outside the classroom setting is not necessarily restricted to office consultation time only. The book includes an essay entitled, "How to improve student's writing without reading any," by Kerry Walk on the effectiveness of out-of-class writing workshops, which serves as an instructional guide with examples and case studies. Work outside the classroom also includes the question of how to use marking as part of one's teaching. There are three chapters which deal with this issue: "Getting the most out of weekly assignments" by Sujay Rao; "Making grades mean more and less with your students" by Judith Richardson; and "Lessons from Michelangelo and Freud on teaching quantitative courses" by Todd Bodner. These give useful tips and guidelines on how to make the best use of assignments, how to give effective feedback when marking, and how to balance criticism with encouragement in one's marking.

Voices of Experience shares with other teachers valuable insights passed on by those who have derived these skills through their own experience. It serves as an informative reference and the informal character of the book gives the reader the feeling of a connection with these fellow teachers.

Huisman, J., Maassen P., & Neave, G. (Eds.). (2001). *Higher Education and the Nation State: The International Dimension of Higher Education.* London: Pergamon for the International Association of Universities. Pages: 256. Price $89.50 USD (hardcover).

Reviewed by Erin T. Payne, Fox Lake, Alberta.

This slim volume, jointly edited by three prominent members of the Centre for Higher Education Studies at the University of Twente in the Netherlands, is a recent installment (pre-9/11) in the Issues in Higher Education series published by UNESCO's International Association of Universities (IAU). The book is almost entirely about European Union (E.U.) member states. While dull in outward appearance and badly in want of a book jacket, the title is accurate. Inside I discovered six chapters written by academics of professional distinction and all but the last

contribution faced peer scrutiny at academic conferences prior to publication. The research is of fairly recent date and each article offers helpful notes and a rich bibliography. This to me is a stage upon which academics are speaking largely to other academics, policy-makers and informed audiences. Nevertheless, all interested and diligent readers will certainly gain from digesting it, even if only to get a sense as to how social policy is getting along in the E.U. these days.

In chapter one, Guy Neave traces the historical development of universities from their medieval beginnings in a universally Christian "European education space." Originally sharing super-ordinate power with the Papacy and the Holy Roman Emperor, universities were later "coordinated" by dynastic princes in the centuries after the Thirty Years War for their capacity to produce "useful knowledge" in the service of the growing territorial state. What emerged, in response to differing political and social conditions in succeeding states, were differing conceptions of the relationship between state, society and higher education. With the recent rise of the "market," the presumption of a new ideological neo-liberal universality, a new super-ordinate power above the nation-state (and the university) has been declared. But this power does not oversee a community of universal belief; and neither is this gospel message conducive to social control. The danger the E.U. now faces, Neave concludes, is not the failure to gel a new "higher education space," but the further division of the continent along the lines of region and class. Neave's article provides a useful historical backdrop for succeeding authors and his approach defines many key concepts that appear later in the book.

In chapter two, David Dill elaborates on how economic and demographic forces have altered the mechanisms of state and federal coordination of higher education in the U.S. Beginning with something of an apologetic for market-oriented reforms, Dill describes and evaluates the U.S. system — "less market-driven than is popularly understood." He is guided by a rule of thumb put forth by the Brookings Institution: state governments should strive to maximize local "productivity," while the federal government should concentrate on expensive basic scientific research and help low income students. Yet, while the federal government distributes R&D funds fairly equitably to all states through

Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) in an effort to transform even the poorest into "'knowledge based economies," even the poorest students are now routinely saddled with large student loans. They are increasingly caught in an updraft as institutions strive to finance themselves through tuition increases — a problem with which policy maker claim to be aware. As for the old "triad" of federal government, state government, and regional accrediting agencies working together to ensure academic quality, the torch has clearly been passed to state governments, institutions, and academics themselves. International professional certification bodies and mega-universities that teach nothing but grant degrees, are other ways in which federal and state control is being sidestepped. Dill makes few normative suggestions and his conclusion contains more question marks than periods, but this is an excellent piece that enables one to better sense the winds of change in the U.S. and gives us something by comparison with the E.U.

In chapter three, the late Antonio Ruberti is representative of the E.U. position in its quest to abolish all barriers to what might be considered a "common European space for science and technology" with the elimination of barriers to personnel mobility and the transference of qualifications. Because of the small size of E.U., economies compared to the U.S. cooperation in expensive, basic research programs in the hard sciences and technologies are essential in maintaining Europe's economic clout — just as this pragmatic emphasis helped rebuild Europe's economies after World War II. While the autonomy of nations and institutions must be respected, a strong '"public policy" (read: E.U. policy) must be maintained in education, as with everything else in which there is a common interest. The chief problems, Ruberti believes, lie in striking the correct balance between cooperation and competition between institutions and member states, and in coaxing some E.U. countries to invest a greater percentage of their GDP in R&D. Ruberti is the most avidly unionist author in the book and his perspective on higher education in the E.U. appears antiquated in that it is obsessed with the maximization of input units. His views are not highly creative, but his article is likely much shorter than a European Commission report on the same topics.

In chapter four, Alberto Amaral compares the role of the medieval university in building a common European cultural identity with opportunities for universities to help build a new common identity in the E.U. To facilitate this, the mobility and transference of persons and qualifications will need to be ensured, but the problematic diversity and mixed quality of institutions in Europe must be addressed. The historic state control principle of "legal homogeneity" has meant that the quality problem is often national, and has only recently been replaced by the market driven concept of the evaluative state. Amaral examines national experiments with quality evaluation (most successfully where academics evaluate their own programs coupled with the report of external experts), and supra-national evaluations based on international peer reviews that focus upon one discipline. The E.U. Commission, for its part, only studies member nation's evaluation methods. Recognizing that diversity of types and styles in higher education is desirable, Amaral points out that maintaining diversity is difficult when deference to the market, or the hegemonic position of a few elite universities, leads to homogeneity among institutions. Given its unique cultural mix Europe may avoid this fate, provided that the E.U. administration, recognizing the principle of "subsidiarity" in these matters, does not attempt to levy it own kind of homogeneity from Brussels.

Chapter five, by Fons Van Wieringen deals entirely with the Netherlands and deals with issues surrounding privatization. After parsing the differences between decentralization, deregulation and privatization, Van Wieringen's main contribution is the results of a questionnaire mailed to "experts" on post-compulsory education. Participants were asked to comment on their degree of certainty or uncertainty regarding a number of trends. Among these were the continuation of market directed education policies, the state funding of participants rather than institutions, the trend towards non-government financing, and a number of "productivity" related trends including increasing competition between public and private universities. Van Wieringen's conclusions are in keeping with much of the previous five chapters: post-compulsory education is diverse and complex and has been for a very long time, so labeling systems as either public or private is "crude." Citizens need not be forced to choose between public and private systems of

higher education, as there are many conceptual frameworks available to evaluate possibilities in the wide open ground between the two extremes. Van Wieringen's common sense approach makes this a wise and timely article for all students of social policy, even if one is inclined to think, as I did, that his presentation of data left something to be desired.

The concluding chapter is a jointly written project by Kurt De Wit and Jef Verhoeven and is based on research from a E.U. research program. The authors address higher education policy from the perspective of "national sovereignty versus Europeanization," and their historical approach to the investigation takes into account the uneven enthusiasm for the E.U. over the years. Given that higher education was nowhere explicitly mentioned in the founding treaties of the EEC, the mere mention of a supra-national body coordinating higher education often produced alarm in countries that desired little more of the EEC than a customs union. In fact, it was not until the mid-1980s when the dust was blown off the 1976 *Action Program in the Field of Education* that a E.U. higher education policy took shape. While opposition to EEC coordination of higher education began to crumble in the 1980s, the treaty of Maastricht (1992) nevertheless made signatory nations sovereign in matters of higher education even as the E.U. consolidated its previous gains. As it now stands, the E.U. chiefly underlines the importance of the mobility of students and staff, and the facilitation of institutional networking. While the power of the E.U. over matters of higher education is on the increase, it is clear from the treaty that the nation states maintain strategic control.

In all of the chapters, readers are one way or another invited to ponder the changes which the realities and rhetoric of globalization and neo-liberalism have wrought upon higher education in the context of the nation state during the past few decades. To what extent, they try to address, is the state "withering away" in significance as new super-ordinate authorities in the market and new international bodies such as the E.U. and the NAFTA zone gradually move into the domain of higher education. The consensus seems to be that all levels of government, and certainly that of the nation-state, still have vital roles to play in higher education, although the international dimension has added greater complexity to the matter. Thus, this is not a book of

doom-and-gloom to those of us which, to paraphrase Guy Neave's words, "still cling to the last vestiges of territorial democracy."

Gallagher, Michael. (2000). *The Emergence of Entrepreneurial Public Universities in Australia.* Canberra, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, Higher Education Division, Occasional Paper Series. Pages: 58. Price: $14.60 AUD (paper).

Reviewed by Robert Pike, Queen's University

Australia's higher education institutions have probably been subjected during the past thirty years to more radical shifts in organisational forms and loci of control than the higher education sectors of any other western country. In 1973, the Commonwealth [federal] government took over funding responsibilities for most of the institutions, including the universities, and, over time, wound up the various state and federal bodies which had previously acted as buffering agents between government and the academy. Since the late 1980s, when universities and certain other major institutions of postsecondary education were amalgamated in a "unified national system," major policy decisions emanating from federal jurisdiction have included a growing "privatization" of the country's 37 publicly-funded universities in the sense that heavy reliance on block grant public funding has been replaced, in considerable measure, by reliance on private "self-earned" income, including student fees and contract research for the private sector. The present Commonwealth government has greatly increased the pressures on this score. Michael Gallagher who is a public servant with the Commonwealth Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs (DETYA), the federal organization to which the universities answer, took the opportunity of an OECD Conference held in Paris in September 2000 to overview the policy settings and organizational changes associated with this growth of self-earned income within an increasingly "entrepreneurial" public university sector. This relatively brief, but remarkably detailed, report is the outcome.