PROPHE THE PROGRAM FOR RESEARCH ON PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION
Dedicated to Building Knowledge about Private Higher Education around the World

PROPHE Working Paper Series
WP No. 12
Septemer 2008

PRACHAYANI PRAPHAMONTRIPONG
PROPHE Doctoral Research Associate, University at Albany, SUNY

INSIDE THAI PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION: EXPLORING PRIVATE GROWTH IN INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

ABSTRACT

This paper examines different institutional characteristics of Thai private higher education in historical-organizational perspective. The analysis applies different conceptual categories of private emergence—Catholic, elite, demand-absorbing—drawn from international literature starting with Levy (1986) to the Thai case. The societal context of Thai private higher education is rooted fundamentally in the hands of both religious foundations and the business sector. Thai diversification partly conforms to international schema but also shows varying emphases. Catholic must be expanded to religious-oriented and elite reformulated as semi-elite. Although demand-absorbing institutions are the majority in the Thai private sector—as also seen elsewhere—the demand-absorbing subsector shows great internal variations. For all the three conceptual categories, missions may be assessed accordingly. Finally, the paper discusses a growing hybrid trend within the Thai private sector.

INTRODUCTION AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Theoretical Orientation

Ample international literature highlights that institutional diversity is a key feature of private growth and its divergent roles in higher education (Altbach 2005a; Geiger 1986; Levy 1986, 2006). According to Van Vught (1996) and Marginson and Considine (2000), *diversity* in higher education signifies a variety of types or entities (such as institutions) within higher education systems while *differentiation* is a process wherein new entities are emerging in the systems. Private emergence, thus, adds important differentiation into higher education systems no longer dominated by a single and largely undifferentiated public sector.

Yet to study diversity, we need to focus on not only inter-sectoral but also intra-sectoral dimensions. Zooming inside private higher education (PHE), institutional diversity has been explored since the 1980s. The pioneering and now classic trio of PHE types developed by Levy (1986) has been amply applied to national and regional cases.[1] Considering three major areas on finance, governance, and function, Levy differentiated types of private higher education institutions (PHEIs) in Latin American countries into three mostly sequential waves: Catholic, elite, and demand-absorbing. The rise of private Catholic universities emerged from changes of the State's and Church's roles. Catholic universities early on principally aimed at religious service through disciplines such as theology and canonical law. Elite universities, in contrast, occurred as the formation of socially advantaged, secular and depoliticized universities which were distinct from or other than the Catholic ones in terms of, for example, particular programs offered in business-oriented fields. The remaining category, demand-absorbing, provides further alternatives to religious study and mainly responds to the rising demand for higher education. Accordingly, demand-absorbing institutions are about quantity much more than quality. In succinct terms, the three basically chronological waves serve largely distinct purposes in satisfying demand on "better" (elite institutions), "different" (Catholic and cultural institutions), and "more" (demand-absorbing institutions) education (Geiger 1986; Pachuashvili 2006).

The Thai Setting

Echoing the global reality where the role of private sector is becoming even more noteworthy due to its increasingly significant enrollment share (Altbach 2005a). Thai PHEIs have grown into one of the principal industries in producing manpower for the job markets in both domestic and international realms. In 2006, approximately 45 percent of the total Thai higher education institutions are private with the enrollment share of 13 percent (Praphamontripong forthcoming). In fact, over the past several decades since the first enactment of the Private Higher Education

Act,[2] the enrollment share of private sector has grown progressively. The institutional diversity that the private sector brings into the Thai higher education system particularly via business-oriented foci, professional training, and abundant numbers of institutions is also remarkable.

Although institutional diversity within the Thai private sector is recognized from the three-tiered types (university, college and institute) stipulated in the Private Higher Education Act,[3] such a classification may portray Thai PHEIs only on the surface; in fact, often there is mobility in institutional status. Similarly to those in international milieus, many Thai PHEIs first register as colleges due to affordability and ease for gaining approval and later on apply for a status upgrade. Therefore, this paper explores the emergence of different forms and salient institutional characteristics of Thai PHEIs. Indeed, the high percentage of institutions, more than enrollment, in PHE, provides fertile territory for analyzing inter-institutional diversity.

The context of PHE in Thailand is prevailingly rooted in both religious foundations and the business sector. While Christianity has played a vital role in private education and Western medical provision in Thailand since 1567 (Matawatsarapak 2001), business associations—parallel to the military-bureaucratic constituents—have been actively involved in public policy-making process since the early 1980s (Laothamatas 1992). Such a reality echoes an international PHE pattern in which the older prestigious private universities are founded by religious affiliations, largely Christian,[4] sometimes by philanthropic elites (Altbach 2005a; Levy 2006). Thus, Levy's (1986) trio of PHE types is applicable in exploring institutional diversity of the Thai private case. Even so, Thai diversification illustrates varying emphases. Catholic is not the only religion of the Thai private institutions. There are Islamic and Buddhist as well. Moreover, all prestigious private institutions founded by business elites are among the oldest PHEIs in Thailand. In addition, while an international pattern shows that demand-absorbing is normally later than other types (Kent 2004; Levy 1986; Silas Casillas 2005), there is overlap in emergence whereas in the Thai case most of the demand-absorbing ones are recent.

Foci and Approach

To understand how and how much the Thai PHE fits the salient global patterns and to contribute to the literature on institutional diversity, such fundamental questions must be explored: What roles do Thai PHEIs play and how do they differ from one another? Thus, this paper focuses broadly on institutional diversity of Thai PHE, presented in the following section which comprises of three subsections: pluralizing religious oriented, semi-elite, and demand-absorbing. Afterwards, the paper concludes with an analysis of a hybrid trend in Thai private growth.

INSIDE THAI PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION: GLOBAL EMULATION?

International literature stresses that PHE has been bound to diversification as it provides alternatives and targets particular niches (Geiger 1991; Johnstone 2002; Levy 1992). The Thai PHEIs emulate global reality to the extent that they distinguish themselves through their backgrounds, missions, and stratas. Insofar as between-institution diversity reflects differentiation among higher education institutions by way of mission, enrollment, clientele, programs, control and sources of funding (Fairweather 2000; Huisman and Morphew 1998), PHEIs highlight institutional diversity via particularities of religious orientation, market demand, partnership, for-profit focus, and non-university distinction (Kinser 2006; Levy 2004). Analyzing institutional differentiation based upon different forms of private emergence and their institutional missions shows great diversity in higher education systems. In fact, there is often abundant variation inside the system, as the Thai case illustrates.

Pluralizing Religious-Oriented

Generally, religious-oriented institutions are distinct from elite ones because of their prime or at least major religious role in providing religious service through philosophy, theology, or canonical law (Levy 1986, 2008b, forthcoming-b). Some of them also intend to train prospective priests or fellows of religious orders (Sunjic 2005). In Thailand, three subtypes of PHEIs emerge within the religious-oriented subsector. As noted, the majority is Christian-oriented while the other two are Islamic and Buddhist. Whereas the Thai reality has not yet expanded beyond "religious-oriented" to "non-religious culturally pluralizing" (Levy 2007b),[5] variations within this religious-oriented subsector are becoming evident.[6]

To begin with, despite Buddhism being the national religion, Christianity has been rooted in Thailand since 1567 with an important role in elementary-secondary private education and Western medical provision (Matawatsarapak 2001). Most of the Thai Christian-oriented private institutions are similar to those in the neighboring countries where Catholic colleges have a long tradition to serve the church and train its members (Altbach 2005a). In particular, Assumption University (AU), officially established in 1972 and administered by the Saint Gabriel Foundation of Thailand, has served as the first and most prestigious modern religiously-oriented private university in the country with a founding mission in Catholic education and business administration.[7] However, as is the case with University of Notre Dame, Georgetown University, Boston College, St. Louis University (Collier 2008), for example, AU is not reflective of the majority of religious-oriented PHEIs in Thailand as most of the others tend to be small and less selective with only few programs.[8]

Among the Thai Christian institutions themselves, institutional diversity appears in terms of focus and size. Even though they all have comparable missions in providing religious service through theology and philosophy, several of them pay more attention to offering Western medical and health fields. Such institutions are Christian University (CTU), Mission College (MC), and Saint Louis Nursing College (SLC) where nursing sciences have been highlighted. Regarding institutional size, while AU is exceptionally large, with enrollment of 19,391 (2006), Saengtham College (SC)—a Catholic private college—enrolled only 323 students in the same academic year.[9] Indeed, institutions with large size tend to be more comprehensive in their programs whereas those with much smaller size are very specialized in either theology or nursing. The Thai case here repeats international context that religious-affiliated colleges tend to be small in general (Collier 2008) and international literature that most PHEIs are rather narrow (Levy 1992).

Unlike Christian institutions, whose history in Thai PHE started much earlier,[10] Islamic and Buddhist institutions did not emerge until the 1990s. This reflects international reality where earlier Catholic or other Christian institutions may be followed by Muslim or Pentecostal initiatives (Levy forthcoming-a). In Thailand, Islamic education was first given at the higher education level in 1998 by Yala Islamic College (YIC). Similarly, it is not until 2003 that the International Buddhist College (IBC) was founded, also in southern Thailand. These two religious-oriented subtypes aim at a provision of canonical law and theology of their religions as well as training future members of their religious orders. Nonetheless, their institutional sizes are sharply different. While YIC had 2,145 students enrolling in 2006, IBC only enrolled 50 students.[11]

The case of Thai religious-oriented PHEIs illustrates great intra-sectoral variations. Such variations clearly stem from different types of founders/ religious orders, various missions and foci, and institutional size. However, the idea of a religious subsector comprising more than one religion alongside a few exceptional cases is embryonic in the PHE literature and, beyond the scope of this paper, whether they would harmonize, ignore, or compete with one another needs further investigation (Levy forthcoming-a; Otieno and Levy 2007).

Meanwhile, the better known aspect of organizational change and blurring has been long studied and can be reflected through the case of religious subsector herein. Collier (forthcoming) stresses that nominally religious-oriented U.S. PHEIs, especially nowadays, have had to throw themselves much deeply into commercial pursuits in order to sustain their brands and survive in the globally-oriented market. Applying similar logic through the population ecology and resource dependency perspectives where changing organizations occur due to constraints from external environment including scarce resource and competition with other organizations within

the same environment (Hannan and Freeman 1989; Pfeffer and Salancik 1978), the present Thai religious-oriented PHEIs show that only several of them are preserving their founding missions and narrowness of programs while some are reshaping their missions and moving toward market ideology. In any case, the bottom line is to survive in the marketplace.

Semi-Elite

While religious characteristics and missions signal a prime identification of religious-oriented institutions, a combination of academic status, admission selectivity, high profile students and faculty members, and business-orientation often epitomizes "elite" globally (Levy 1986, 1992). Indeed, elite universities are characterized as those having strong research orientation with great professional influence in decision making (Clark 1987). They are the most complex organizations among others due to their diverse goals and high degree of functional differentiation which makes them least subject to bureaucratic control (Rhoades 1992).

Nevertheless, empirical evidence illustrates that outside the U.S. academic elite in PHE is very rare and what actuality shows more commonly is PHEIs with "semi-elite" status. The term "semi-elite" has just very recently been defined and studied (Demurat 2008; Levy 2008a, 2008b; Praphamontripong 2008a, 2008b; Silas Casillas 2008a); this working paper is the first detailed empirical analysis of a national case. The fundamental yet simple definition is that these institutions are those "between elite and non-elite." Semi-elite institutions—with or without regard to academic and research distinction—are often the leading PHEIs in their own nations with multi-dimensional prestige of their students' socio-economic status, comparable reputation to most good public counterparts, leadership in a niche and business-related fields, entrepreneurial and market-oriented with well-tuned employment networks for their graduates. Indeed, they are typically recent and trendy in internationalism (Levy 2007a, 2008a; Marginson 2004).

Even applying such definitional characteristics from key international literature, semi-elite institutions are still rare in the Thai private sector when compared to PHEIs in other subsectors. Moreover, the Thai reality illustrates intriguing or even conflicting findings in that institutions belonging to the semi-elite category tend to be among the oldest and the first to gain legal approval for university status in the Thai PHE history. These pioneering universities, unofficially known since the 1940's, were founded by business elites for a specific mission in professional trainings in business-related fields.

Examples of semi-elite pioneering universities in Thai PHE include Bangkok University (BU), Dhurakij Pundit University (DPU), and the University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce

(UTCC), all located in Bangkok. UTCC was founded and licensed by the Thai Chamber of Commerce; DPU was created by revered wealthy scholars. Likewise, BU's founder was an elite businessman who was a former minister of several ministries. In an international context, such a phenomenon of the PHEI establishment and its early growth involving people from the public sector is found in China, India, and elsewhere (Gnanam 2002; Ping 2002).

Whereas different types of legal ownership indicate institutional differentiation among the Thai semi-elite pioneering universities, functional differentiation by diverse missions is likely limited in the Thai semi-elite case. These institutions tend to have comparable missions inasmuch as they all claim for academic distinction through a combination of both theoretical and hands-on experiments in business-related fields. Such missions are explicitly translated into their functioning by way of breadth of programs offered, internship and practicum training with business networks of the universities, high profile faculty members and guest speakers, and so forth.[12] This list coincides with the literature in that not only do elite private universities compete for privileged and outstanding students, but they also seek well-qualified and distinguished faculty members and researchers, because they obtain their reputations through their success and academic status in the markets (Rhoades 1992; Trow 1987). In fact, Chongwibul's (2001) study of Thai PHEIs confirms that the three prestigious universities exemplified above particularly attempt to produce graduates for the business and technological related industries networking with them.

Diversity by institutional size may be restricted within the Thai semi-elite subsector yet the size criterion makes this subsector sharply distinct from other subsectors. Elite by definition is reserved via selectivity and limited access of students to higher education (Levy 1992); nonetheless, semi-elite pioneering universities in Thailand are among the largest within the Thai private sector and comparable to the typical large public counterparts.[13] For instance, the 2006 data confirm that the three semi-elite examples here are among the largest private universities in Thailand—Bangkok University (28,489 students), Durakij Pundit University (22,469 students), University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce (19,692 students), respectively.[14] In addition, each of the three private giants has been persistently holding a considerable share of roughly 10 percent of the total private enrollment for decades.[15] Concisely put, the three giants have made up about 30 percent of the private total.

To contrast with its religious-oriented subsector, Thailand's semi-elite pioneering subsector is distinctive in its longstanding foundation with a specific mission in business training and technological specialization. Also, semi-elite universities are large in their institutional size and comprehensiveness via breadth of programs offered whereas the religious ones tend to be much

smaller and narrower in their offered fields even though both subsectors have a comparatively longstanding history in the Thai private sector.

Demand-Absorbing

A majority of PHEIs worldwide tend to be demand-absorbing in nature, and institutions within this subsector have become very diverse in multi-dimensions. By definition, "demand-absorbing" can be broadly referred to as non-elite institutions generally emerged to absorb demand that the public supply of higher education cannot or will not accommodate (Levy 1992, 2007b; Obasi 2006; Silas Casillas 2005). Though not always, the demand-absorbing subsector tends to emerge more recently than their religious-oriented predecessors. Demand-absorbing institutions have been viewed as problematic for quality and finance with low cost—focusing on such inexpensive programs as accounting, business, law, and cheaper professional training places (Geiger 1991; Gellert and Rau 1992; Levy 2006). Recent empirical evidence, however, has illustrated great variations within the demand-absorbing subsector that helps re-conceptualize its meaning (Bernasconi 2006; Levy 2007b; Silas Casillas 2008b). For instance, Levy (2007b) categorizes non-elite demand-absorbers into two different types: 1) serious job-oriented institutions; and 2) profit-making "garage" institutions. The first one may often be lauded, given that the development role of institutions in this type is seen as access providers specifically within the highly stratified societies and as suppliers for the job market.

Reflecting the global trends, approximately 80 percent of Thai PHEIs fit the category of demand-absorbing with roughly 50 percent of the total private enrollment. Thai demand-absorbing institutions differ sharply from their semi-elite and Christianity-affiliated counterparts since they are much younger in their emergence. In contrast, they are akin to other religious-oriented institutions—such as Islamic and Buddhist—in their relative recency, mostly established after 1991.

Furthermore, within the demand-absorbing subsector itself, roughly more than half are proprietary whereas the rest are companies and foundations.[16] Thai demand absorbers reside mainly in Bangkok and the central area as well as in highly developed provinces of each region. Such characteristics accentuate that Levy (1986) demand-absorbing institutions as well as other PHEIs are often initially located in the big cities. Despite dominating the private sector by their numbers of institutions, they, by and large, are small—having fewer than 1,000 students—and each of them shares only a tiny amount of the total private enrollment. Nonetheless, it is noted that several demand-absorbers are exceptional in their size, enrolling over 10,000 students. Examples include Rattana Bundit University (RBAC) and Siam University (SIAM).

Differences in institutional size of Thai demand-absorbing PHEIs are also reflected by institutional missions inasmuch as the organizational functions determining institutional size and programs rely heftily on such missions. Generally, Thai demand-absorbing institutions claim to provide academic services and training in the high-demand fields in response to the economic and societal needs. Such a claimed mission is not so different than that of semi-elites except that the latter ones often claim to emphasize on research and academic distinction—at least, at the national level. Nevertheless, Chongwibul (2001) and Dulayakasem (2002) report that most PHEIs in Thailand rarely conduct research and heavily focus on job trainings in high-demand low-cost fields like business administration. Such characteristics are often and pertinently seen in demand-absorbing institutions elsewhere. Additionally, while findings show comparable missions between demand-absorbing and semi-elite institutions, demand absorbers' mission does clearly differ from their religious-oriented counterparts' mission, given the sharp divergence between training in the high-demand fields like business administration and training in theology and nursing sciences. Above all, PHEIs including demand-absorbing ones may be perceived as capitalistic, making profits via high tuition charge, extensive commercialization, and easy access for a high enrollment volume.

In terms of programmatic diversity, Thai demand-absorbing institutions play overlapping roles among themselves, yet with a slight degree of variation within the subsector. Most small demand absorbers emphasize business-oriented or technology-related fields. The former's most popular programs are business administration, communication arts, and fine arts & humanities; the latter's ones are computer sciences and technology. Both reflect those in the for-profit sector by way of fundamental vocational and technical characteristics (Kinser 2006). The Thai reality also portrays a parallel picture to the recent PHE literature in that private institutions—neither elite nor the opposite—may perform well in selected fields which reflect narrowness of PHEIs and that such specializations generally cover commercial fields like business administration, tourism, and technology. Such institutions may be regarded as serious demand-absorbing ones. Mahanakorn University of Technology (MUT) can be a good example for engineering and technology fields while Dusit Thani College (DTC) labors in tourism and hotel management. Yet, expensive fields such as medicine and health professions are almost never offered by demand-absorbers in the Thai case.

In sum, Thai demand-absorbing institutions are markedly divergent from religious-oriented ones in their missions and focused fields of study whereas they are largely homogeneous to their semi-elite counterparts in their business and market foci. Even so, they cannot compare to both religious-oriented and semi-elite predecessors in terms of historical backgrounds since demand-absorbing ones have emerged much later. Additionally, demand-absorbers cannot catch up with semi-elites in terms of size but may catch up in size with some religious-related predecessors.

THE GROWING HYBRID TRENDS OF THAI PRIVATE GROWTH

The three main subsectors of PHE in Thailand possess both different and overlapping characteristics. In Table 1, one of the fundamental traits that make PHEIs differ from one another is ownership. Religious-oriented subsector is saliently distinguished from the other two subsectors, given that its owner is a religious foundation whereas both semi-elite and demand-absorbing counterparts show a mixed ownership type, always secular, among proprietary, company, and foundation. The nature of such owners leads to the pursuit of differentiated roles and missions in PHE provision. For instance, religious-oriented institutions primarily position themselves in providing religious service and training future priests. Semi-elite and demand-absorbing subsectors, in contrast, share a business-oriented focus. Even so, semi-elites envision themselves as private universities with academic distinction and wealth, which is opposite to demand absorbers whose roles are concerned more on undergraduate fast-training for the high-demand job market.

Furthermore, different types of PHEIs differ in what they actually do. Since the prime missions of religious-oriented institutions are religiously-related, theology and nursing science are their main fields offered. Semi-elites, on the contrary, are comprehensive, offering a wide range of programs, despite the fact that their origins are business-focused in specific niches. Demand-absorbing institutions copy their semi-elite counterparts, focusing on business-related fields while following much on specialization and narrowness of the religious-oriented ones.

Table 1: Institutional Diversity within the Thai Private Higher Education Sector

Institutional Characteristics	Religious-Oriented PHEIs	Semi-Elite PHEIs	Demand-Absorbing PHEIs
Legal ownership	Foundation & religious organization	1. Company & Chamber of Commerce 2. Proprietary (elites)	1. Proprietary 2. Company 3. Foundation
Mission	1. Religious role 2. Training future priests	1. Professional trainings in business-related fields 2. Academic distinction 3. leadership in a niche 4. Well-tuned employment networks	1. "Claimed" mission - Academic services - Training (in high-demand fields) 2. "Underlying" mission - Profit making via high tuition charge, extensive commercialization, easy access

Institutional Characteristics	Religious-Oriented PHEIs	Semi-Elite PHEIs	Demand-Absorbing PHEIs
Fields of study	1. Philosophy, theology, canonical law 2. Nursing sciences 3. Business-oriented	Breath of programs offered (comprehensiveness in both expensive & inexpensive fields)	1. Business-oriented 2. Technological-related (Exception: a few large comprehensive universities)
Size	1. Large (10,000-19,999) & comprehensive 2. Medium (3,000-9,999) & comprehensive 3. Small (1,000-2,999) & very small (fewer than 1,000) & either theology or nursing	Large to very large (19,000-29,000)	1. Small (1,000-2,999) & Very small (fewer than 1,000) 2. Large to Very large (19,000-29,000)
Type & Age	1. Christianity, old 2. Islam, new 3. Buddhism, new 4. Culture & arts, new	Oldest	New, mostly founded after 1991
Location	Mostly outside Bangkok	Northern suburb Bangkok (i.e., all on the same road)	1. Proprietary – widespread across the country (Bangkok, north-east, and central) 2. Company – Bangkok & central (w/ several in other regions) 3. Foundation – Bangkok & central

In particular, semi-elite institutions distinguish themselves from the other two subsectors by way of prestigious historical background, very large institutional size and national reputation as well as comprehensiveness. Although the common definitional characteristics of semi-elites in the global context often associates niche fields and recency, Thai semi-elites have once echoed the literature in their business niches when first established but afterwards have grown tremendously in size and comprehensiveness, once again making the Thai case unusual. Demand-absorbing institutions, on the other hand, differ from their predecessors through their recency, the enormous number of institutions and the preponderance of proprietary family-owned institutions across the country. Contrasting sharply to the semi-elite ones, the majority of both demand-absorbing and religious-oriented institutions are small or very small in size, except for the religious AU, being as large as some of those semi-elites.[17]

Nevertheless, the analysis reveals a growing trend of hybrids. One kind of mix has common elements from all three subsectors; other hybrids mix common elements from any two. Mostly, hybridization has been a salient trend as soon as new sectors have arisen while exceptional cases such as AU and its other semi-elite counterparts have illustrated hybridization throughout their institutional developments. Thai religious-oriented institutions can be semi-elite or demand-absorbing as illustrated in the cases of AU and a few medium-to-large comprehensive religious universities. Semi-elite universities are not distinctive in that regard either, insofar as many of them have expanded both their institutional size to be among the largest and breadth of programs offered—beyond business orientation—to be among the most comprehensive private institutions. Imitating semi-elites institutions, several demand-absorbing ones signal some seriousness in either widening their niches through a more expensive field or networking aggressively with their job market or both. Stark examples include large comprehensive universities in both proprietary and company types. Accordingly, we are witnessing some juxtaposed roles *between* and *within* subsectors of Thai PHE, and challenges to research on institutional diversity and PHE policy have become crucial, given an increase of such hybrids.

REFERENCES

Akekachon, Sumnak Kijjakan Sathaban Udomsuksa. 1995. *Kumeu Kanyeunkumkhorub Bai Anuyat Jattung Sathabanudomsuksa Akekachon* [Manual of private higher education institution establishment]. 4th ed. Bangkok: Ministry of University Affairs.

Altbach, Philip G. 2005a. The Private Sector in Asian Higher Education. In *Private Higher Education: A Global Revolution*, edited by P. G. Altbach and D. C. Levy. The Netherlands: SensePublishers, 85-88.

———. 2005b. Universities: Family Style. In *Private Higher Education: A Global Revolution*, edited by P. G. Altbach and D. C. Levy. The Netherlands: SensePublishers, 29-32.

APHEIT, Association of Private Higher Education Institutions of Thailand. 2003. *Association of Private Higher Education Institutions of Thailand 2003-2005*. Bangkok, Thailand: Jamjuree Product.

Bernasconi, Andrés. 2006. Does the Affiliation of Universities to External Organizations Foster Diversity in Private Higher Education? Chile in Comparative Perspective. *Higher Education* 52 (2):303-42.

Chongwibul, Pinmada. 2001. The Roles of Private Universities in Bangkok Metropolitan and Vicinities in Managing Higher Education. Education, Mahidol University, Bangkok.

Clark, Burton R. 1987. *The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds*. Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Collier, Marry Beth. forthcoming. Student Choice of Non-Elite Private Colleges. Doctoral Dissertation, Educational Administration and Policy Studies, University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany.

Collier, Mary Beth. 2008. Institutional Evolution and Survival: Non-Elite, Catholic Colleges in the United States. In *Private Higher Education: Global Trends and Indian Perspectives*, edited by A. Gupta, D. C. Levy and K. Powar. New Delhi, India: Shipra Publications, 29-39.

Demurat, Joanna. 2008. The First-Second Choices: What Methods Do Ambitious Polish Private Higher Education Institutions Use to Attract near Pinnacle Students? Paper presented at the 33rd Annual Conference of The Associate for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE), International Division, November 5-8, at Jacksonville, Florida.

Dulayakasem, Utai. 2002. *Sungkomsart Purkanpattana* [Sociology for development: concepts of research and development]. Ayuthaya, Thailand: Teinwattana.

Fairweather, James S. 2000. Diversification or Homogenization: How Markets and Governments Combine to Shape American Higher Education. *Higher Education Policy* 13:79-98.

Geiger, Roger L. 1986. *Private Sectors in Higher Education: Structure, Function, and Change in Eight Countries*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

———. 1991. Private Higher Education. In *International Higher Education: An Encyclopedia*, edited by P. G. Altbach. New York: Garland Publishing, 233-46.

Gellert, Claudius, and Einhard Rau. 1992. Diversification and Integration: The Vocationalisation of the German Higher Education System. *European Journal of Education* 27 (1/2):89-99.

Gnanam, A. 2002. Private Higher Education in India. In *The Report of the Second Regional Seminar on Private Higher Education: Its Role in Human Resource Development in a Globalised Knowledge Society*. Thailand: SEAMEO-RIHED, 23-35.

Hannan, Michael T., and John Freeman. 1989. *Organizational Ecology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Huisman, Jeroen, and Christopher C. Morphew. 1998. Centralization and Diversity: Evaluating the Effects of Government Policies in U.S.A. And Dutch Higher Education. *Higher Education Policy* 11:3-13.

Johnstone, Bruce D. 2002. Private Institutions. In *Higher Education in the United States: An Encyclopedia*, edited by J. J. Forest and K. Kinser. California: ABC-CLIO, Inc., 482-89.

Kent, Rollin. 2004. Private Sector Expansion and Emerging Policy Responses in Mexican Higher Education. Paper presented at The 17th Annual Conference of the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers, 17 – 19 September, at University of Twente, The Netherlands.

Kent, Rollin, and Rosalba Ramirez. 1999. Private Higher Education in Mexico: Growth and Differentiation. In *Private Prometheus: Private Higher Education and Development in the 21st Century*, edited by P. G. Altbach. Boston, MA: Boston College Center for International Higher Education, 85-99.

Kinser, Kevin. 2006. From Main Street to Wall Street: The Transformation of for-Profit Higher Education. In *Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) Higher Education Report*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Konmolmas, Prathip M. 2002. Lesson Learned: Credit Transfer and Mutual Recognition: A Case Study of Thailand's Private Higher Education Institutions. In *Experiences of Higher Education Institutions in Thailand*, edited by K. Sangmahachai. Bangkok, Thailand: Office of Permanent Secretary, Ministry of University Affairs, 31-44.

Laothamatas, Anek. 1992. *Business Associations and the New Political Economy of Thailand: From Bureaucratic Polity to Liberal Corporatism*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Levy, Daniel C. 1986. *Higher Education and the State in Latin America: Private Challenges to Public Dominance*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

———. 1992. Private Institutions of Higher Education. In *The Encyclopedia of Higher Education*, edited by B. R. Clark and G. Neave. New York: Pergamon Press, 1183-95.

———. 2004. The New Institutionalism: Mismatches with Private Higher Education's Global Growth. *PROPHE Working Paper No.3*, http://www.albany.edu/dept/eaps/prophe/publication/paper.html.

———. 2006. The Unanticipated Explosion: Private Higher Education's Global Surge. *Comparative Education Review* 50 (2):218-40.

———. 2007a. Legitimacy and Privateness: Central and Eastern European Private Higher Education in Global Context. In *Private Higher Education in Post-Communist Europe: In Search of Legitimacy*, edited by S. Slantcheva and D. C. Levy: Palgrave Macmillan.

———. 2007b. Private-Public Interfaces in Higher Education Development: Two Sectors in Sync? Paper presented at Conference on Higher Education and Development, the 2007 World Bank Regional Seminar on Development Economics, January 16-17, at Beijing, China.

———. 2008a. Exploring the Viability of a Semi-Elite Category. Paper presented at the 33rd Annual Conference of The Associate for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE), International Division, November 5-8, at Jacksonville, Florida.

———. 2008b. Private Higher Education's Global Surge: Emulating U.S. Patterns? Paper presented at Privatization in Higher Education Conference, January 6-8, at the Samuel Nieman Institute for Advanced Studies in Science and Technology, Technion, Haifa, Israel.

———. forthcoming-a. Commonality and Distinctiveness: Indian Private Higher Education in International Perspective. In *Private Higher Education: Indian and International Cases*, edited by A. Gupta, D. C. Levy and K. Powar. New Delhi, India: Deep and Deep Publications.

———. forthcoming-b. Public Policy for Private Higher Education: A Global Analysis. In *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, edited by D. C. Levy and W. Zumeta.

Marginson, Simon. 2004. Keynote Address: Global Educational Markets and Global Public Goods. Paper presented at ANZCIES conference, December 3, at Australian Catholic University, Melbourne.

Marginson, Simon, and Mark Considine. 2000. *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Matawatsarapak, Preecha. 2001. *Sathaban Satsana Christ Nikai Roman Catholic Kub Parakijtangkansuksa Nai Prated Thai* [Roman Catholic Institution and Its Educational Mission in Thailand]. Social Science Research Center, Research Institute Assumption University.

Obasi, Isaac N. 2006. New Private Universities in Nigeria. *International Higher Education* (45), http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/Number45/p14_Obasi.htm.

Otieno, Wycliffe, and Daniel C. Levy. 2007. Public Disorder, Private Boons? Inter-Sectoral Dynamics Illustrated by the Kenyan Case. *PROPHE Working Paper No. 9*, http://www.albany.edu/dept/eaps/prophe/publication/paper.html.

Pachuashvili, Marie. 2006. The Politics of Educational Choice: Explaining the Diversity in Post-Communist Higher Education Policy Choices. Paper presented at the First Annual Doctoral Conference, April, at Central European University, Hungary.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey, and Gerald R. Salancik. 1978. *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.

Ping, Li. 2002. Private Higher Education in China. In *The Report of the Second Regional Seminar on Private Higher Education: Its Role in Human Resource Development in a Globalised Knowledge Society*. Thailand: SEAMEO-RIHED, 17-22.

Praphamontripong, Prachayani. 2008a. Different Access Roles between Demand-Absorbing and Semi-Elite Subsectors in Thai Private Higher Education. Paper presented at the 52nd Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society, March 20, at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

———. 2008b. Institutional Governance and Finance of Semi-Elite Private Universities: What Differences Do They Bring to the Thai Higher Education System? Paper presented at the 33rd Annual Conference of The Associate for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE), International Division, November 5-8, at Jacksonville, Florida.

———. forthcoming. Intra-Sectoral Diversity: A Political Economy of Thai Private Higher Education. Doctoral Dissertation, Educational Administration and Policy Studies, University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany.

Rhoades, G. 1992. Organization Theory. In *The Encyclopedia of Higher Education*, edited by B. R. Clark and G. Neave. New York: Pergamon Press, 1884-96.

Scheker, Ancell. 2007. School-Level Private Education in the Dominican Republic: Parallels to Private Higher Education? Paper presented at The Comparative and International Education Society 51st Annual Conference, February 25-March 1, at Baltimore, Maryland.

Silas Casillas, Juan Carlos. 2005. Recognizing the Subsectors in Mexican Private Higher Education. In *Private Higher Education: A Global Revolution*, edited by P. G. Altbach and D. C. Levy. The Netherlands: SensePublishers, 241-43.

———. 2008a. Almost There: Semi-Elite Private Institutions in Mexico. Paper presented at the 33rd Annual Conference of The Associate for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE), International Division, November 5-8, at Jacksonville, Florida.

———. 2008b. Demand-Absorbing Institutions as Enhancers of Access to Higher Education in Mexico. Paper presented at The 52nd Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society, March 20, at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

Sunjic, Marijan. 2005. Catholic Universities in Central Europe. In *Private Higher Education: A Global Revolution*, edited by P. G. Altbach and D. C. Levy. The Netherlands: SensePublishers, 179-82.

Trow, Martin A. 1987. The Analysis of Status. In *Perspectives on Higher Education: Eight Disciplinary and Comparative Views*, edited by B. R. Clark. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 132-64.

Van Vught, Frans. 1996. Isomorphism in Higher Education? Towards a Theory of Differentiation and Diversity in Higher Education Systems. In *The Mockers and Mocked: Comparative Perspectives on Differentiation, Convergence and Diversity in Higher Education*, edited by V. L. Meek, et al. New York: Pergamon for IAU Press, 42-58.

NOTES

[1] The country cases most analyzed in Levy (1986) were Chile, Mexico, and Brazil. Levy's (2007b) paper refashions his classic trio typology with worldwide explored cases and years of private growth. Also see Kent (2004), Kent and Ramirez (1999), and Silas Casillas (2005) for further modification on the Mexican case, Scheker (2007) for an application to the elementary-secondary education level in Dominican Republic.

[2] The first enactment of the Private Higher Education Act was in 1969 when the Act permitted only college status with the offer of associate degree programs for the private sector to operate. Later, the Act was revised and reauthorized in 1979, 1992, and 2003, respectively. For more details on Thai PHE law in English, see the 2003 Private Higher Education Institution Act of Thailand in *PROPHE Country Laws on Private Higher Education*, [online] from http://www.albany.edu/dept/eaps/prophe/data/countrylaw.html.

[3] Section 9 of the 2003 Private Higher Education Institution Act stipulates that private higher education institutions in Thailand are classified into three types: 1) university; 2) institute; and 3) college. *University* signifies an institution that offers broad various programs and holds degree-granting status for all levels. Its mission aims at instructional provision and research. Similar to university in its mission, *institute* signifies an institution that provides specialized fields of study and holds degree-granting status for all levels. *College* signifies an institution that offers particular programs and holds degree-granting status for only levels under master's degree. Its mission is teaching while research may be given but not obligated. In addition, the establishment for the university type requires land given of 100 rais (approximately 40 acres) whereas only 6 or 8 rais (roughly 2.4 or 3.2 acres) are mandated for the types of institute and college (Akekachon 1995; Konmolmas 2002).

[4] Among such institutions are Santa Dharma in Indonesia, Sophia and Doshisha in Japan, Ateneo de Manila and De La Salle in the Philippines, and Sogang and Yonsei in South Korea (Altbach 2005a).

[5] As of 2007, all PHEIs in the religious-oriented subsector have some religious characteristics, except for the newly registered Arsom Silp Institute of the Arts and Development, which is culturally-oriented but has not yet enrolled any students.

[6] Until the last decade, the religious-oriented subsector in Thailand had not shown much variation because only Christianity ruled the sector. Islamic and Buddhist have just emerged recently, adding more diversity to the religious-oriented subsector in the Thai PHE system. Although Thailand is a Buddhist country, PHEIs offering Buddhist education is very rare, seeing that traditional delivery of such religion is given to the public sector. There are two explicitly Buddhist public universities: Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University founded in 1887 (see http://www.mcu.ac.th/En/index.php?) and Mahamakut Buddhist University founded in 1893 (see http://www.eng.mbu.ac.th/).

[7] Interestingly, required by the Foundation, the AU's president must be a reverend appointed and sent from the Foundation.

[8] We often associate small with more selective.

[9] Data from *Higher Education Enrollment in Thailand Year 2006*, [online] from http://www.mua.go.th/infodata/49/all2549.htm.

[10] Despite that the role of Christianity in Western medicine, welfare, and education (mostly in elementary and secondary levels) has emerged in Thailand since 1567, higher education offered through the private sector, including Christian foundations, was not allowed until the enactment of the Private Higher Education Act in 1969.

[11] Despite this fact, IBC was founded much later than YIC and in southern Thailand the major population is Muslim. In addition, the enrollment data are retrieved from the Office of Higher Education Commission. See supra note 9.

[12] See an example of detailed academic features of the UTCC [online] from http://www.utcc.ac.th/faculties/curriculum.html. In addition to business orientation, which is the core emphasis of the three universities, BU also highlights its breath of programs in the fields of journalism and communication arts.

[13] The average size for a large public university with all degree levels is roughly 15,000-29,000 students. Examples of large public university include Naresuan University (north), Chiang Mai University (north), Khon Kaen University (north-east), Mahidol University (Bangkok and vicinities), Burapha University (east), Rajabhat Suan Sunandha University (Bangkok), King Mongkut's Institute of Technology North Bangkok (Bangkok), to name a few. In 2006 if excluding the open university subsector, there are only 2 public universities with an extremely large size, over 45,000 students: Rajabhat Suan Dusit University (47,868 students) and Kasetsart University (45,730 students), respectively. For detailed data, see *Information*, Commission on Higher Education [on-line] from http://www.mua.go.th/infodata/49/all2549.htm.

[14] See Commission on Higher Education, supra note 9.

[15] From *Higher Education Data and Information*, Commission on Higher Education, [online] from http://www.stat.mua.go.th/ebook/

[16] In Thailand, PHEIs can be legally differentiated into 3 types according to their legal ownership of licensee designation: 1) proprietary; 2) company and the Chamber of Commerce; and 3) foundations and religious organizations (APHEIT 2003). Paralleling the literature in terms of definitions (Altbach 2005b; Bernasconi 2006), Thai *proprietary* universities are usually founded and licensed by individuals as well as being governed almost solely by the founders and their successors. Indeed, they are often perceived as family-run educational institutions. Beyond the Thai case, the U.S. for-profit family-owned/ individual-entrepreneur-owned institutions are called "enterprise" institutions (Kinser 2006). It is useful to apply Kinser's (2006) typology of for-profit PHEIs into the differentiation analysis herein, given that leading PHE literature has noted how much many legally nonprofit demand-absorbing PHEIs really function much like for-profit ones (Altbach 2005b; Kinser 2006). As a result, a categorization apt for for-profits may well make sense for nonprofit demand-absorbing institutions, particularly the company type in the Thai case. *The company and the Chamber of Commerce* type comprises PHEIs that are licensed by a company and the Thai Chamber of Commerce. The Thai definition is tricky if paralleled to the for-profit literature since "company" implies a meaning of "enterprise" or entrepreneur-owned status that Kinser (2006) designated in his "enterprise" institutions type, which also includes family-owned status. In other words, proprietary and company types in the Thai case, by definitions, may altogether represent the enterprise type according to Kinser (2006). The last and least ambiguous type signifies those licensed by *a foundation or a religious organization*.

[17] Also, large size of semi-elite illustrated here in the Thai case clashes with Levy's (2008a) postulation in semi-elites being selective and thus generally small. It is not that Levy is wrong on these but he is attempting to identify common characteristics and some of these do not fit every national case.