

necessary formulae, of matters such as ‘tacit knowledge’ and ‘the presence of business services’, are going to be ‘evasive’ (39) – to put it mildly. One finding that he reports is that the transfer of university research is more likely to help innovation in small firms rather than large ones. This chimes with anecdotal reports from people managing knowledge transfer in British universities, to the effect that SMEs are often amazed to find that the knowledge needed to solve their critical problems is readily available in a nearby university department.

A particularly interesting chapter by Varga and his colleague at Pécs, Parag, argues that ‘the quality of research network connections influences the scientific productivity of individual network members’ (141), a hypothesis that they test with data from their own university. While they find that better-connected researchers tend to be more productive, it is surely also the case that more productive researchers tend to be better connected. Nevertheless, the patterns of networking as between the different university departments that the authors present are striking: I wanted to learn more about how these departments differed in real-life, not just statistically.

The main UK contribution to the book is a chapter by Faggian, McCann and Sheppard on the relationship between graduate migration within Britain and regional economic performance. They conclude that ‘the knowledge base of a region plays a role in attracting university graduates into a region, while these graduate inflows simultaneously play a role in promoting regional dynamism ... there is evidence of a cumulative causation mechanism’ (268). They offer the telling statistic that there are 40% more graduates employed in London than are educated there, whereas in Yorkshire and Humberside the position is exactly reversed. As noted above, the trick must be somehow to bring together the different elements that make up a prosperous knowledge-region – organisational, human and cultural – at the same time, in the same place.

This is a valuable book for those interested in understanding the university’s interactions with national and regional economic life; and many of the ideas it presents are capable of further, and productive, development.

References

- Committee on Higher Education. 1963. *Higher education: Report (Cmnd 2154)*. London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office.
- Florida, R. 2004. *The rise of the creative class: And how it’s transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Shattock, M. 2009. *Entrepreneurialism in universities and the knowledge economy: Diversification and organizational change in European higher education*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill.

Paul Temple
 Institute of Education, University of London, UK
 p.temple@ioe.ac.uk
 © 2010, Paul Temple

Higher education and social justice, by A. Furlong and F. Cartmel, Maidenhead, Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, 2009, 160 pp., £24.99 (paperback), ISBN-13: 978-033-522362-6, 978-0-33-522361-9

The chief virtue of this short but elegant book is that it gives a research-informed ‘all-through’ account and analysis of the issues that relate to social justice and participation in UK higher education. It is about who gets in, but also about where they get in (both aspects of ‘access’), what they receive and how they respond (‘experience’) and with what effects on life chances

(‘destinations’). The original empirical work is exclusively about Scotland, drawing especially on three Rowntree-supported studies of a cohort of approximately 500 students. Together these constitute an original and valuable longitudinal study of the three phases of access, student experience and initial careers.

The Scottish context is important because ironically it represents one end of the spectrum in terms of the performance of the UK higher education system in all of the areas that the authors are most concerned about. Largely because of the amount of higher education that is offered in and through further education institutions, class-based distinctions in terms of access, progression and experience are in general more stratified than in the system as a whole. The irony is that in Scotland this feature is frequently combined with political pride in higher participation rates (about 10 percentage points ahead of the rest of the UK) and a national rhetoric about social justice achieved through education (in the spirit of *The Democratic Intellect* – Davie 1961 – and its derivatives) that is shown here to be deeply unempirical.

The conceptual framework is one of classic conspiracy theory, taking the view that ‘any apparent political commitment to introduce the types of reform that would result in a socially just system of opportunities are, at best, superficial and at worst designed to placate or mislead the working classes’ (3). The thesis is about ‘social closure’ (69) and class control:

Through their ability to navigate and manipulate educational structures, from primary to tertiary levels, the middle classes have helped ensure that levels of downward mobility remain low while meritocratic opportunities for upward social mobility among the working classes are blocked or severely restricted. (104)

Whatever have been the merits of a half-century of higher educational reform and restructuring ‘social justice’ has not been one of them.

There is no gainsaying that this is broadly what their Scottish data establishes. First of all, in terms of ‘getting in’ the middle-class priority dominates, not only because of relatively higher levels of prior educational attainment but also through ‘affordability’ and the class-based ‘authenticity’ of the offer. Secondly, in terms of their educational experience, working-class students can expect it to be relatively ‘semi-detached from the world of the academy’ (55) as a result of economic (especially the necessity of paid work), social and cultural pressures. They can also expect to be corralled into lower-status vocational courses in less prestigious institutions. In so far as the higher education system has become more diverse and complex, the authors claim, the outcomes are ‘more about class-based processes of stratification than about fresh opportunities’ (69). Thirdly, in terms of ‘getting on’ the view from their sample is gloomy ‘with over a third of those in the West of Scotland study regarding their qualification as a disadvantage in their search for work’ (95).

When they cast the net wider, and consider additional data from South of the border, the authors have to concede that the glass might be a little fuller. Brennan and Naidoo are quoted to the effect that ‘entry to any form of higher education is likely to maintain or improve a person’s life chances and this is especially the case for people from disadvantaged social groups’ (103). Expansion has meant a higher volume of working-class participation, even through relative proportions of the top and bottom groups in society remain in lock-step. More encouragingly, they acknowledge the body of work that shows that as graduates proceed through their working lives their working experience becomes more graduate-like in demand and reward. However, on the UK stage as well, class continues to rule, with the so-called ‘graduate premium’ remaining lower for the lower socio-economic groups, who also (deeply regressively) continued to hold the highest (and longest to clear) levels of personal debt.

Perhaps most significantly, Furlong and Cartmel do not follow one well-worn left-wing path. They do not believe that the new higher education should simply ape the old, and try to make a discarded archetype universal:

It is important that we recognize that higher education is not just about formal learning and academic engagement. For young people it is also about independence and becoming an adult and about lifestyle and sexual freedom. Universities should not expect to take centre stage in the lifecourse of young adults or demand that students' commitment transcends the instrumental. (85)

Their final prescriptions echo this injunction. Undergraduate teaching should be 'concentrated in those institutions willing to commit whole-heartedly to the principles of social justice and to explicitly recognize that one of their core missions is to promote social justice'. This will require a curriculum, among other things, promoting 'social mobility and cross-class socialisation' (108). Above all (and following Rawls) 'a socially just system can only be built if all forms of selection are removed' (110).

While acknowledging its strong point of view, I would have no hesitation in recommending this work to students, scholars and policy-makers interested in a deeper understanding of the question of higher education and social justice than that commonly held (not just in the media but also by some who should know better). The comparative analysis of other systems (Continental Europe, Scandinavia, North America and Australasia) is well-handled; the theoretical framework may be relatively narrow, but is well-marshalled; and the thesis is argued with passion and conviction.

Reference

Davie, G. 1961. *The democratic intellect: Scotland and her universities in the nineteenth century*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

David Watson
 Institute of Education, University of London, UK
 d.watson@ioe.ac.uk
 © 2010, David Watson

International perspectives on the governance of higher education: alternative frameworks for coordination, edited by Jeroen Huisman, Routledge, New York and London, 2009, 278 pp., £22.99 (paperback), ISBN 978-0-415-98933-6

Governance of higher education has become a major part of the higher education discourse during the past two decades. As the contributions to this volume show it broadly breaks down into two substantive topics: system governance, concerned with the implementation of national higher education policies, and institutional governance, concerned with ensuring that individual universities and colleges are managed effectively and efficiently to meet specified objectives. System and institutional governance overlap because to a large extent the new public management towards which many countries have moved means ensuring that financial and regulatory mechanisms are set up to ensure that the objectives of institutional governance are at least broadly in line with system objectives as perceived by national governments. One of the main underlying drivers of the changes has been that higher education systems have become too large and too diverse for national governments to be able to regulate higher education through bureaucratic control as in most continental countries or through publicly financed *laissez-faire* as was once the case in the UK and Australia.

International Perspectives on the Governance of Higher Education, the latest in the Routledge series of *International Studies in Higher Education*, will be very useful to students of higher education policy and management and ought to be of interest also to university presidents, vice-chancellors and others in the burgeoning senior management teams of the world's universities.