information contained in a report such as this. That is, not only are significant questions answered, but more are raised, the hallmark of a good analysis.

Julia A. Heath
University of Memphis, Memphis, TN, USA
E-mail address: jheath@memphis.edu
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Opportunity Foregone: Education in Brazil

This is a collection of 18 articles written by 42 authors and organized as chapters. Sponsored by the Inter-American Development Bank, its origin can be traced to a symposium held in Rio de Janeiro on March 24-27, 1991, five years prior to publication.

These characteristics might keep potential readers away on various grounds. First, the inclusion of so many authors, it might be argued, inevitably leads to inarticulation in format and discontinuity of content, both of which detract from analytical integrity. Second, works published by international development organizations seldom transcend mere institutional attempts to justify a loan or fund a project and, more often than not, lack the theoretical rigor and methodological complexity expected from “real” academic books. And third, by the time symposia proceedings are published, usually the nature of the problems has changed, the data are obsolete, and proposed solutions no longer apply.

Yet Birdsall and Sabot manage to beat the odds and come up with an interesting and worthwhile volume. They blend insights from U.S. and Brazilian writers and combine the scholastic elegance of university professors with the down-to-earth perspectives of a broad selection of professionals from public, international, and applied-research agencies, distilling a product which is surprisingly cohesive and adequately balanced in terms of arguments, analysis, and recommendations. And while the data seem to be somewhat outdated, mostly from the 1970s and 1980s, it is difficult to ascertain whether the obsolescence is due to the time elapsed between the symposium and publication of the proceedings or to the perennially archaic nature of Latin American statistics. Certainly the arguments, analysis, and recommendations remain relevant to Brazilian education: The overall system needs to be reformed, since it has failed, and continues to fail, in preparing children to function competitively in a modern market economy, thus creating a huge bottleneck in the development process.

The 18 chapters are grouped into four sections. Section I provides the background and setting, assessing the sector’s poor performance, in terms of both inputs and outputs, and comparing it with the experiences of other countries at the same level of economic development. Poor performance is blamed on the predominance of private interests over public purposes in policy formulation and implementation, and the findings suggest that an additional year of schooling per labor-force participant would increase real output by approximately 20 percent.

Section II contains four studies which examine the relationship between education and productivity at the individual level. Focusing on urban labor markets and returns to schooling across industries, these studies use both cross-sectional and time-series data to estimate different aspects of the wage-education profile. The empirical evidence is quite revealing: Returns to post-primary schooling, especially university education, are substantially higher than returns to primary schooling, thus suggesting that Brazil’s income distribution disparities could be reduced by decreasing the country’s high repetition and dropout rates. Inequalities in income distribution seem exacerbated by the existence of very high returns to schooling to workers in multinational industries which use advanced technology and benefit from protectionism. The evidence also indicates that wages are affected by schooling quality over and beyond the effect of schooling quantity.

The studies in Section III probe different aspects of the relationship between access to schooling and income distribution. Using the concept of “circular mobility,” based on educational background and experience, and transitional matrices, the empirical evidence shows here that, regardless of level of economic growth reported by region of residence, more education leads to greater mobility. Each additional year of schooling leads to an increase of 10 percent in a status scale which is the social counterpart of the real-output indicator used by economists in Section I. However, educational attainment seems to be relatively unresponsive to improvements in household’s socioeconomic status, which suggests that direct increases in quantity and quality of schooling are necessary to reduce inter-regional disparities.

Finally, the studies of Section IV touch on specific problems of the country’s educational system. These problems include grade repetition, quality of schooling, and government policies that affect access to private education. While the authors estimate that greater quality would pay for itself by reducing grade repetition, low-income students in good private schools experience difficulties in overcoming the structural deficiencies associated with their physical and intellectual background at
home. Private and public universities also are examined, and the latter show lower rates of internal efficiency.

The basic theme and policy conclusions throughout the book are refreshing for their simplicity and profound implications. The rates of return to private as well as public investment in Brazil are constrained by low productivity of the labor force, largely the consequence of an educational system which is anemic, inefficient, and inequitable. Simultaneous stimuli in the supply of, and demand for, more and higher-quality schooling are needed to increase workers’ skills and ensure the sustainability of Brazil’s socioeconomic development. While obviously more resources would help, the key element of the book lies in its appeal for major reform consistent with a more rational allocation of existing resources.

Manuel J. Carvajal
Florida International University,
Miami, FL, USA
E-mail address: carvajal@fiu.edu

Enrollment Management for the 21st Century: Institutional Goals, Accountability, and Fiscal Responsibility

As ambiguous as any administrative concept in higher education, enrollment management has been discussed and practiced (more often in the breach than the observance) for almost thirty years. In one of those circular definitions for which educational theorists are famous and which drive logicians and the more practical minded screaming into the night, Penn quotes Hossler’s standard definition: “Enrollment management is an organizational concept and systematic set of activities whose purpose is to exert influence over student enrollments” (Hossler, Bean and Associates, 1990, p. 5). As Hossler’s definition only partially clears the semantic fog surrounding the idea of enrollment management, so Penn’s disjointed and superficial survey of the field only partially clarifies current enrollment management practice.

Penn begins with a review of the current macro-economic and public policy world within which higher education and enrollment management exists. She proceeds to a discussion of the various theories of enrollment management, its most common operating models, twelve mini-mini-case studies of how enrollment management is practiced at a cross-section of public universities and arrives at a series of marginally useful and overly general set of concluding observations. In mimicking the inchoate field of enrollment management, Penn’s work is neither valuable as theory nor as practical advice. As theory, it does not advance the profession. Penn’s contribution is scarcely more than a summary of the findings of a survey of how nascent notions about managing enrollments have been implemented. Regarding implementation, Penn offers scant practical advice and too few nuggets of insight. Such insight as she does provide ranges from the discovery of the obvious – Presidential involvement, faculty and senior administrative commitment are crucial to successful enrollment management – to the teasingly interesting – the University of Memphis’s creation of a 35 person, campus-wide enrollment management council.

There are, these misgivings aside, several things one can learn from Penn’s somewhat slapdash survey of the enrollment management field. First, enrollment management as it is actually practiced generally has some combination or all of four goals: a) “to define the institution’s nature and characteristics, and to market the institution appropriately;” b) “to incorporate all relevant campus constituencies into marketing plans and activities;” c) “to make strategic decisions about the role and amount of financial aid for students and the institution;” and d) “to make appropriate commitments of human, fiscal, and technical resources to enrollment management” (p. iii, citing Dixon, 1995, p.7). Secondly, enrollment management practice includes four administrative models: a) enrollment management committee, b) enrollment management coordinator, c) enrollment management matrix, and d) enrollment management division. The first is the most informal, the latter the most formal. All are driven by the relative degree of institutional commitment and the chief enrollment manager’s personal charisma. Lastly, enrollment management’s greatest value is as a centralizing focus for a student-centered institution and as the campus-wide engine driving continuous quality improvement and outcomes assessment.

Other than a good bibliography for the beginning student of enrollment management, the chief value of Penn’s work is the latter observation. Enrollment management is a new paradigm in higher education governance. It is a construct that unites all of an institution’s various independent facets. It combines academics with student services, both of these with intercollegiate athletics and all of the above with the institution’s purely operational components – bursar, maintenance, buildings and grounds, etc. – into a unified service organization attempting to meet the needs of students. Because it is such a radical departure from previous organizational models, its adoption has been sporadic, piecemeal and