may not be discussed in this chapter. In light of this condition, while parts of my proposed conceptual framework are based on empirical studies that have already been conducted in higher education, parts of it also involve propositions and speculations that have been explored theoretically and conceptually, but have yet to be tested extensively in research. I hope that the proposed framework will serve as a beginning point to organize and contextualize forthcoming studies that seek to understand how interlocking systems of power dynamics in relation to multiple social identities affect college access and success. To illustrate the utility of this model, I subsequently apply it to the case of Latino college access and success toward the end of this chapter.

With this goal of providing an organizing frame for research about Latino postsecondary educational equity, I now turn to a discussion of the background, definition, and limitations of intersectionality. In this next section, I will address the conceptual lens of intersectionality to set the stage to discuss the application of intersectionality as a conceptual framework in higher education. After discussing how higher education has employed intersectionality as a conceptual lens, I will then examine the potential of this lens to enhance the study of Latino college access and success in higher education.

Intersectionality Background, Definition, and Limitations Across Disciplines

Intersectionality is a lens that has been applied to understand how power relations shape life opportunities according to multiple social identities in a wide range of disciplines. These disciplines include, but are not limited to, (a) feminist studies,

(b) legal studies, (c) sociology, (d) political science, (e) psychology, and (f) higher education (e.g., Anthias 2013; Cho et al. 2013; Davis 2008; A. Hurtado and Cervantez 2009; Museus and Griffin 2011; Renn and Reason 2013). Observers in fields as diverse as higher education and student development (Renn and Reason 2013), sociology (Anthias 2013; Bonilla-Silva 2013), and feminist studies (Cho et al. 2013; Davis 2008) have noted that intersectionality is not yet a theory. In mapping out the state of intersectionality studies about two decades after the emergence of the intersectionality perspective (e.g., Collins 1990; Crenshaw 1991; Cho et al. 2013) assert that intersectionality is "best framed as an *analytic sensibility*" to explore:

> the problem of sameness and difference and its relation to power. This framing—conceiving of categories not as distinct but as always permeated by other categories, fluid and changing, always in the process of creating and being created by dynamics of power—emphasizes *what intersectionality does rather than what intersectionality is*. (795, emphasis added)

The notion of focusing on what intersectionality "does" rather than what it "is" means that it will be employed in different ways according to the disciplinary context and topic of inquiry, as an analytical tool to understand the role of interlocking systems of oppression in shaping life opportunities for individuals from multiple privileged and/or marginalized social categories. To indicate the range of social identities to which an intersectionality lens has been applied, intersectionality research has found at least 14 social categories or "lines of difference" (Davis 2008, p. 81), including gender, sexuality, racial phenotype, ethnicity, national belonging, class, religion, and able-bodiedness—that are salient in shaping life opportunities—and this list may be longer (Lutz 2002, as cited in Davis 2008).

According to Dill and Zambrana (2009), intersectionality has four main analytical tasks:

(1) Placing the lived experiences and struggles of people of color and other marginalized groups as a starting point for the development of theory
(2) Exploring the complexities not only of individual identities but also group identity, recognizing that variations within groups are often ignored and essentialized
(3) Unveiling the ways interconnected domains of power organize and structure inequality and oppression
(4) Promoting social justice and social change by linking research and practice to create a holistic approach to the eradication of disparities and to changing social and higher education institutions (p. 5)

Several observers have noted that, while making much progress on the first two tasks, intersectionality still has yet to reach its potential as an analytical tool to carry out the latter two tasks (e.g., Anthias 2013; Bonilla-Silva 2013; Cho et al. 2013). In assessing how intersectionality has been developed and applied within the past two decades, Cho and colleagues (2013) argue that, across multiple disciplines, the application of intersectionality has tended to focus on the analysis of how individuals experience multiple social identities, rather than the power dynamics that circumscribe or enhance life opportunities for those holding those identities.

Put differently, an intersectionality lens has tended to focus on "who people are" and how people experience social inequality rather than "the way things work" and how that social inequality is perpetuated (Chun et al. 2013, p. 923). Not understanding how power inequalities are perpetuated makes achieving Dill and Zambrana's (2009) fourth task of advancing social change much more difficult. Therefore, a central purpose of this research synthesis is to sharpen the capability of higher education research to expose the workings of various "domains of power" (Dill and Zambrana 2009, p. 5), with the aim of creating more equitable higher education opportunities for students from underrepresented groups.

Intersectionality and Its Application in Higher Education

Intersectionality has the potential as an analytical tool to transform higher education into a social site that offers individuals, particularly those from historically marginalized backgrounds, more equitable chances for economic and social mobility, in a society that has historically been characterized by significant social inequality (e.g., Dill and Zambrana 2009; Hurtado et al. 2012; Jones 2009; Renn and Reason 2013; Smith 2009). Accordingly, higher education scholars have recently turned to intersectionality as a lens to explore how multiple social identities across different institutional contexts shape educational processes and outcomes. This research synthesis addresses the question: How can higher education research be framed to further illuminate how interlocking systems of power, privilege, and domination shape higher education equity and opportunity for groups from unique social identities? The intersectionality lens provides attention to both structure and identity in the reproduction of inequality. In this section, I discuss conceptual and empirical work on higher education and intersectionality.

Development of Conceptual Work

Before higher education scholars began to use the terminology of "intersectionality" to explore this question, they were already considering the role of multiple identities with relationship to various social contexts and interlocking systems of power, privilege, and oppression in shaping higher educational experiences and outcomes. In student development theory, Jones and McEwen's (2000) model of multiple dimensions of identity theory (MMDI) aligns closely with the intersectional perspective. It postulates that an individual is embedded in social contexts in which social identities interconnect and play out. These authors sketch out a figure that resembles an atom, with one's identity at the center, multiple overlapping ovals representing the different identities, and dots on the ovals that represented the salience of various identities.

Abes et al. (2007) extended this work to include Baxter-Magolda's (1998) notion of the capacity for self-authorship, including how students construct, interpret, and make meaning out of their multiple identities. Meanwhile, Torres and Hernández's (2007) empirical work on Latino students indicated that Baxter-Magolda's notion of self-authorship is incomplete in explaining key developmental tasks for Latino college students, which also include handling racism and building community. Their work revealed the salience of these students' encounters with systems of privilege and power—in this case, with racism—in Latino students' college growth and indicated that future theory about student development incorporate the consideration of power asymmetries.

While this work focused on identity development, higher education research also has considered the role of structure in identity development, postsecondary opportunities, and college experiences. At least three theories have considered the role of situated social contexts in constraining or enhancing college access and success. Renn and Arnold's ecological theory of student development (2003) emphasizes the role of embedded social micro-, meso-, and macro-level contexts, including organizational and external subcultures, in shaping the nature and salience of social identities in college students' lives. Similarly, Perna (2006) and Perna and Thomas's (2008) model of college access and success articulates how situated layers of context (including the family, K-12 school, local higher education systems, state policies, and economic conditions) influence students' considerations of, enrollment in, experiences in, and completion of college. Neither of these theories used intersectionality as a guiding lens, but they pointed to the critical role of multiple social and contextual identities and related institutional dynamics to influence college access and success.

Hurtado and colleagues' diverse learning environment (DLE) model of campus climate (2012) is another example of a model that considers situated social contexts in affecting college access and success. They specifically use the lens of intersectionality to illuminate the importance of considering multiple social identities for social actors in organizations and how different micro-, meso-, and macro-level contexts may condition these identities and affect educational experiences in different ways. They suggest that prior frameworks such as those of Renn and Arnold (2003), Perna (2006), and Perna and Thomas (2008) have significantly advanced our understanding of the role of situated contexts and campus climate with relation to external influences in shaping students' college experiences but also that these "organizational models fail to specify the *dynamics between actors within the institution*" (p. 46, emphasis added). In updating the Hurtado et al. (1999) framework of campus climate, Hurtado and colleagues (2012) were encouraging higher education scholarship to consider more extensively the role of meso-level and macro-level contexts, such as state higher education policies or public attitudes about these policies, in affecting college access and success. In particular, they noted that "scholarship is still needed to also identify how institutions produce inequality [because] the latter has the potential to advance institutional transformation if it moves institutional actors towards reflexivity to alter their role in the reproduction of inequality" (Hurtado et al. 2012, p. 105).

Similarly, Smith (2009) argues that the lens of intersectionality can be useful in informing more equitable policy and practice through the insights it provides in understanding the general relationship between identity and diversity within higher education institutions. This perspective recognizes that individuals have multiple identities, which include affiliations with groups (or group-based social identities) as well as personal identities, and that individual and institutional identities can intersect and affect students' experiences and outcomes. Furthermore, these identities may take on different degrees of saliency in different contexts (Steele 2010). Identifying the workings of privilege and marginalization in organizations can enable institutional actors to challenge these workings and develop policies and programs to advocate for the inclusion and equitable advancement of diverse students, faculty, and staff (Smith 2009).

Development of Empirical Work

Similar to the conceptual developments described, some earlier research did not necessarily use the term "intersectionality" as a conceptual lens, but it took an intersectionality perspective by addressing the experiences of faculty and graduate students who were women of color. This research considered the role of multiple identities and institutional systems such as racism and sexism in affecting higher education experiences. Specifically, Cuádraz and Pierce (1994) and Turner (2002) argued that the effects of multiple marginal identities of being women and people of color affected graduate students and women faculty of color academics in unique and simultaneous ways, limiting their capacities to actualize their goals in some ways, but in other ways offering them a source of strength.

More recent work has explicitly used intersectionality as a conceptual lens to examine how having multiple social identities shapes faculty and students' experiences with power, privilege, and oppression in higher education settings. Jones (2009) employed intersectionality as a framework for examining how multiple identity dimensions shape how faculty and students navigate privileged and marginalized identities. She examined how, for her and for her graduate students, multiple social identities (including gender, class, race/ethnicity, disability) constrained or enhanced their educational experiences and how they encountered various systems of domination and oppression, sometimes independently and sometimes simultaneously, across different societal contexts (Jones 2009).

Jones et al. (2012) and Abes (2012) extended this work further by using autoethnographic techniques to illuminate how elusive and understudied categories such as class and sexuality interplay fluidly with other categories, such as gender and race, across different social contexts to shape students' and faculty members' college experiences. Griffin and Reddick (2011) used qualitative techniques to explore African American faculty's different experiences according to gender. They found that women faculty perceived that they were more likely to be expected to mentor

and take care of students, while men were cautious about associating with students for fear of being accused of taking advantage of these students.

In their edited volume of *New Directions for Institutional Research*, about the application of intersectionality and mixed methods in higher education, Museus and Griffin (2011) offer several examples of studies that explicitly employ an intersectionality lens. Among other findings, these studies have revealed variations in Filipino and Filipina American students' experiences with campus climate according to gender (Maramba and Museus 2011) and complexities and inconsistencies in how mixed heritage individuals identify racially/ethnically (Harper 2011). Importantly, the use of multiple methods revealed a multidimensional view of these phenomena. For example, in one mixed methods study, quantitative results did not show a statistically significant difference between gender identities with experiences in campus climate, but qualitative results revealed different patterns in how Filipinos and Filipinas expressed their encounters with institutional personnel and the campus setting (Maramba and Museus 2011).

Likewise, Strayhorn's (2013) edited volume about intersectionality and African American college students offers several examples of studies that explicitly apply intersectionality to examine Black students' identities and experiences in college. This work focuses on how Black students' various social identities (e.g., gender, class, sexuality) in contexts as diverse as STEM fields (Fries-Britt et al. 2013), honors programs (Griffin and Pérez 2013), and HBCUs (Gasman et al. 2013) shape their college experiences and outcomes. Now, I turn more specifically to higher education research that has employed an intersectionality lens to understand Latino college access and success.

Intersectionality and Latino College Access and Success

Development of Conceptual Work

Intersectionality is particularly suitable for framing the understanding of diversity among Latinos because it recognizes that individuals can hold multiple social identities simultaneously (including both privileged and marginalized identities) and that these identities affect how they experience social, political, and economic contexts, including that of higher education (Collins 2007; Davis 2008; Smith 2009). The guidelines for intersectionality closely resemble the tenets of Latino Critical Race Theory (LatCrit) (Dill et al. 2007), a theory which has been employed in several studies to investigate Latino equity in higher education (e.g., Solórzano and Villalpando 1998; Villalpando 2003, 2004; Solórzano et al. 2005).

LatCrit's tasks include (a) placing the experiences of people of color at the center of analysis, (b) focusing on institutional racism as a central factor affecting educational outcomes, (c) advancing social change, and (d) recognizing the intersectionality of categories such as race, class, gender, ethnicity, nationality, language, and citizenship status in shaping life opportunities (e.g., Solórzano and Villalpando

1998; Villalpando 2003, 2004). LatCrit has offered less guidance on how to study or frame intersectionality in social inquiry, but this dimension of LatCrit is important, because it emerged in response to a binary (Black-White) way of examining race to highlight the importance of alternative and additional social identities (Dill et al. 2007; Solórzano and Villalpando 1998; Villalpando 2003, 2004). One subtle distinction between intersectionality and LatCrit is that LatCrit emphasizes centering the social category of race and system of racism in the analysis, while intersectionality also acknowledges the centrality of race, but (not surprisingly) leaves the choice more open to the researcher or educator as to which social categories and associated forms of power and privilege to address (Dill and Zambrana 2009).

Development of Empirical Work

Taking an intersectionality view, Torres (2004) emphasized the importance of considering multiple social identities and societal contexts for understanding Latinos' college access and success, particularly variations in ethnicity and national origin. In their literature review, Sáenz and Ponjuán (2009) uncovered evidence that gender is also a critical factor in understanding variation among Latinos in college access and success. Since then, a handful of studies have explicitly employed an intersectionality perspective to examine these and other variations. In my search, I found four studies, three concerning students and one concerning faculty, that explicitly used intersectionality as a conceptual framework to guide the investigation.

In one such study, Covarrubias (2011) coined the term "critical quantitative intersectionality" and employed it as a lens to examine variations in high school and postsecondary outcomes along multiple social identities including gender, class, ethnicity, and citizenship. In another study, Ramírez (2013) used qualitative techniques to explore Latinas' and Latinos' processes of choosing graduate school. Her findings included that Latinas were more likely to express that remaining closer to home and to their families of origin was important and that Latinos and Latinas were sometimes willing to forego attending elite graduate institutions if they found environments in these institutions unwelcoming. In their autoethnographic work, Núñez and Murakami-Ramalho (2011) used intersectionality as a lens to examine how their own mixed heritage Latina identities have shaped their research, teaching, and service as faculty members in a Hispanic-Serving Institution. Finally, Ruiz Alvarado and Hurtado (in press) have used quantitative techniques to examine how Latino students report the saliency of their different social identities, including race/ethnicity, gender, class, and sexuality, in different institutional contexts. They found that these students reported varying degrees of saliency of these identities according to whether their colleges had higher or lower proportions of Latinos, women or men, and lower socioeconomic status students.

Other studies that have not used the terminology of intersectionality have nonetheless taken an intersectional view to examine Latino college access and success. Following Torres's (2004) call to explore the topic, two related examples concern

racial/ethnic differences in Latino college access. Using LatCrit as one of the guiding conceptual lenses, Núñez et al. (2008) used quantitative techniques to examine ethnic differences between Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans in terms of 4-year college choice and found that, when holding constant other key factors, Mexican Americans and Latinas tended to enroll in less selective schools. Using a different data set, Núñez and Crisp (2012) used multiple regression to analyze the factors influencing college choice of Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans and found that Mexican Americans were more likely than Puerto Ricans to enroll in community colleges. They speculated that different histories of higher education, colonization, and economic conditions—all components of structures of power and oppression—influenced these differential college choice and enrollment patterns.

Similar to other higher education intersectionality research, the research that has employed intersectionality or an intersectionality perspective to guide analysis of Latino college access and success has primarily focused on students' or faculty members' perspectives on the role of multiple social identities and in some cases on systems of power and oppression in shaping their higher education experiences. Quantitative descriptive techniques in higher education studies have typically disaggregated data to identify differences in college access, experiences, and success according to multiple social identities (e.g., Covarrubias 2011; Maramba and Museus 2011; Núñez and Crisp 2012; Núñez et al. 2008; Ruiz Alvarado and Hurtado in press). Quantitative multivariate techniques have tended to sample one social identity (e.g., one racial/ethnic group) and control for the independent effects of other social identities on college access and success outcomes (e.g., Maramba and Museus 2011; Núñez and Crisp 2012; Núñez et al. 2008). Qualitative techniques have included autoethnography and semistructured interviews in which study participants describe the role of multiple social identities and associated systems of power and oppression in shaping their higher education experiences (e.g., Abes 2012; Griffin and Reddick 2011; Jones 2009; Jones et al. 2012; Núñez and Murakami-Ramalho 2011).

Notably, much of the quantitative and qualitative work employing intersectionality focuses on the perspectives of the study participants, rather than other actors (e.g., college personnel) who could shape those participants' experiences in higher education. Collectively, this research demonstrates the importance of considering multiple social identities and associated systems of power and oppression in shaping college access and success inequities. However, as feminist legal scholar Catharine MacKinnon argues, these identities "are the ossified outcomes of the dynamic intersection of multiple hierarchies, not the dynamic that creates them. *They are there, but they are not the reason they are there*" (MacKinnon 2013, p. 1023). While intersectionality work in higher education has emphasized the role of the social contexts in contributing to educational conditions, the application of intersectionality to empirical studies has largely been limited to *descriptions of these actors' experiences, rather than organizational dynamics among social actors or other entities that shape those experiences*. For example, more is known about the variation among Latinos in college access and success according to multiple social identities, but it is less clear what specific institutional norms, beliefs,

attitudes, or behaviors related to these identities contribute to lower Latino college completion rates. Therefore, the potential of intersectionality to illuminate systems and structures of domination and power (Dill and Zambrana 2009; Cho et al. 2013; Renn and Reason 2013) is not fully harnessed. In the next section, I note patterns in higher education research that suggest that more work could address institutional systems and structures of domination and power.

Structure and Agency in Higher Education Scholarship

Like in other fields (e.g., Cho et al. 2013), intersectionality research in higher education has focused primarily on individual agents' experiences of power and oppression according to multiple social identities, rather than how social structures themselves shape these individuals' experiences. This reflects a state of higher education research where the student or individual is the primary unit of analysis, which limits the capacity to explore the role of social contexts in shaping college access and success. Perna and Thomas's (2008) comprehensive review of literature in economics, sociology, psychology, and education pertaining to their college access situated context model revealed that, out of 175 articles in these four disciplines, just three used the institution as the unit of analysis, and two used the state. Furthermore, just three articles out of the 175 reviewed used two levels of analysis, such as student and institution, or student and state.

In a similar example of the limited capacity of higher education research to speak to the role of social context in college access and success, Harper (2012) found that most articles in the most commonly used higher education journals that purport to focus on the experiences of minoritized groups in higher education and associated social contexts do not directly focus on the effects of *racism* as a structural system of oppression that limits minoritized individuals' educational opportunities. In particular, Harper (2012) found that just 16 out of 255 (about 6 %) of these articles used the term "racism" or "racist" three or more times as an indicator of recognition of this system of power and privilege. Similarly, Hart (2006) found that, among a multiyear sample of articles in three of the most commonly used journals in higher education, just 1 % used the term "feminism" and fewer than 10 % indicated in the titles that they addressed women as subjects. Even though some time has passed since their reviews, Perna and Thomas's (2008), Harper's (2012), and Hart's (2006) assessments of higher education scholarship suggest that higher education research still primarily focuses on the individual level of analysis rather than to institutional dynamics that could enhance or constrain conditions for educational access and success. This state of the research can obscure the organizational and institutional role in shaping equitable outcomes as well as solutions to promote equity (Bensimon and Bishop 2012).

This state of the research reflects the historically strong influence of psychology on educational research and highlights that more attention should be paid to how more meso- and macro-level social structures affect college access and success, an

area that sociology is well poised to address (Hurtado 2007). Focusing higher education research primarily on the level of individual identity makes it all too easy to ascribe inequities in educational outcomes not to inequities in educational opportunity or the practices that perpetuate these inequities, but to the perceived shortcomings of individuals themselves and the racial/ethnic groups in which they hold membership (Zuberi 2001). Foregrounding the student as the unit of analysis emphasizes the student's responsibility, in turn deemphasizing the institution's responsibility and the role of broader contexts for perpetuating inequitable outcomes (e.g., Bensimon and Bishop 2012; Harper 2012), and makes it more difficult to develop strategies to challenge inequities. Conversely, identifying dynamics within and across societal "domains of power" has the potential to inform strategies to advance educational equity in higher education (Dill and Zambrana 2009, p. 5).

Critique of Intersectionality: The Importance of Specifying Power Dynamics

As noted in the previous sections, intersectionality has been useful in higher education empirical research to guide the examination of the role of multiple identities and associated systems of power, privilege, and oppression in higher education actors' experiences (Renn and Reason 2013). While its flexibility and versatility could be seen as strengths to study the simultaneous influence of multiple identities and social contexts that could interplay in myriad ways, some have critiqued intersectionality for being too vague a concept—a "buzzword" (Davis 2008) in need of greater analytical precision. Sociologist Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2013) has argued that the concept of intersectionality is promising in understanding issues like racial/ethnic equity in life outcomes but that it is still a "first-generation" concept requiring further development. Similarly, sociologist Floya Anthias (2013) argues that intersectionality needs greater specification to increase its utility in social science research.

In this research synthesis, I have argued that limitations in higher education scholarship in identifying power dynamics in societal structures that perpetuate inequities (Pusser and Marginson 2012) reflect similar problems identified in other disciplines, such as sociology and feminist studies. As Bonilla-Silva (2013) and Anthias (2013) suggest, these disciplines have not offered as much specific guidance on how researchers can identify, describe, and make visible the domains of power (Dill and Zambrana 2009), matrices of oppression (Collins 1990), or interlocking systems of oppression and domination that challenge educational equity. This is partly because, as sociologist Roscigno (2011) argues, the concept of power is difficult to conceptualize and theorize, much less be applied to guide empirical work to identify specific power dynamics that reproduce social inequality.

Anthias (2013) asserts that applying intersectionality to study power relations must entail examining how (a) particular social categories are constructed as

inferior to others; (b) people in a capitalist world are viewed as part of a larger economic project and source of labor, rather than beings who could actualize their own potential; and (c) resources are distributed unevenly to enhance the life chances of some at the expense of others, particularly those in marginalized social categories. An implication of undertaking these tasks is that intersectionality can be refined conceptually from serving as a static location where individuals experience the consequences of multiple identities and associated forms of privilege or oppression (as in descriptive comparisons disaggregating one social category, like gender, within another, like race), toward serving as a perspective that lays bare and challenges the power dynamics that (re)produce educational and societal inequities.

As noted, the concept of power has been undertheorized in sociology (Bonilla-Silva 2013; Roscigno 2011) and in higher education research (Pusser and Marginson 2012). This state of affairs has made it difficult to visualize what terms like domains of power, matrices of domination, and systems of oppression mean when applying theoretical perspectives such as intersectionality, Critical Race Theory, and LatCrit. There are examples of studies in sociology that have illuminated some of the power dynamics that contribute to societal inequality, which are also applicable to education. One is Bonilla-Silva's (2010) research analyzing how, when asked about sources of and reasons for societal inequities, individuals use discursive strategies to obscure the recognition that racially minoritized groups experience unequal life chances due to discrimination and oppression. Another is Roscigno's (2011) research on how company employees defend legal charges of racism and sexism inhibiting minoritized groups' job advancement by rationalizing marginalized employees' lack of advancement in terms of individual traits or shortcomings.

Some higher education research has also focused on institutional dynamics that privilege some and not others with respect to particular social identities. Smith and colleagues (2004) demonstrate how, contrary to common assumptions, faculty and women of color do not receive extra privilege or consideration in the faculty recruitment process, but instead are often overlooked in "usual" procedures that do not place value on or render invisible the unique contributions that faculty and women of color can make in research, teaching, and service at an institution. Similarly, Delgado Bernal and Villalpando (2002) illustrate how standards of review for faculty promotion and tenure often privilege members of certain groups and not other marginalized groups, due to reasons that are beyond the merit of the scholarship itself—such as the unequal application of review standards for research, teaching, and service. They argue that one way this is manifested is in the devaluation of epistemologies, methods, and topics of inquiry that may be particularly important to faculty of color, such as an orientation toward the public good (González and Padilla 2008). These studies of higher education institutional power dynamics have addressed how power dynamics shape faculty opportunities, but more insights are needed to inform how power dynamics such as institutionalized racism (e.g., Harper 2012) or patriarchy (e.g., Hart 2006) shape college student access and success.