things such as its mission, staffing profile, students profile (including "home/domestic students"), teacher preparation, recruitment and promotion, organization and staff development, and international and external communication – "cannot be effected by university edict alone, but only through the creative utilisation of the imagination and agency of those who comprise the university (Webb, 117).

To conclude, *Teaching international students* provides useful insights into the experiences and related issues of international students in Western institutions. Its theoretical discussions and helpful suggestions can prove very useful for all of us who teach in the increasingly racially and ethnically diverse institutions of higher learning, particularly those in metropolitan cities. The argument that is advanced about the need for systemic changes in today's institutions is quite crucial, for it speaks to the need for administrators and teachers to recognize and accommodate, not only the cultural, social, linguistic, navigational, familial and aspirational capital that the growing numbers of international students bring into our institutions and to their learning process but those of ethno-racial minority "home students" as well. Yosso (2005) suggests that these dynamic inter-related forms of capital provide individuals with the support necessary to successfully resist the oppressive conditions, and navigate the structural inequality that often operate as barriers to making their dreams a reality (p. 77). While the contributors to this anthology appropriately identify cultural differences as a key factor influencing the relationships and interactions among teachers and students, and international and "home" students nothing was said of how racism or colonialism might be operating to affect the learning-teaching context. Indeed, these systemic factors play a significant role in mediating individual interactions, and are responsible for the resistance to the changes – both individual and institutional – that must come about if our situations are to be responsive to the needs and aspirations of all students.

References

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community wealth. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 8 (1), 69-91.

Currie, J., Petersen, C. J., & Mok, K. H. (2006) *Academic Freedom in Hong Kong.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books. Pages: 204 Price: 70.00 USD (cloth).

Reviewed by Ying Yu, University of Hong Kong.

The authors of the book bring insights and expertise from three different disciplines (education, law, and public policy) to explore the issue of academic freedom in Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR), as particularly revealed in two recent critical incidents. The book inspires deep thoughts about

how to safeguard academic freedom within the "one country, two system" model, and in universities around the world more generally.

In this book, academic freedom is highlighted as a socially constructed concept. The authors first offer a historical analysis of the changes in the extent of freedom that academics enjoy over the centuries in western and non-western contexts, due to the influence of some political, religious, and economic factors. Threats also exist in the contemporary society against practices of academic freedom in universities around the world. The war against terrorism places restrictions on criticizing government policy and puts scientific as well as academic communication under censorship. Voices from academics that express unorthodox or unpopular political views are silenced in the classroom in avoidance of offending others. The authors point out that advancing knowledge "can sometimes be disturbing" (p. 33) and so a tolerant academic environment is desirable. Meanwhile, there is a global tendency to shift from a tenure system to contract positions, for commercial and managerial reasons in some universities. Many scholars are concerned that this will put academics in a vulnerable position who may thus shun from taking risks. There are also debates about using public accountability system to review university or faculty performance, based on which to allocate research funding. The review of such issues at the beginning of the book provides a background for readers to understand academic freedom in the Hong Kong context in which many of the issues discussed prevail, and also offers a basis for the empirical study reported in the later part of the book.

The uniqueness of the Hong Kong situation lies in that academics in Hong Kong have enjoyed relatively greater freedom in research and expression than many of their Asian counterparts, including Mainland China, but concerns arise about a possible loss of academic freedom after the handover in 1997 because of a close relationship between the Hong Kong administration and the central government. The book uses Beetham's model of legitimacy to analyze the decision making of the first chief executive (CE) Tung Chee-hwa's administration in relation to some political, economic, and social issues, and how this led to crises of legitimacy in Hong Kong. The analysis shows that the CE's failure in addressing these issues effectively caused increasing discontent and mistrust among the Hong Kong people. Regular surveys conducted by two local institutions during the period of the Tung's administration (1997-2005) indicate consistent drop of public support for the HKSAR government, and for the CE in particular. The top-down approach that the CE adopted in many of the decision making, as well as his failure in implementing a number of policies, led to his unpopularity. In the accumulation of the loss of public confidence in the HKSAR government, the authors identify the two critical incidents, the Robert Chung affair and the Article 23 incident, as the triggers of the legitimacy crises in Hong Kong.

The book gives a detailed account of the two incidents. These two incidents are closely related to academic freedom and freedom more generally. The Robert Chung affair in 1999 involves government's interference with a PhD candidate and research associate's research project which shows dissatisfac-

tion of the general public with Tung's administration. The research project was discontinued because of the pressure from Tung via an intramural channel. The incident caused great dispute and received extensive attention at that time. An Independent Investigation Panel was set up to examine the allegation and hold public hearings. The results of the investigation led to the resignation of two parties involved, one government official and the Vice Chancellor of the university where the Robert Chung did his PhD.

Another incident is concerned with Tung's government's rushed implementation of Article 23 without sufficient consultation with the general public. Article 23, a legislation relating to national security, was drafted in 2002. Some of the proposals in the legislation were reasonable. However, provisions relating to sedition created great concern in the academic community, as they could directly affect academics' freedom to publish articles and books. Other provisions were equally controversial and imposed great threats to people's freedom of expression in Hong Kong. The government's lack of willingness to listen to the critical voices and make sufficient accommodations resulted in the massive demonstration in July 2003. The legislation was finally withdrawn.

Although the two incidents were resolved in immediate victories, the authors are concerned about potential threats that may undermine academic freedom in the future. They argue that the close relationship between university and government, the adoption of a more centralized governance system for efficiency reasons, and the replacement of elected deans with appointed deans in Hong Kong universities may make it difficult for academics to file complaints if interferences similar to the Robert Chung case occur in the future. As regards Article 23, Hong Kong will ultimately face a new bill implementing the article, as required by the Basic Law. The concern is whether such a strong political response will be generated as it was in 2003 if the future legislation fails to guarantee freedom of research and expression.

The last part of the book reports a study the authors conducted in 2000-2002. The study asks academics and administrators in two Hong Kong universities through interviews and online survey about their perceptions of academic freedom as a concept, its importance, and any changes they observe after the handover in 1997. The authors find that most of the respondents value academic freedom as a key legitimating concept of a university and agree that freedoms found in most western cultures are allowed in Hong Kong. Believing that academic freedom is more of a western concept, both Chinese and non-Chinese academics involved in the study recognize a blending with Confucian moralities in the notion within the Hong Kong context, that is, maintaining social harmony while encouraging criticism. This may result in a likely increase of self-censorship. Even so, the respondents are generally optimistic about the situation of academic freedom in their universities and they only observe minor deterioration in recent years.

The study also investigates the extent to which some international trends take place in their universities and how these influence their academic freedom.

Most of the respondents observe substantially increased use of quality assurance and performance indicators in their institutions and agree this may have some impact on academic freedom. The slight increase in the entrepreneurial activities in the two universities, as the respondents think, may cause conflict of interests and thus may somehow affect academic freedom. Public funding for universities is reported to have decreased slightly during the time of the study. Its impact on academic freedom may not be immediate, but some of the respondents are reasonably concerned that an intensive workload due to the shortage of staff may spare academics no time to criticize their own institution or the government. In terms of tenure positions, the reduction of these positions in Hong Kong universities is noticeable. Those academics who are on contract jobs are likely to avoid controversial issues in either academic or administrative contexts.

At the end of the book, the authors examine the current democracy and accountability situations in Hong Kong and the undergoing reforms and changes in Hong Kong universities. The authors argue that academic freedom can not be well preserved unless there is a democratic and legitimate society and that within this broad context, an open, transparent academic community.

This book demonstrates what legislation can do to protect academic freedom and how important it is for academics and the society to assume responsibilities and protest against any threat to the freedom that people should enjoy. This book has significant implications for academics in the Asian contexts and for universities around the world.